

**Presidential Task Force on Campus Climate
Preliminary Report: Campus Response Subcommittee**

May 1, 2018

Background

The Campus Response subcommittee was charged with reviewing and making recommendations to address: (1) how the university should respond to any future incidents, whether local or broader in scope, that infringe upon our core principles, (2) our mechanisms of support, communication, and response related to bias incidents, (3) the role of individuals and campus groups in efforts to counter unacceptable actions and act as positive forces that counter harmful incidents, and (4) metrics to evaluate long-term success.

Subcommittee members deemed it appropriate to acknowledge, review, and document the bias incidents that led to the creation of the Presidential Task Force as well as those that occurred during our appointed term. These incidents include the following:

- In September 2017, an African American student was allegedly harassed and beaten in Collegetown by a White member of a Cornell fraternity. Earlier in the evening, the same individual was recorded using racial epithets in reference to another student and the recording was posted on social media (<http://cornellsun.com/2017/09/19/was-the-collegetown-assault-of-a-black-student-a-hate-crime/>).
- Earlier that month, a Cornell undergraduate student allegedly chanted “build a wall” near the Latino Living Center less than 24 hours after President Trump ordered the end of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program (<http://cornellsun.com/2017/09/07/fraternity-member-allegedly-chants-build-a-wall-near-latino-living-center/>).
- In October 2017, Anti-Semitic posters with swastikas were posted on several university buildings and on a statue of Ezra Cornell (<http://cornellsun.com/2017/10/23/anti-semitic-posters-appear-on-campus-advertising-apparently-fake-hate-group/>).
- Black Lives Matter posters were vandalized at the Veterinary School.
- In March 2018, two White males allegedly assaulted and used racial slurs to harass an African American undergraduate student near a taco truck in Collegetown. The alleged assailants, who were not students of either Cornell or Ithaca College, reportedly injured others including the Good Samaritan that attempted to assist the initial victim (<http://cornellsun.com/2018/04/12/police-arrest-2-in-assault-of-black-cornell-student-who-said-he-was-called-a-slur/>).
- Also in March, a female Cornell undergraduate student was sexually assaulted while trying to enter her apartment at night (https://www.cupolice.cornell.edu/alerts.cfm?ALERT_ID=2141).

The campus response sub-committee recognizes that these published events are not an exhaustive or representative list of bias incidents that have affected the campus community. However, these publicized incidents, their impacts and the ensuing responses served as bases for many discussions of campus climate and institutional responses to bias incidents. They also shaped our findings and inform our recommendations regarding responses to incidents of bias or harassment.

Organization and Work Processes

We began our work by organizing into four working groups, each focusing on different aspects of campus response. Specifically, guided by our initial charge, the campus response sub-committee organized into working groups that focused on: (1) instructional support, (2) community health, (3) co-curricular support, and (4) bias communication and reporting.

To reach out to as many individuals, offices, or groups as possible in the limited time available, the working groups conducted independent or collaborative outreach efforts to meet their information needs. As a result of the degree of independence across working groups and the possibility of overlap in their separate charges, there are some common findings and overlapping recommendations across groups, as well as some unique themes identified within each group. The major themes that surfaced across groups are summarized in the section that follows.

Common Themes

The Cost of Perceived Inconsistencies

Our outreach efforts revealed concerns about differences in responses over time, across incidents, or across units. Because the differences in responses are more easily observable than factors that influence these differences, students perceive inconsistencies and draw unfavorable inferences about the extent to which the institution or institutional actors are committed to creating an inclusive campus climate.

Examples include:

- Some students drew unfavorable inferences about the extent to which the campus community cares about sexual assault as a result of their observation that the initial statements about the two incidents that occurred in March came from different university officials.
- Students noted inconsistencies across schools and instructors in terms of if or how they addressed recent bias incidents.
- With the widespread use of social media, many students hear of bias incidents, even those that do not attract media attention. Thus, there is the potential for some to notice and react negatively to differences in how the university responds to publicized vs. unpublicized incidents. At least one person attributed this perceived difference to a greater concern for the image of the institution than for the safety of its students.
- The committee noted differences in how the two groups that handle bias incidents on campus operate. The Bias Assessment and Response Team (BART) addresses all bias incidents that ONLY involve students. Any incidents that involve faculty and staff (even if another party is a student) are channeled to the Department for Inclusion and Workforce Diversity. BART currently reaches out to both the victim and the alleged perpetrator of a bias incident (if names are given) whereas the Department for Inclusion and Workforce Diversity only reaches out to offer support to the victim. They do not contact the alleged perpetrator at all.

The Lifecycle of Responses

Our outreach efforts suggest that students attend to more than just the initial statements released immediately after incidents of bias or sexual assault. Their comments suggest that responses have a lifecycle that ends with knowledge of how a bias incident is resolved. In addition to the initial verbal response, students also observe and infer meaning from:

- Observable actions that follow any initial statements.

- The presence or absence of information about how bias incidents are resolved (e.g., was the alleged perpetrator punished?).
- The severity of the consequences, if any.

Perceived Overreliance on Unpaid or Untrained “First Responders”

Our findings suggest that Cornell is challenged by a heavy reliance, either by the institution or by the students it serves, on a variety of early responders (e.g., student leaders, residence hall staff, graduate TAs, instructors, etc.) who lack the training, incentives, or bandwidth to provide sufficient support for affected populations. The following observations or sentiments support this theme:

- Student leaders, especially those from marginalized populations, feel that they are too frequently called upon to assist university efforts to address bias incidents when they, themselves, are affected and have other responsibilities to perform (e.g., coursework).
- The university appears to rely heavily upon Greek letter organizations to provide safe, secure, developmentally appropriate social gatherings and housing for students.
- Empathetic staff members, who have other responsibilities, are perceived to be overburdened with the responsibility to provide care and support in response to crises.
- Graduate TAs and faculty are sometimes seen as “first responders” by students who expect them to address bias incidents that occur on campus. However, some faculty feel unequipped to discuss these issues.

Challenges of Social Media

The widespread use of social media, especially by the student population, has created a number of challenges that create the need to reevaluate our processes for communicating initial responses to bias incidents. These challenges include:

- The speed with which students send and receive information through social media results in the potential for information about bias incidents to be circulated before key facts can be verified by outlets with higher accuracy thresholds.
- The use of social media to disseminate information about bias incidents can result in students being informed about incidents even if they are not publicized in the media.
- For victims of sexual assault or bias incidents, social media has become a space to take ownership and shame alleged perpetrators when they believe official reporting mechanisms are likely to fail them (<https://www.theguardian.com/society/2016/sep/13/social-media-rape-survivors-justice-legal-system>).

Each working group sought to develop recommendations that address a combination of these common themes as well as the unique findings that surfaced during the course of their independent outreach efforts. Specifically, many recommendations involve policies or practices intended to eliminate or manage perceived inconsistencies in responses to bias incidents; equip students, faculty and staff with the skills and comfort to address and respond to bias incidents and talk, teach and/or mentor across difference; build capacity to better support students affected by future bias incidents; and recognize, accommodate, reward and even incentivize student contributions to a more inclusive climate. The specific recommendations of each working group along with some of their additional findings are summarized and presented in the sections that follow.

Instructional Support

Findings – TAs

- Graduate TAs teach, mentor, and advise undergraduate students. They interact with graduate students in small settings and get to know some of them very well. Their role as educators is crucial and they should be equipped with skills for teaching marginalized students and be well versed in adequate responses to the potential bias incidents that these students face.
- Currently, Cornell University has no central mandatory training for Graduate TAs. Some departments require TAs to attend training related to their field, but only a few departments/colleges focus on diversity and inclusion (D&I) issues in these trainings. We have found that Graduate TAs from STEM fields are fairly reticent to the idea of D&I training and that Graduate TAs from the humanities who teach on race are more amenable to the idea.
- Center for Teaching Innovation (CTI) and the Center for the Integration of Research, Teaching, and Learning (CIRTL) lead The Inclusive Teaching Institute training for graduate students once a year. This year 16 students participated in the Spring institute. This 1.5-day training allows participants to explore their own social identities to increase awareness of how those identities inform their teaching; consider how to use the framework to guide their planning for increasing inclusive teaching practices; examine complexity of student experience and identity development; categorize things that impact classroom climate; identify inclusive teaching strategies; explore the LARA method for communication with guest facilitators from the Intergroup Dialogue Project.
- The Intergroup Dialogue Project offers an 18-hour course for graduate students and postdoctoral scholars during the winter and summer intersessions. The course relies on a four-stage process: (1) developing a shared meaning of dialogue; (2) understanding social identity, social relations, and conflict; (3) practicing dialogue: understanding intergroup inequality; and (4) building alliances and other next steps. Last winter, 18 students participated in the course.

Recommendations – TAs

Recommendation 1: We recommend that the Graduate School work with CTI, IDP, CITE, CIRTL, and the colleges to develop mandatory training for Graduate TAs focusing on teaching and mentoring across difference, with the goal of relating the issues of inequality to the course material.

Findings – Faculty/Academic Staff

- Students see faculty as first responders, and expect them to address bias incidents that occur on campus or in the classroom. Students appreciate faculty that talk about these issues and/or facilitate meaningful conversations about bias incidents on campus.
- Only a few faculty feel comfortable addressing such issues in the classroom. They don't think that they have the necessary knowledge or skills, and some are worried about addressing "political" issues in the classroom.
- Currently Cornell University has no mandatory D&I training for faculty.
- CTI offers the Faculty Institute for Diversity twice a year. FID brings tenured and tenure-track faculty together to engage in complex discussions about aspects of diversity; creates a network of teachers and scholars who can serve as a resource for one another on matters of diversity and education; supports faculty in incorporating diversity elements into new or revised courses.
- CITE offers D&I sessions for departments. The CITE team is very small, and since they are not funded by the university they have to facilitate workshops off-campus on a regular basis. It's difficult for the team to address the needs of many departments on campus.

- It looks like the training sessions offered by CITE and CTI focus more on the “what” in diversity (what is racism/sexism/homophobia etc., what is micro-aggression, what is insensitive behavior in the classroom etc.) and less on the “how” (how to create an inclusive classroom, how to understand particular dynamics, how to mentor/advise/teach across difference). Moreover, CTI focuses on curriculum and pedagogy. There is no training that allows faculty to deeply examine their own privilege and oppression, their biases, and the way they communicate with others; to practice dialogue and communication skills; and to create a network of faculty interested in these issues.

Recommendations – Faculty/Academic Staff

Recommendation 2: Encourage faculty to address incidents of bias in their classrooms about relevant instances of bias on Cornell’s campus and in the larger community.

Recommendation 3: Equip faculty with basic tools to increase their comfort with addressing and responding to bias incidents. We further recommend that CTI and IDP work together to develop training and materials focusing on these tools.

Recommendation 4: Support the CITE team financially to allow CITE staff to focus on trainings and workshops for Cornell faculty in the departments.

Recommendation 5: We also recommend that the Associate Vice Provost for Faculty Development and Diversity enhances the D&I training for new faculty (during new faculty orientation).

Recommendation 6: We recommend that CTI, CITE, and IDP collaborate to enhance existing workshops/institutes and to develop new intragroup programming to allow faculty to develop skills for communication/teaching across difference.

Recommendation 7: Modify course evaluations to include an assessment of the instructor’s efforts to create an inclusive climate.

Additional Findings

- Students affected by bias incidents cited experiences with unsympathetic professors refusing to make allowances that account for the time commitment and emotional labor that detract from their coursework.

Additional Findings

Recommendation 8: Implement a uniform policy for giving extensions on coursework for students who have been affected by a campuswide bias incident.

Community Health

Recommendations

Recommendation 9: Develop written Cornell University policy that clearly states the core principles, especially related to bias and discrimination, also addressing community expectations and potential consequences to behaviors/actions that counter core principles. (Consider Cornell Health’s Hazing Framework) See shared “Mental Health Framework”

Recommendation 10: Frame bias, racism and discrimination not only as infringing on Cornell University values, but also as a public health issue.” To date, racism has primarily been conceptualized as a psychosocial stressor in the health science literature, and the strongest and most consistent evidence of its adverse health effects concerns mental health, as detailed in several comprehensive, systematic reviews. Self-reported racism was positively associated with increased levels of negative mental health, including all individual mental health outcomes except for positive affect (e.g., depression, anxiety, distress, psychological stress, negative affect, and post-traumatic stress), and negatively associated with positive mental health (e.g., self-esteem, life satisfaction, control and mastery, and wellbeing).” The Lancet, Vol 389, April 8, 2017.

Recommendation 11: Develop a standard, centralized procedure to address any type of bias incident (local/national/global). The steps in the process should be consistent across the university. The procedure should be easily accessible and transparent, and include a mechanism for tracking time-line expectations. (Skidmore College example)

Recommendation 12: Provide additional CAPS resources to facilitate community outreach (most of time dedicated to patient/client care-unable to offer additional support during the day due to clinical responsibilities, compensation to therapists/CAPS staff who offer support/groups after hours). This recommendation includes increasing the number of diverse therapists/providers.

Recommendation 13: Increase diversity of therapists/clinicians through recruiting, hiring, and retention practices.

Recommendation 14: Provide proactive programming and ongoing training for all campus students/staff/faculty (for example, “Intervene” bias training videos facilitated by Cornell Health Skorton Center for Health Initiatives, Intergroup Dialogue Project course for all students).

Recommendation 15: Promote and reinforce staff/faculty/student awareness of available resources for support (Caring Community, CUinfo)

Recommendation 16: Raise awareness regarding additional services at Cornell Health – all Cornell University students are assigned a PCP/primary care provider who can also be a resource, along with Cornell Health’s Behavioral Health Consultants-members of primary care team with expertise in the social, behavioral, emotional, and psychological aspects of health.

Recommendation 17: Ensure staffing to provide support mechanisms currently in place include: Let’s Talk, CCI, Community Support Meetings, Activist Burnout workshop led by Dr. Ginger Armas (CAPS), and “Friend to Friend” (this may include increase in CAPS staff to allow for outreach efforts without negatively impacting access to care/available appointments at Cornell Health).

Bias Communications and Reporting

Findings

- Currently, Cornell University has no response protocol for incidents related to bias, which leads to bias incidents being handled inconsistently. While some degree of flexibility is desired, this lack of bias response protocol has led to the quality of university response varying even with

bias incidents happening in the same month. This variance could lead to conclusions about the university's priorities, perceived preferences for certain identity groups, and, most importantly, lapses in support to the community.

- Currently, there is no one in charge of communications with relation to diversity, equity, and inclusion. This gap has created confusion as to who and when specialists in diversity and inclusion need to be consulted in response to bias incidents. It has also resulted in certain university communications being substantially better than others in response to concerns about diversity and inclusion. Additionally, the lack of a centralized communications office for diversity and inclusion has hindered publicity: There are many resources at the university that many members of the community do not know exist.
- Currently, the response to bias incidents on campus is transitioning to be split between two groups. The Bias Assessment and Response Team (BART) addresses all bias incidents that ONLY involve students. Any incidents that involve faculty and staff (even if another party is a student) are channeled to the Department for Inclusion and Workforce Diversity. BART currently reaches out both to the victim and the alleged perpetrator of a bias incident (if names are given). The Department for Inclusion and Workforce Diversity only reaches out to offer support to the victim. They do not contact the alleged perpetrator at all.

Recommendations

Recommendation 18: We recommend that the University Diversity Council develop a general strategy for university response within the next 6 months to reflect the need for consistent and thorough response. We recommend this university response strategy reflect the following guidelines:

- Immediate response should first go out to the communities most affected by any bias incident (perhaps by contacting community leaders and organizations responsible for supporting those affected communities). Resources for care and healing should first be directed here.
- Any campus-wide responses (e.g. shows of support or discussions/town halls about campus climate) should only happen AFTER administrators have had some time to reflect on what the best course of action would be and to make sure that key administrators and facilitators qualified to lead a campus-wide discussion or activity can be present.
- Because bias incidents are all not the same, some administrator should be tasked with making real-time calls on when/how to deviate from the protocol mentioned previously. This responsibility could rotate among the UDO's (similarly to on-call duty for crisis managers or residential life staff), fall under the purview of an already existing administrator, or fall under a centralized D&I administrator (such as a Chief Diversity Officer) if that position is created.
- The bias response protocol should think about how to address social media. Oftentimes, information about bias incidents spreads through informal student networks on social media very quickly, and the university should think about how to address disparities in content of information between social media and university communications as well as how information from university communications often lags behind the information posted on social media.
- There is current discussion about making residence halls the place for first response for bias incidents with RAs and GRFs/SAs holding meetings for residents in response to bias incidents. If this is the route the university wants to go, we highly recommend working closely with RNSP and West Campus administrators AND student staff to develop this procedure for the following reasons:
 - Currently, RAs and GRFs/SAs are not adequately trained to plan and hold support meetings of this nature, and there needs to be better support for residential life student staff, who may also need support in response to bias incidents.

- To provide Residential Life student staff with this necessary training, we recommend that the university continues with its plan to provide and require all residential staff to take some form of IDP training whether as a substantial portion of their August training or as a course in the spring semester before their start of employment as residential life staff.
- We recommend that residential life staff also work with the IDP Student Engagement Coordinator, a new position in the IDP office, throughout their employment in residential life.
- We also recommend thinking through how to reach the substantial population of students who live in Greek Life, co-ops, and off campus.
- We should keep in mind that residential life student staff are students first, staff members second. It is not unimaginable that the need to respond quickly to bias incidents in the dormitory space may get in the way of student staff's academic responsibilities, as planning and holding a support meeting take much time and energy.
- If student staff responsibilities include the important task of being the first responders in their communities to bias incidents, they should be compensated in accordance with the importance of this work. Otherwise, the university risks sending the message that this work is not valued or significant, both to student staff members and residents.
- If we rely on Faculty in Residence, House Professors, Residence Hall Directors, and Assistant Deans, we need to also think about how to compensate/offset responsibilities. Often, the most capable individuals in these positions are managing many other responsibilities, so we can't merely give additional duties to these individuals.
- Staff members (House Professors, Residence Hall Directors, Assistant Deans, Faculty in Residence) who live with students should be trained in bias crisis management. New guidelines for hiring/appointing for these positions might require training in handling bias incidents if the individuals hired do not already bring this competency to the position.

Recommendation 19: We recommend the creation of a Diversity & Inclusion Communications Director whose responsibilities would include the following.

- The creation, execution, and periodic revision of a communications protocol for incidents related to bias. This protocol, which would be part of the general university response strategy indicated above, would indicate which university administrator is reaching out to which university community (e.g. the student body, the faculty, the entire University, etc.) at which stage of response.
- The UDO's have indicated they are only consulted occasionally about university communications in response to bias incidents. The director would be consulted for all university communications regarding bias, diversity, and inclusion.
- The D&I Communications Director would be consulted about how D&I issues are presented in the Cornell Chronicle and be in charge of maintaining the D&I website.
- The D&I Communications Director would regularly consult with UDO's and other members of the community doing diversity work (TBD) to keep tabs on the campus climate.
- The D&I Communications Director would work on better publicizing both established and new resources for D&I at Cornell.
- The D&I Communications Director would attend all meetings with regards to University Communications.

Recommendation 20: As the transition to two distinct bias reporting mechanisms continues in the coming months, we recommend the following:

- Because both teams are undergoing periods of transition, the teams are at an unusually opportune moment to reimagine their roles and responsibilities for the university. We recommend that both BART and the Department for Inclusion and Workforce Diversity develop protocols for response that are publicly available. The specificity of these protocols should mirror those of Title IX, and these teams should be given adequate support and compensation as they develop these protocols.
- As part of these protocols, we recommend that the Department for Inclusion and Workforce Diversity develop a procedure to talk to and provide (at the very least) educational resources, like the BART team, to the alleged perpetrator of a bias incident.
- Because the Department for Inclusion and Workforce Diversity is currently understaffed and under-resourced to handle their current work, we also recommend that this office be expanded with at least 2 more staff members and given a more substantial budget.
- One of these staff members should solely be responsible for analyzing data on bias incidents and publishing those findings. Because the Department for Inclusion and Workforce Diversity is understaffed, there has been a lag in publication of campus-wide bias reports. Having another staff member solely dedicated to this task would make sure that reports are published on a timely basis. This staff member would also be in charge of making sure all constituencies of the university are notified when these reports are available.
- The administrators in the Department for Inclusion and Workforce Diversity should also have individual offices to provide a space for private conversation regarding sensitive issues around identity. The team currently works in cubicles.
- The BART team anticipates working with mechanisms for alternative dispute resolution in development by the Dean of Students office. We recommend that both the BART team and the newly created office of alternative dispute resolution be given the time and space to develop a protocol for alternative dispute resolution conversations for bias incidents. We also recommend that the Department for Inclusion and Workforce Diversity also think about incorporating alternative dispute resolution into their response to bias incidents. One suggestion would be to work with the Ombudsman, but if this is the case, then the Office of the Ombudsman would need to hire staff who are trained in both diversity and inclusion issues and alternative dispute resolution with respect to bias. Another suggestion might be to create positions in the Department for Inclusion and Workforce Diversity who specialize in alternative dispute resolution.

Recommendation 21: We recommend a centralized or coordinated communication effort to update all members of the Cornell Community, including professors, RHDs, staff, about all bias incidents that occur on campus or in the surrounding community.

Recommendation 22: We recommend that Cornell produces and regularly updates a list of reported incidents (bias incidents as well as sexual assaults) on and around campus to increase transparency between students and the administration.

Recommendation 23: We recommend that data on the occurrence and location of sexual assaults that have been reported on or around campus be made available on an easily accessible map.

Recommendation 24: Strengthen efforts to educate and train campus leaders (including student leaders, advisors, RA/RHD, etc.) about the procedure and process for responding to bias incidents.

Co-Curricular Support

Findings

- The Care and Crisis Services Office is housed under the Dean of Students and charged with supporting individual students in distress and equipping students with the skills to manage crises in their lives, following educational disruptions such as university-sanctioned leaves of absences or behavioral health visits to Cayuga Medical Center (<http://dos.cornell.edu/care-crisis-services>). Insights from this office may be useful in our efforts to more effectively manage responses to bias incidents that affect the Cornell community.
- Student leaders do not appear to be connected in a way that that enables them to form a united front against issues of bias and discrimination.
- Students appear to rely on the Cornell Chronicle, the Daily Sun, Twitter, GroupMe, Facebook, etc. to stay informed. Some of these sources are not vetted for accuracy. It is therefore hard to effectively inform populations with a high risk of exposure to rumors.
- Many Cornell student organizations do not have designated staff/faculty advisors who have been sufficiently trained to respond to bias incidents. Thus, student leaders are often tasked with responding to crises without advice from a trained professional, putting an undue burden on these student leaders.
- Our working group perceives opportunities for Cornell alumni to play a greater role in institutional responses to bias-related crises.

Recommendation 25: The University should enhance its existing bias response and crisis services capabilities by hiring additional personnel to serve these needs. Clemson University seems to have a useful model for the coordination of responses to crises, which can inform our approach to preparing for bias incidents (<https://www.clemson.edu/studentaffairs/advocacy-success/crisismanagement.html>). Likewise, the U.S. Department of Education and FEMA have issued guidelines guidance on emergency preparedness, which may be useful for Cornell staff members (https://www.fema.gov/media-library-data/20130726-1922-25045-3638/rem_s_ihe_guide.pdf). At the very least, its general principles of information sharing should be adopted to manage expectations for members of the Cornell community.

Recommendation 26: The University should create engaged-learning grants for students to serve as bias response assistants or campus climate researcher assistants who can continue to assess the university's progress toward its new destination goals.

Recommendation 27: The University should develop a mechanism or forum to provide timelines and regular updates about progress toward key performance indicators related to Task Force recommendations.

Recommendation 28: We recommend that the University establishes a Presidential or other high profile leadership award that recognizes, rewards or incentivizes student efforts to make significant contributions to an inclusive campus climate.

Recommendation 29: In the spirit of incentivizing and rewarding student efforts to embody our core values, we recommend that the University creates a student leadership development program that features D&I training and includes an opportunity for certification.

Data Sources/Outreach Efforts

- Notes from Town Hall Meetings conducted by the S
- CALS Advisory Board
- Student Disability Services
- CAPS Director and leadership staff
- Skorton Center for Health Initiatives
- Cornell Health Communications
- Cornell Minds Matter
- Ombudsman
- Vijay Pendakur (Dean of Students)
- Advising Deans
- EARS-Empathy, Assistance and Referral Service
- College Associates
- Ryan Lombardi (Vice President for Student and Campus Life)
- Justin Goldsman (IFC Advisor)
- Caitlin Gleason (Last Year's Panhellenic president)
- Drew Lord (Last Year's IFC president)
- Brianna Barrett (Last Year's MGLC president)
- Varun Devatha (SA EVP)
- Office of Residential and New Student Programs
- Lavanya Aprameya (President of Haven)
- Joe Anderson (Representative to the University Assembly)
- Arky Asmal (Co-Chair of La Asociacion Latina)
- Manisha Munasinghe (EVP OF GPSA)
- Sophie Sidhu (Director of the Asian and Asian American Center)
- Paul Russell (President of IFC)
- Sasha Chanko (President of Cornell Hillel)
- Catherine Ramirez (RHD of Latino Living Center)
- Black Students United E-Board
- Community Conversation co-sponsored by BSU, South Asian Council, ISU, Haven, FGSU, and IFC.
- Yael Levitte (Associate Vice Provost for Faculty Development and Diversity and UDO Communications Liaison)
- Angela Winfield (Director of Inclusion and Workforce Diversity)
- Sara Hernandez (Associate Dean for Inclusion and Student Engagement, Graduate School)
- The BART Team (Marla Love and Denise Zajac)
- Department for Inclusion and Workplace Diversity (Cornell Woodson)
- University Relations (John McKain and Melissa Shaffmaster)
- The University Diversity Officers (UDOs) and University Diversity Council (UDC).
- Sphinx Head Society
- PTF Survey
- The Center for Teaching Innovation (CTI)
- The Intergroup Dialogue Project (IDP)
- The Center for the Integration of Research, Teaching, and Learning (CIRTL)
- Men of Color Colleague Network Group
- Women of Color Colleague Network Group

Sub-Committee Members

Lee Adler	Lecturer, School of Industrial and Labor Relations
Stefan Antonsson '19	Student, College of Arts and Sciences
Gary Cremeens	Project Associate, Transportation and Mail Services
Delmar Fears '19	Student, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences
Adi Grabiner Keinan	Program Director, Intergroup Dialogue Project
Jada Hamilton	Physician, Cornell Health
Carolyn Headlam	Administrative Assistant, Law School
Stephen Kim	Graduate Student, English literature
Jenna Kyle '19	Student, Law School
Samuel Lagasse	Graduate Student, English
Jamila Michener	Assistant Professor, College of Arts and Sciences
Vanessa Navarro Rodriguez '19	Student, College of Arts and Sciences
Shivani Parikh '19	Student, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences
Kyonne Rowe '18	Student, School of Industrial and Labor Relations
Co-Chair: David Wooten	Professor of Marketing in the Dyson School of Applied Economics and Management and Associate Dean and Chief Diversity Officer of the Cornell SC Johnson College of Business