DARTMOUTH COLLEGE INCLUSIVE EXCELLENCE ACTION PLAN

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE EXTERNAL REVIEW COMMITTEE
DECEMBER 2018

External Review Committee:
David T. Carreon Bradley (Chair), Kimberly Griffin, John Rich ’80, Kiva R. Wilson ’04
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Dartmouth College Inclusive Excellence External Review Committee has authored this report, which contains background and context, the charge of the external review committee, and a series of findings and recommendations organized into four main categories: 1) Action Plan Progress, 2) Communication, 3) Data, and 4) Structures. Below is a list of all recommendations from this report. Further details and context for these recommendations can be found in the main body of the report.

Recommendations:

• 1.A: we recommend that the Office of the President communicate to all campus members updating them on the remaining Action Plan tasks, explaining any delays and obstacles, setting revised timetables, and reiterating accountability structures for each task.

• 2.A: we recommend that the OIDE and President’s Diversity Council review the 17-18 DART Report to 1) determine if the data have been sufficiently analyzed and if any additional questions remain to be answered; 2) evaluate the recommendations in the report; and 3) make recommendations to DART and the Executive Committee on next steps regarding the community study.

• 2.B: we recommend that the Office of the President communicate to all campus members updating them on the status of the community study, including the progress made thus far and the remaining work to be completed in the near future.

• 3.A: we recommend that the Provost’s Office partner with the Deans to develop a plan for academic departments and divisions to submit their annual diversity and inclusion plans.

• 3.B: we recommend that the Executive Committee work with the cognizant division leaders to develop a plan for all non-academic divisions to submit their annual diversity and inclusion plans.

• 3.C: we recommend that the Executive Committee develop a structure for auditing and providing substantial accountability for the annual diversity and inclusion plans.

• 4.A: we recommend that the Provost work with the Deans to develop a campus-wide, synergistic approach to recruiting a diverse faculty. This plan should be systemic and systematic, and should be made available to students, staff, faculty, and the general public.

• 4.B: we recommend that the Provost partner with OIDE to develop a concrete and actionable plan for tracking and addressing faculty retention issues.

• 4.C: we recommend that the Provost and Deans adopt modern high impact practices across all faculty hiring units, including requiring diversity statements and adding equity advisors to search committees.
• 4.D: we recommend that the Office of Institutional Research, DART, and all units and divisions report faculty demographic data disaggregated by race and ethnicity, and refrain from including groups in aggregated data that are not underrepresented in the academy or the specific discipline.

• 4.E: we recommend that the Provost assemble a fully constituted team with accountability for faculty diversity, recruitment, and retention.

• 5.A: we recommend that the Office of Communications engage with and evaluate the current communication activities regarding the Action Plan and other diversity initiatives on campus to identify areas for improvement. Pending the results of this analysis, we recommend a more strategic, innovative, and comprehensive communication strategy.

• 6.A: we recommend that the Office of Communication work with the Office of Student Affairs to determine a strategy for engaging students in an effective and ongoing manner.

• 6.B: recommend that the Provost’s Office and the Office of Human Resources partner with OIDE to examine the mechanisms by which students offer feedback about faculty and staff, determine if they need to be improved, and explore ways to incentivize behaviors that increase the inclusive climate for a diverse student body. The results of this effort should be clearly communicated to all students and other members of the campus community.

• 7.A: we recommend that the Executive Committee work with the Office of Human Resources to engage staff as partners in efforts to create a more inclusive climate and community.

• 8.A: we recommend that the Executive Committee initiate a new campus climate study to be implemented in 2019, with the intention of carrying out similar surveys every 3 years.

• 8.B: we recommend that the Executive Committee partner with DART and OIDE to develop a cohesive and strategic, campus-wide approach to the collection and analysis of diversity and inclusion data.

• 9.A: we recommend that the Executive Committee devise a mechanism for evaluating the effectiveness of each Action Plan task and the quality of its implementation. Upon creation of this mechanism, we recommend that the Executive Committee charge a group with applying the mechanism to all completed tasks.

• 10.A: we recommend that the Executive Committee work with DART and OIDE to determine how to manifest the qualitative shifts in the knowledge, skills, and behaviors of community members to more readily ensure the desired outcomes related to campus climate.

• 10.B: we recommend that DART and OIDE partner to identify and develop additional metrics and data-monitoring activities necessary to the Action Plan and diversity and inclusion at Dartmouth in general. Upon completion of this report, we recommend that the Executive Committee develop a plan for implementing the sustained assessment of diversity and inclusion using these metrics.
• 10.C: we recommend that DART be restructured and its charge be redefined based on the recommendations in this report.

• 11.A: we recommend that the Office of the President reconvene all Inclusive Excellence Initiative stakeholders to discuss progress to date, refresh each unit and subcommittee’s charter, and ensure effective organizational dynamics, appropriate support, and operational success of the initiative.

• 12.A: we recommend that the President create a new group, the Executive Accountability Council (EAC) for Inclusive Excellence.

• 13.A: we recommend that the Executive Committee revise and reiterate the mandates of the Inclusive Excellence Initiative units and subcommittees within the context of the work done over the past two years.

• 13.B: we recommend that the President consider restructuring OPAL and OIDE so that OPAL is either a direct report to the VPIDE or a dual-report to the Dean of the College and the VPIDE, to ensure greater coordination and accountability. The appropriate resources should accompany this restructuring.

CONTEXT FOR THIS REPORT

In May of 2016, Dartmouth issued an Action Plan for Inclusive Excellence. The Action Plan called for the creation of an External Review Committee (ERC) comprised of national thought-leaders in diversity and inclusion in higher education. The ERC visited campus for the first time in June 2017. The ERC chair at the time (Keivan Stassun), in consultation with the Executive Committee on Inclusive Excellence, determined that this first meeting would focus on leadership and accountability for the items in the action plan, with subsequent visits to include open forums with the broader community. The ERC produced the 2017 Report, which was made publicly available on the Inclusive Excellence website and via a Dartmouth Communications office news story.

In October 2018, the ERC visited the campus once again and met with the groups and individuals listed below.

Executive Committee on Inclusive Excellence
• Philip J. Hanlon, President
• Evelynn Ellis, Vice President for Institutional Diversity and Equity
• David Kotz, Interim Provost
• Richard Mills, Executive Vice President
• Christianne C. Hardy, Special Assistant to the President
• Joseph Helble, Provost

DART: Diversity Assessment and Research Team
• Alicia Betsinger, Associate Provost for Institutional Research
• Prudence Merton, Associate Director, Faculty Programs and Assessment, DCAL
Office of Institutional Diversity and Inclusion (OIDE)
• Evelynn Ellis, Vice President for Institutional Diversity and Equity
• Theodosia Cook, Director, Institutional Diversity and Equity
• Kelly Cusick, Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Program Manager
• Theresa Hernandez, Program Coordinator
• Kara Wakefield, Program Manager

President’s Diversity Council
• Evelynn Ellis, Vice President for Institutional Diversity and Equity
• Theodosia Cook, Director, Institutional Diversity and Equity
• Sharon Bickel, Associate Professor of Biology Sciences
• Dia Draper, Director, Strategic Initiatives, Tuck School of Business
• Julie Findley, Chief Operating Officer of Campus Services
• Denise Garn, Director of Compensation
• Suzanne Pendegrass, Advisor to International Students, Office of Visa and Immigration Services
• Jane Siebel, Assistant Dean Recruiting and Diversity, Guarini School
• Hannah Silverstein, Senior Writer, Office of Communications
• Holly Wilkinson, Associate Dean of Thayer School of Engineering
• Magda Vergara, Associate Director Alumni Relations

Faculty Diversity Group
• Duane Compton, Dean, Geisel School of Medicine
• Dia Draper, Director, Strategic Initiatives, Tuck School of Business
• Joseph Helble, Dean, Thayer School of Engineering, and Provost-elect
• F. Jon Kull, Dean, Guarini School for Graduate and Advanced Studies
• Dean Lacy, Assistant Provost for Faculty Recruitment
• Elizabeth Smith, Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences

Students Representatives (including the student body president and vice president)
• Dante Mack ‘20
• Nicholas Gutierrez ‘20
• April Lam ‘20
• Nicole Knape ‘19
• Chinedum Nwaigwe ‘19
• Samantha Hussey ‘20
• Shelby Snyder ‘21
• Tyler Baum ‘20
• Rashaad Cooper ‘19
• Monik Walters ‘19
• Gabriel Zuckerberg ‘20
• Julia Huebner ‘20
• Saba Maheen ‘20
Additional Administrators

- Kathryn Lively, Interim Dean of the College
- Liz Agosto ’01, Senior Associate Dean of Student Affairs
- Scot Bemis, Chief Human Resources Officer

Additionally, the 2018 ERC reviewed a wide variety of documents and websites, including those listed below.

- 2016 Action Plan on Inclusive Excellence
- 2017 External Review Committee Report
- 2018 Diversity Assessment and Research Team (DART) Report
- 2017 Annual Report of Faculty Diversity
- 2017 Tuck Diversity and Inclusion Plan
- 2017 Geisel Diversity Plan: Geisel Plan for Diversity, Inclusion and a Respectful Workplace
- 2017 Thayer School of Engineering Diversity Plan: Inclusive Excellence at Thayer School
- 2017-18 Guarini School for Graduate and Advance Studies Diversity and Inclusion Plan
- inclusive.dartmouth.edu (accessed October 2018)

In November and December of 2018, the ERC met twice with the Executive Committee to discuss preliminary findings and recommendations.

This report is based on the meetings and documents listed above, and was submitted to the Executive Committee in December 2018. It shall be presented to the Board of Trustees and made publicly available

EXTERNAL REVIEW COMMITTEE CHARGE

The ERC is charged by the President to deliver annual reports with findings and recommendations with respect to the Action Plan on Inclusive Excellence. The Executive Committee on Inclusive Excellence interprets this charge as encompassing three aims: accountability, evaluation, and inspiration.

- **Accountability** - to verify whether the College fulfills the commitments made in the Action Plan.
- **Evaluation** - to assess the effectiveness of the implemented initiatives/strategies and offer counter strategies based on the ERC’s combined experience.
- **Inspiration** - to provide inspiration and encouragement to the Dartmouth community, its leadership and accountable offices in the undertaking of this hard but important endeavor to ensure an inclusive culture for higher education where a diverse community of scholars, learners, and employees can thrive.

The ERC reports to the Board of Trustees annually to evaluate Dartmouth’s accountability for the commitments outlined in the Action Plan.
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Provided below are the significant findings of the ERC regarding the Action Plan and the associated diversity and inclusion initiatives and structures of the College. The findings are organized into four main categories: 1) Action Plan Progress, 2) Communication, 3) Data, and 4) Structures. Based on these findings, recommendations for the Executive Committee and the College are also provided.

I. ACTION PLAN PROGRESS

Finding 1 – Action Plan Tasks

Significant progress has been made on the Action Plan. Specifically, of the forty-seven (47) tasks being tracked, half (26) were completed in AY 16-17, and eleven (11) were completed in AY 17-18, with ten (10) tasks left to be completed. This completion rate is a commendable accomplishment, and the ERC is looking forward to the completion of the remaining tasks with the understanding that these remaining tasks have specific challenges and may take longer to complete than originally anticipated.

Recommendation 1.A: we recommend that the Office of the President communicate to all campus members updating them on the remaining Action Plan tasks, explaining any delays and obstacles, setting revised timetables, and reiterating accountability structures for each task.

Finding 2 – 2016 Community Study

DART conducted an analysis of the data from the 2016 Community Study. The results of this analysis are found in the 17-18 DART Report.

It appears that most campus community members are unaware of the progress that has been made in this area. The 17-18 DART Report is relatively new, so it is possible that there has not been sufficient time for this information to be disseminated. However, the consensus heard by the ERC during our visit was that campus members (even those close to the process, such as President’s Diversity Council members) were lacking clarity on what has transpired since the community study data were collected.

Recommendation 2.A: we recommend that the OIDE and President’s Diversity Council review the 17-18 DART Report to 1) determine if the data have been sufficiently analyzed and if any additional questions remain to be answered; 2) evaluate the recommendations in the report; and 3) make recommendations to DART and the Executive Committee on next steps regarding the community study.

Recommendation 2.B: we recommend that the Office of the President communicate to all campus members updating them on the status of the community study, including the progress made thus far and the remaining work to be completed in the near future.
Finding 3 – Unit Diversity and Inclusion Plans

The Action Plan states that, “every academic department, division, and school, as well as every administrative division of the College, will be required to develop and post an annual diversity and inclusion plan.” Each school has produced such a plan as of the writing of this report. However, no plans have been made available from academic departments and some non-academic divisions. The ERC did not see a specific plan for having these academic departments and non-academic divisions develop these plans in the near future or on an annual basis.

The mechanism for evaluating and providing feedback on these plans is also not clear. Some plans are submitted to the OIDE, but not all plans go through this office (the academic department plans should probably not pass through this office, but rather through the respective school). Although the creation of the plans themselves has inherent value, without a sustainable evaluation process, the primary benefit of the annual submission of these plans will not be realized. Also, specific questions regarding the metrics of accountability associated with these diversity plans have yet to be answered. For example, what are the annual and longitudinal goals for these plans? What are the rewards and sanctions for units that perform well and units that fail to meet the mark, respectively? How does the college address the relatively low response rate from departments and units? Answering these questions is imperative to the success of these plans.

In an ideal situation, the auditing and accountability process would be embedded into the existing management structures of the institution. However, given the nascent aspect of this initiative, the ERC believes that a special structure will need to be created to carry out this work for the foreseeable future. Additionally, it is imperative that the auditing of these plans is structured to allow for synergies and efficiency across the campus. Therefore, it is likely that this work will need to be done by a representative group or a high-level office with dedicated staff. (The Executive Accountability Council (EAC) for Inclusive Excellence, a proposed group detailed below, may be able to address this work).

Recommendation 3.A: we recommend that the Provost’s Office partner with the Deans to develop a plan for academic departments and divisions to submit their annual diversity and inclusion plans.

Recommendation 3.B: we recommend that the Executive Committee work with the cognizant division leaders to develop annual diversity and inclusion plans for all non-academic divisions.

Recommendation 3.C: we recommend that the Executive Committee develop a structure for auditing and providing substantial accountability for the annual diversity and inclusion plans.

Finding 4 – Faculty Recruitment and Retention

There has been considerable effort in the area of faculty recruitment, particularly as evidenced by some of the unit diversity and inclusion plans. The ERC commends this work and is excited to see it continued. As a next step, this work could benefit from a more coordinated campus-wide effort that
includes all of the schools, and takes advantage of possible synergies across schools and units. Although work is progressing in the area of faculty recruitment, the area of faculty retention seems to lag behind in comparison. Nine out of the 15 tasks under this initiative in the Action Plan remain incomplete according to the Inclusive Excellence website.

The Action Plan includes a task to track data on underrepresented faculty. Currently, much of the data reported by Dartmouth is aggregated across many races and ethnicities, and includes Hispanics and Asian Americans, who are not underrepresented in the academy.

The ERC understands that there were previously two positions that address faculty diversity in the Office of the Provost: Vice Provost for Academic Initiatives and the Assistant Provost for Faculty Recruitment. There have been personnel shifts in this office, and one of these positions is currently vacant. The ERC believes that the Provost’s office should assemble a fully constituted team with accountability for faculty diversity, recruitment, and retention given the vast about of work to be completed in this area under the Action Plan.

**Recommendation 4.A:** we recommend that the Provost work with the Deans to develop a campus-wide, synergistic approach to recruiting a diverse faculty. This plan should be systemic and systematic, and should be made available to students, staff, faculty, and the general public.

**Recommendation 4.B:** we recommend that the Provost partner with OIDE to develop a concrete and actionable plan for tracking and addressing faculty retention issues, including cultural taxation of women and people of color in terms of service, career development, navigating tenure and promotion, and ensuring an equitable and inclusive climate.

**Recommendation 4.C:** we recommend that the Provost and Deans adopt modern high impact practices across all faculty hiring units. In particular, we recommend that Dartmouth require all faculty applicants to submit a diversity statement. In this case, search committees should be trained on how to use the diversity statement as evidence of a qualified candidate. Additionally, we recommend that all search committees include an equity advisor, defined as a search committee member from outside the searching unit, appointed by the Dean, responsible for promoting evidence-based inclusive practices during all phases of the search.

**Recommendation 4.D:** we recommend that the Office of Institutional Research, DART, and all units and divisions report faculty demographic data disaggregated by race and ethnicity. In the case where aggregated data must be reported, we recommend that all units and divisions refrain from including groups that are not underrepresented in the academy or the specific discipline.

---

1 The ERC understands the term “underrepresented,” in this context, to mean that a particular group’s proportionate representation in the academy, or in a field of study, is smaller than its representation in the population at large. Members of underrepresented groups include people from all genders of varying sexual orientations, physical abilities, religions, and ethnicities. In the academy, underrepresented races and ethnicities particularly include those who are Native American Indian/Alaska Native, Black/African American, Mexican American/Chicana/Chicano and Puerto Rican, or Native Pacific Islander (Hawaiian/Polynesian/ Micronesian). In some areas of the country, individuals from other groups, such as the Hmong, may be underrepresented. In some academic disciplines, individuals from some groups may be underrepresented. For example, Asian Americans are not underrepresented in the academy in general, but may be underrepresented in leadership positions and within some fields in the social sciences and humanities.
Recommendation 4.E: we recommend that the Provost assemble a fully constituted team with accountability for faculty diversity, recruitment, and retention.

II. COMMUNICATION

The initial communication regarding the Action Plan began with a strong start by communicating its diversity and inclusion efforts to the members of the community. The effort resulted in broad participation of faculty, staff, and students who formed working groups to make recommendations for the initiative. Additionally, a website was created and a work plan was disseminated to the community. However, the ERC continues to have some major concerns regarding communication around this initiative, and diversity and inclusion in general.

Finding 5 – Strategic Communications

As the effort moves into its third year, the communication momentum seems to have diminished. Evidence from the ERC visit indicates that most people who are not directly involved with the initiative are unaware of the activities. A theme from the community study [from the 17-18 DART report] also supports this concern: “There were many recommendations from all populations that communication within the campus community needed to be increased and improved...” Recommendation 5.A: we recommend that the Office of Communications engage with and evaluate the current communication activities regarding the Action Plan and other diversity initiatives on campus to identify areas for improvement. Pending the results of this analysis, we recommend a more strategic, innovative, and comprehensive communication strategy. In particular, a plan that goes beyond the current website and periodic all-campus emails is necessary to embed the message of Dartmouth’s commitment to diversity. The communication plan should include well-articulated values of Dartmouth that will persist beyond any specific initiative. (Note: the ERC did not meet with the Office of Communications during our visit, so we may not have a full understanding of their involvement with the Action Plan. However, our recommendation is based on our observations of the results of the current communication efforts.)

Finding 6 – Student Communication

In our meeting with students, we heard several stories indicating that their enthusiasm, which was substantial early on, has waned. The students seemed particularly unaware of the ongoing Action Plan.

The Executive Committee shared a recent process to better articulate Dartmouth values in a clear and concise way across students, faculty, staff, and alumni. While none of the five values specifically reference diversity and inclusion, all the values are clearly enhanced by the diversity and inclusion in the community. For example, “a spirit of adventure” is a critical driver for student freshman trips, in which more than 90% of incoming students participate. A treasured aspect of these trips is the
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diversity and the bringing together people from different backgrounds and identities. Perhaps the Dartmouth values initiative could serve as a roadmap for better communicating to students about diversity and inclusion.

The students also indicated that in their day-to-day experience with individual faculty and departments, they continue to perceive a lack of appreciation of inclusion. For example, students told stories of professors who hold relatively narrow views on diversity but may be regarded as excellent teachers. Students told stories of presenting such professors with ideas for projects that incorporated their own sense of identity with regard to gender, race, or sexual orientation, and being discouraged from pursuing such projects. Students reported that, under these circumstances, they often acquiesced, feeling that if they pursued a project that was unpopular with the professor, their grades would suffer. Furthermore, students felt they had few avenues to register their dissatisfaction. They also believed that no action was taken when they expressed their concerns, and that the process of lodging a complaint was in itself an emotionally stressful event. Therefore, students felt less inclined to report such issues. These stories were gathered from a limited number of students, so it would be beneficial to assess them more broadly.

**Recommendation 6.A:** we recommend that the Office of Communication work with the Office of Student Affairs to determine a strategy for engaging students in an effective and ongoing manner. **Recommendation 6.B:** we recommend that the Provost’s Office and the Office of Human Resources partner with OIDE to examine the mechanisms by which students offer feedback about faculty and staff, determine if they need to be improved, and explore ways to incentivize behaviors that increase the inclusive climate for a diverse student body (this may include ways that students themselves can be involved in crafting potential solutions). The results of this effort should be clearly communicated to all students and other members of the campus community.

**Finding 7 – Staff Communication**

While we did not meet directly with a representative group of staff, our meetings with the Executive Committee and with the President’s Diversity Council included members of the staff. Those conversations suggested that staff are also at the periphery of diversity and inclusion efforts at Dartmouth. We recognize that while staff do not participate in classroom instruction, they are a critical part of the fabric of experiential learning at Dartmouth, as well as an important connection to the surrounding community. We heard from Rick Mills that staff who participated in diversity related trainings came away enlightened and empowered.

**Recommendation 7.A:** we recommend that the Executive Committee work with the Office of Human Resources to engage staff as partners in efforts to create a more inclusive climate and community.

**III. DATA**

**Finding 8 – Data Collection and Analysis**

Dartmouth is collecting more information and data on diversity and inclusion than ever before, and
theERC commends the college on this work. Modern high-impact practices in diversity and inclusion show that campus climate surveys should be conducted on a regular basis (every ~3 years) to track longitudinal changes. Since the last climate survey was conducted in 2016, this coming year would be an opportune time to carry out the survey once again. Lessons learned from the previous survey and the subsequent analysis of its data should be applied when creating the 2019 survey. Although much information and data are being collected, the ERC doesn’t see a cohesive and strategic, campus-wide approach to the collection and analysis of these data. In particular, the Inclusive Excellence Initiative, DART, and OIDE could be better coordinated with one another and better connected to the data in the annual diversity and inclusion plans submitted by units across the college.

**Recommendation 8.A:** we recommend that the Executive Committee initiate a new campus climate study to be implemented in 2019, with the intention of carrying out similar surveys every 3 years. **Recommendation 8.B:** we recommend that the Executive Committee partner with DART and OIDE to develop a cohesive and strategic, campus-wide approach to the collection and analysis of diversity and inclusion data (including the data from the proposed 2019 survey).

**Finding 9 – Action Plan Tracking**

The tracking of the Action Plan tasks has been designed using a system that indicates whether each task is 1) in planning, 2) in progress, or 3) completed. However, the current tracking system does not adequately capture the effectiveness of each completed task or the quality of its implementation. The evaluation of these additional metrics is essential to ensuring the ultimate success of the Action Plan and the sustainability of its associated institutional changes.

**Recommendation 9.A:** we recommend that the Executive Committee devise a mechanism for evaluating the effectiveness of each Action Plan task and the quality of its implementation. Upon creation of this mechanism, we recommend that the Executive Committee charge a group with applying the mechanism to all completed tasks. If this work is taken up by DART, OIDE, or the President’s Diversity Council, the current workload of the group must be considered, and an appropriate allocation of resources must be made to the group members to ensure the sustainability of this work.

**Finding 10 – DART**

The DART report says, “the Action Plan, which was designed as a compliment [sic] to the work of Moving Dartmouth Forward, is insufficient as a stand-alone initiative with respect to changing Dartmouth’s overall climate. Hence, further considerations are needed and should focus on qualitative shifts in the knowledge, skills, and behaviors of community members to more readily ensure the desired outcomes related to campus climate are achieved.” The ERC agrees wholeheartedly with this assessment.
The original charge of DART included the task of identifying and developing additional metrics and datamonitoring activities necessary to the action plan. DART revised its charge in 2016-2017, and this task was removed. However, it seems that the task was not reassigned to another body.

The DART report indicates that this group is interested in disbanding. However, the ERC believes that there is much work to be done by a group of this nature, and we advise against dissolving this group. Instead, the group should perhaps be restructured and its charge should be redefined based on the recommendations in this report.)

**Recommendation 10.A:** we recommend that the Executive Committee work with DART and OIDE to determine how to “manifest the qualitative shifts in the knowledge, skills, and behaviors of community members to more readily ensure the desired outcomes related to campus climate.”

**Recommendation 10.B:** we recommend that DART and OIDE partner to identify and develop additional metrics and data-monitoring activities necessary to the Action Plan and diversity and inclusion at Dartmouth in general. The result of this work should be reported back to the Executive Committee. Upon completion of this report, we recommend that the Executive Committee develop a plan for implementing the sustained assessment of diversity and inclusion using these metrics. (The Executive Accountability Council (EAC) for Inclusive Excellence, a proposed group detailed below, may be able to address this work).

**Recommendation 10.C:** we recommend that DART be restructured and its charge be redefined based on the recommendations in this report.

**IV. STRUCTURES**

Dartmouth’s Inclusive Excellence Initiative launched in 2016 and benefited tremendously from its prominent placement in the President’s office. The sustained commitment of President Hanlon and his staff elevated the visibility and prioritization of the inclusive excellence initiative as evidenced by the quick formation and activation of DART, the President’s Diversity Council, and the Executive Committee on Inclusive Excellence. We believe that the President’s sponsorship was critical to the successful incubation of this new initiative and resulted in the swift completion of many of the tasks in the Action Plan.

This work introduced the foundation for building an inclusive community. As the Action Plan nears completion, the ERC believes that it is time to carry out a reset of structures. With this reset, Dartmouth now has the opportunity to move from incubating to integrating inclusive excellence into its ongoing operations and practices. This is a pivotal moment for Dartmouth to maximize on the inclusive excellence investments made thus far. Without major consideration and revision of the diversity and inclusion structures that exist independent of the Action Plan, Dartmouth will not see the dividends of the work done over the past two years. Specifically, we believe that Dartmouth must renew its commitment to the Inclusive Excellence Initiative, ensure accountability, and better integrate its existing diversity and inclusion structures.
Several groups and individuals expressed concern regarding leadership turnover and a lack of demographic diversity in leadership positions. As the structures of the college are considered in light of this report, we believe that this area of concern should also be addressed by the Executive Committee.

**Finding 11 – Reconvening Stakeholders**

As the Inclusive Excellence Initiative enters its third year, there is a unique opportunity to celebrate the progress made thus far, apply lessons learned, and democratize the effort to a broader cross-section of stakeholders.

**Recommendation 11.A:** we recommend that the Office of the President reconvene all Inclusive Excellence Initiative stakeholders, including the Executive Committee, OIDE, Chief Human Resources Officer, Dean of the College, Faculty Diversity Panel, President’s Diversity Council, and DART to discuss progress to date, refresh each unit and subcommittee’s charter, and ensure effective organizational dynamics, appropriate support, and operational success of the initiative. While scheduling a gathering of this type may prove logistically challenging, the ERC believes it would be time well spent establishing an effective and cohesive coalition under the President’s direction. This reconvening should also include any possible missing constituents and divisions such as OPAL and student government representatives.

**Finding 12 – Accountability**

It appears that most sub-committees view the ERC or the Office of the President as their primary accountability partner vis a vis implementing the Inclusive Excellence Initiative. To support the ongoing integration of new inclusion practices and the continued oversight of their effectiveness, we believe that a new group should be established: the Executive Accountability Council (EAC) for Inclusive Excellence.

EAC would be comprised of one representative each from OIDE, OPAL, Office of the Provost, Office of the Dean of the College, Office of the President, and Office of Communications. The new group would serve as the internal accountability system and sounding board for all units and subcommittees related to diversity and inclusion. This group would report to the Executive Committee on a regular basis. It would also begin to absorb some of the responsibilities of the ERC and the Special Assistant to the President as the Action Plan nears completion, with a stronger focus on sustainable and integrated components of the initiative (e.g. evaluation of the annual diversity and inclusion plans from units and divisions across campus). The group will also help streamline the information received by the Executive Committee, so that it can focus on strategic and high-level work in this area. This new structure will help ensure incremental progress and cohesion of all groups working on diversity and inclusion. In particular, it will help ensure the cohesive continuation of this work beyond the annual convening of the ERC.
Recommendation 12.A: we recommend that the President create a new group, the Executive Accountability Council (EAC) for Inclusive Excellence, as detailed above.

Finding 13 – Restructuring

Although individual units and groups are doing commendable work, the ERC does not see a sustainable structure for continuing diversity and inclusion work beyond the completion of the Action Plan. Given the ancillary nature of this work for most people involved in the initiative, it is imperative that each unit understand its distinct role and responsibility and its expected contribution to the Action Plan and the broader diversity and inclusion work across campus.

The ERC also noted that OPAL is not part of OIDE. It is highly unusual for an Office of Institutional Diversity and Equity to not have a direct report from an OPAL analogue. Without the student piece, it can be difficult for OIDE to serve as the strategic center for diversity and inclusion on campus. Recommendation 13.A: we recommend that the Executive Committee revise and reiterate the mandates of the Inclusive Excellence Initiative units and subcommittees within the context of the work done over the past two years.

Recommendation 13.B: we recommend that the President consider restructuring OPAL and OIDE so that OPAL is either a direct report to the VPIDE or a dual-report to the Dean of the College and the VPIDE, to ensure greater coordination and accountability. The appropriate resources should accompany this restructuring.

MEMBERS OF THE EXTERNAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

David T. Carreon Bradley (Chair) recently served as the Vice President for Inclusion, Diversity, and Equity at Smith College, where he was also an Associate Professor in both the physics department and engineering program. He was also at Vassar College for over 10 years where he was an Associate Professor of Physics and the chief diversity faculty-administrator. He conducts research on diversity and inclusion in higher education, access and equity in STEM, and architectural acoustics - the latter for which he won the prestigious NSF CAREER Award. He has published two books and over fifteen refereed articles and has presented at over 40 national and international conferences and symposia. He is a leader in the National Association of Diversity Officers in Higher Education, is a lifetime member of SACNAS (Society for Advancement of Chicanos/Hispanics and Native Americans in Science), is an alum of the Linton-Poodry SACNAS Leadership Institute, serves on the American Institute of Physics Liaison Committee for Underrepresented Minorities, and is past-chair of the Acoustical Society of America’s Committee on Education. Kimberly Griffin is an associate professor in the Higher Education, Student Affairs, and International Education Policy Program at the University of Maryland, and specializes in studying the experiences of underrepresented communities in higher education. A graduate of Stanford University, she earned her master’s in education policy and leadership at the University of Maryland and her PhD in higher education and organizational change at UCLA. She is the coauthor of two books and author and
coauthor of numerous scholarly articles; her interests include access and retention in graduate education and the professoriate, diversity within the African American higher education community, and the impact of mentorship relationships on student outcomes.
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