We commend the External Review Committee for their useful and frank report, the product of careful scrutiny of the first year of the Inclusive Excellence Action Plan. Further, we are grateful for their many useful suggestions and experienced counsel as we embark on the second year of the plan, and continue to build an inclusive Dartmouth.

The ERC Report identifies many areas of strength in the Action Plan for Inclusive Excellence, not least the plan itself and its emphasis on transparency and accountability. Further singled out as successes are: the work of the Diversity Assessment and Research Team to leverage data and rigorous analysis to the effort, a promising first season of diverse faculty recruiting, embedding diversity and inclusion in the new house community structure and programming and Dartmouth’s distinctive teacher-scholar model as a foundation for inclusivity.

Following the order of their report, we offer a response that outlines what we are doing to address deficiencies within the Action Plan, and ways of incorporating the helpful suggestions of the External Committee.

Main Findings of the External Review Committee Report: The External Review Committee identified six key deficiencies in the Action Plan for Inclusive Excellence. These are: 1. Ambiguity regarding ownership of diversity and inclusion goals, 2. Ambiguity regarding responsibility for faculty diversity, 3. Concern regarding the sustainability of the Action Plan in general and the work of the Diversity Assessment and Research Team in particular, 4. Skepticism regarding the feasibility of the faculty diversity goal of 25% by 2020, 5. lack of a faculty retention strategy and 6. inconsistent community messaging around the plan and its progress.

The external review committee also usefully identified ways in which we could better engage our students, faculty, staff and alumni, provided recommendations for the role of leadership and the board of Trustees, and offered advice for maintaining momentum for these efforts over the long haul, all of which we accept whole-heartedly and are working actively to put into practice. We will not detail our response to these suggestions here, but rather will concentrate our response on the six key findings emerging from the report. These we address as follows:

Accountability: We take under advisement the challenges Dartmouth’s unique reporting structure might bring to clear and transparent responsibility for the action plan. We reaffirm that ownership of the action plan ultimately lies with the Executive Committee, and the President as the ranking officer on that committee. We are clarifying the responsibility specifically with regards to faculty initiatives as follows:

1. Successful recruitment of Dean Elizabeth Smith, who understands and is committed to the aims of the action plan and who is actively partnering with these efforts
2. Greater involvement of and support for the Associate Deans of Arts and Sciences with regards to recruitment and retention efforts
3. Pending appointment of a faculty member dedicated to faculty development and diversity in the office of the Provost with resources to support faculty across all the schools and charged with developing a comprehensive and ongoing program of support for the deans around faculty development and diversity.
4. Incorporating diversity and inclusion into the weekly Deans meetings with the Provost.
5. Linking diversity and inclusion goals to resource allocation by incorporating review of the former in the annual budgeting process with the Provost and Executive Vice President.

**Sustainability:**
We have responded to the External Review Committee’s concern about the sustainability of the action plan in the following ways:

- **In regards to the Diversity Assessment and Research Group,** the group has defined their activities for year two of the initiative. (See appendix I) The Office of Institutional Research continues to coordinate this group, and in year two will undertake the following activities:
  - i. Provide reports and updates to the Council on Institutional Diversity and Inclusivity and other entities as needed
  - ii. Update the inclusive excellence action plan report card
  - iii. Analyze Retention and Campus Climate (includes qualitative analysis of surveys from the 2015 COACHE faculty survey and 2016 Community study, and faculty and staff exit surveys.

**Faculty Goals:**
The External Review committee indicated that the goal of reaching 25% URM faculty by 2020 was unrealistic, and further outlined the need for a clear action plan for faculty retention. We have since undertaken a robust analysis of market availability for URM and our annual turnover rate, and concluded that in fact the external review committee is correct that achieving our goal by 2020 is unrealistic. Rather that lower our sights, we remain committed to achieving a 25% institution-wide minority faculty level, which we believe may be realistically achieved through aggressive recruitment and retention strategies by 2027, sooner if early recruiting results are sustained and we make some gains in retention. (see Appendix II)

The Deans of the professional schools as well as Arts and Sciences are developing comprehensive retention strategies for their faculty, which will be supported by the soon-to-be appointed Vice Provost for Faculty Development and Diversity. Retention plans are due to the Provost from the Deans by the end of October 2017.

**Communication:**
The challenges of consistent communication and the identification of opportunities for community of engagement is a concern shared by the Executive Committee and one we are addressing as follows:
1. The Office of Institutional Diversity and Equity, in its reconfiguration, will add a key function to its responsibilities: institutional consultation on diversity and inclusion. This will enhance both general communication and provide opportunities for community engagement around diversity and inclusion.

2. The new director of Information technology is assisting with an assessment of communication tools to ensure more interactive communication beyond the inclusive excellence website. These efforts supplement the existing Office of Communications strategy of highlighting Dartmouth’s diversity and inclusion activities in its regular reporting, and the commitment of senior leadership to report on and speak to diversity and inclusion in all community communications as possible.

Inclusive Excellence Executive Committee:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philip J. Hanlon</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Dever</td>
<td>Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Mills</td>
<td>Executive Vice President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelynn Ellis</td>
<td>VP Institutional Diversity and Equity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix I: Dartmouth Assessment and Research Team (DART)

Year 2 Plan

Membership: Remains constant

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alicia Betsinger</td>
<td>Associate Provost, Institutional Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yusaku Horiuchi</td>
<td>Professor of Government &amp; Quantitative Social Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petra Bonfert-Taylor</td>
<td>Professor of Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prudence Merton</td>
<td>Associate Director for Faculty Programs &amp; Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Edens</td>
<td>Assistant Dean &amp; Advisor to First Generation and/or Low Income Students and Black Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenda Shoop</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Medical Education &amp; Medicine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Year 1 Charge:

- Review metrics proposed by IE working groups and recommend ones for diversity and inclusivity report card;
- Provide reports and updates to the Council on Institutional Diversity and Inclusivity and other entities as needed;
- Respond to requests from the Council for new types of data;
- Identify and develop additional metrics and data-monitoring activities necessary to the Action Plan.

Year 2 Charge:

- Provide reports and updates to the Council on Institutional Diversity and Inclusivity and other entities as needed;
- Update inclusive excellence action plan report card; and
- Analyze Retention and Campus Climate:
  - Complete qualitative analyses of survey comments from the 2015 COACHE Faculty Survey and 2016 Community Study.
  - Conduct additional quantitative analyses of 2015 COACHE Faculty Survey and 2016 Community Study items by available breakout groups (e.g., gender, gender identity, race/ethnicity, etc.).
  - Review faculty and staff exit surveys for question consistency and provide analytic support on results.
FACULTY DIVERSITY AT DARTMOUTH

OCTOBER, 2017
OVERVIEW

Dartmouth Picture:

- As of 2016, 17% of Dartmouth’s tenure-line faculty were minorities. The percentage of minorities at Dartmouth remained largely flat from 2012 to 2016.

- The number of minority tenure-line faculty at Dartmouth increased by 7% from 2012-2016. This growth coincided with a 4% increase in white faculty, and a 5% increase in the total faculty at Dartmouth.

- Though Dartmouth has made gains in the total number of minority faculty (which includes Asian faculty), the number of American Indian/Alaskan Native, Black/African American, and Hispanic faculty steadily decreased from 2012 to 2016.

National Picture

- 21% of the national faculty population are minorities. Similarly, 21% of all AAUDE faculty are minorities.

- The percentage of minority PhDs nation-wide is 25%.

Notes on the analysis:
- Dartmouth’s definition of minority faculty includes Asian faculty, but excludes white women who are underrepresented in their fields.
- National data is pulled from IPEDS. Unlike Dartmouth, IPEDS does not place Non-Resident Aliens into their race categories.
FACULTY DIVERSITY AT DARTMOUTH

Minority Faculty as a Percentage of the Total Dartmouth Faculty, 2006 – 2016

Overall: 17%
Asian: 9%
Hispanic: 4%
Black: 2%
2+ Races: 2%
American Indian: 0.5%
Native Hawaiian: 0.2%
FACULTY DIVERSITY AT DARTMOUTH

Total Number of Asian and Non-Asian Minority Faculty at Dartmouth, 2006 – 2016

- **Asian Faculty**
  - 2006: 32
  - 2016: 54
  - **8% increase**

- **Non-Asian Minority Faculty**
  - 2006: 50
  - 2016: 54
  - **69% increase**
# DARTMOUTH’S RECRUITMENT & RETENTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Proportion (2016)</th>
<th>Recruit Rate (5-yr avg.)</th>
<th>Recruits/Year (5-yr avg.)</th>
<th>Depart Rate (5-yr avg.)</th>
<th>Departures/Year (5-yr avg.)</th>
<th>Turnover Rate (5-yr avg.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Asian Minority</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Total</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>82.6%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recruit Rate = number of new hires divided by total new hires  
Depart Rate = number of departures divided by total departures  
Turnover Rate = number of departures divided by total faculty
# 2017 Recruitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Minority Recruits</th>
<th>Minority Recruit Rate</th>
<th>Total Recruits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geisel</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuck</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thayer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prelim. Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>54%</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recruit Rate = number of new hires divided by total new hires

**Note:** This is preliminary data that has not yet been vetted by OIR. This also does not consider any retention losses that Dartmouth may have sustained in 2017.
**Steady State:** Where would Dartmouth be in 10 years if recruitment and retention patterns remain the same?

These projections use the five-year average recruitment and turnover rates (for the years spanning 2012-2016) to estimate Dartmouth's minority faculty population in 2027. This model assumes no changes to the 5-year average recruitment or turnover rates. It also assumes that the size of the faculty will remain consistent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Non-Asian Minorities</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Asian</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total White</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Faculty</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Departs</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departs Non-Asian Minority</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departs Asian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departs White</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hires Non-Asian Minority</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hires Asian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority %</td>
<td><strong>17%</strong></td>
<td><strong>17%</strong></td>
<td><strong>17%</strong></td>
<td><strong>17%</strong></td>
<td><strong>17%</strong></td>
<td><strong>17%</strong></td>
<td><strong>17%</strong></td>
<td><strong>18%</strong></td>
<td><strong>18%</strong></td>
<td><strong>18%</strong></td>
<td><strong>18%</strong></td>
<td><strong>18%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5-yr Avg. Recruit Rate</th>
<th>5-yr Avg. Turnover Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Asian Minority</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Recruits over 10 Years</th>
<th>New Recruits/Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Asian Minority</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Increased Recruitment: What would it take for Dartmouth to reach the 25% goal by 2027?

These projections assume that 36% of new recruits each year will be minorities and that the turnover rate will be 5% institution-wide. It also assumes that the size of the faculty will remain consistent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Non-Asian Minities</strong></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Asian</strong></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total White</strong></td>
<td>511</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Faculty</strong></td>
<td>619</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Departs</strong></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departs Non-Asian Minority</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departs Asian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hires Non-Asian Minority</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hires Asian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hires White</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority %</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Recruit Rate</th>
<th>Turnover Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Asian Minority</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>New Recruits over 10 Years</th>
<th>New Recruits/Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Asian Minority</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>340</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This report summarizes the findings of the Inclusive Excellence External Review Committee during our on-site visit to Dartmouth College on June 7, 2017, and our examination of materials related to the implementation of the Action Plan on Inclusive Excellence. The effort to support a diverse community of faculty, staff, and students at Dartmouth by creating an inclusive environment, and the recasting of normal business to promote inclusion, calls for this review committee to assess the progress of the leadership of Dartmouth—and in particular the Executive Committee on Inclusive Excellence—with respect to the aims of the Action Plan. Further, we see ourselves as a resource in evaluating those efforts and a source of inspiration in the pursuit of an inclusive community of higher learning.

With this charge in mind, we have determined the inclusive excellence initiative has made significant progress and achieved several notable successes consistent with the Action Plan. As expected, our assessment identified several challenges, as well as promising opportunities; our report focuses principally on these challenges and opportunities.

Among the successes, we note:

- A concrete action plan—with clear objectives and a desire to be held accountable to those objectives—that distinguished it from past diversity and inclusion initiatives
- Creation of a Diversity and Assessment Research Team committed to using real data collection, logic models, and rigor in their work
- A promising first season of diverse faculty hiring with some tangible gains
- Undergraduate housing communities that engage faculty and that embed diversity, inclusion, and difference into their structure and programming
- The Dartmouth Teacher-Scholar ‘brand’ as a foundational shared value for inclusivity, if the link can be made more explicit (see below)
The primary challenges in the implementation of the plan we found include:

- Ambiguity about ownership of diversity and inclusion goals: the action plan is clear regarding who is accountable for what, but not to whom they are accountable.

- The Dean of Faculty of A&S plays a critical role in faculty hiring and retention, but accountability is ambiguous; the Provost has accountability for faculty diversity yet this Dean is autonomous from the Provost.

- Sustainability: There is no clear plan for the overall, ongoing coordination of the Action Plan in general, and the ongoing role of DART in particular.

- Goal of 25% URM faculty in 3 years is not realistic given market conditions and therefore will likely fall short, a perception shared by faculty themselves.

- Faculty retention is the next immediate challenge to sustain progress on faculty hiring; there does not appear to be a clear retention strategy in place.

- There appears to be a lack of consistent communications and messaging with regard to the Action Plan: the community (especially students and staff) needs to be kept engaged and informed of progress, and given opportunities to actively contribute.

To address these challenges, we have identified some key opportunities that can be capitalized upon:

- Existing themes and Dartmouth cultural values to build upon: such as Moving Dartmouth Forward and the Dartmouth Teacher-Scholar model

- Upcoming Dean of Faculty of A&S selection and on-boarding to ensure commitment to the aims of the action plan

- HR know-how with developing hiring plans based on analysis of turnover, national pools, etc., that can be applied to faculty diversity challenge

- Upcoming cluster faculty hires which provide a visible opportunity to advance faculty diversity; indeed, because of its visibility, this opportunity can become a liability if diversity is seen to not be a priority
Report of the Inclusive Excellence
External Review Committee

Keivan Stassun (Chair), Kimberly Griffin, John Rich ’80, Kiva R. Wilson ’04
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MEMBERS OF THE EXTERNAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

Kimberly Griffin is an Associate Professor in the Higher Education, Student Affairs and International Education Policy Program at the University of Maryland, where she focuses on access and retention in graduate education and the professorate, the access, experiences, and outcomes of underrepresented communities in higher education; diversity within the Black higher education community; and the influence of relationships on outcomes at critical time points.
http://www.education.umd.edu/Academics/Faculty/Bios/index.cfm?URLID=kgriff29

John A. Rich is Professor at the Drexel University School of Public Health, and a member of the Dartmouth Class of 1980. His work has focused on serving one of the nation’s most underserved communities, African-American men in urban settings, and his research has shaped policy discussion and health practices throughout the United States. He is a recipient of a Macarthur Grant, and served on the Dartmouth Board of Trustees from 2008-2016.
http://drexel.edu/dornsife/academics/faculty/John%20Rich

Keivan G. Stassun is the Stevenson Endowed Professor of Physics & Astronomy and the Senior Associate Dean for Graduate Education and Research at Vanderbilt University, where he directs the Vanderbilt Initiative in Data-Intensive Astrophysics and directs the Vanderbilt Center for Autism & Innovation. He is also adjunct professor of physics at Fisk University, and is the Founding Director of the Fisk-Vanderbilt Masters-to-PhD Bridge Program. He is an elected Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science and of the American Physical Society, from which he also was awarded the Nicholson Medal for Human Outreach. In 2015-16 led Vanderbilt’s Diversity and Inclusion Strategic Plan.
http://astro.phy.vanderbilt.edu/~stassuk

Kiva Wilson is Diversity Program Manager at Facebook where she conducts the outreach and recruitment strategies to attract, promote and retain historically underrepresented talent. Prior to her work at Facebook, she served among other positions with the Peace Corps, where she worked to diversify the applicant pool for Peace Corps service. She is a member of the Dartmouth Class of 2004.
https://www.linkedin.com/in/kiva-r-wilson-b175588
In May of 2016, Dartmouth issued an Action Plan for Inclusive Excellence whose recommendations were drawn from the analysis of three working groups, focusing on Faculty, Student and Staff Diversity. This Plan sought to positively influence the composition and experience of the Dartmouth community by creating an inclusive environment where diversity can thrive. The focus of the plan was on transforming the everyday practices of our community, and featured a strong emphasis on building accountability into the tasks associated with this initiative.

To that end, the action plan called for the creation of an external review committee comprised of national thought-leaders in diversity and inclusion in higher education. The external reviewers will report to the board of trustees annually to evaluate Dartmouth’s accountability for the commitments outlined in the Action Plan on Inclusive Excellence.

The External Review Committee (ERC) gathered for the first time on June 7, 2017. It was determined by the ERC’s chair, in consultation with the Executive Committee on Inclusive Excellence, that this first meeting would focus on leadership and accountability for the items in the plan, with subsequent visits to include open forums with the broader community. While on campus they met with:

- Inclusive Excellence Executive Committee: President Phil Hanlon, Provost Carolyn Dever, Executive Vice President Richard Mills, Vice President for Institutional Diversity and Equity Evelynn Ellis
- Diversity Assessment and Research Group: Alicia Betsinger, Director of Institutional Research (Chair), Yusaku Horichi, Professor of Government and Quantitative Social Science, Prudence Merton, Associate Director for Faculty Programs & Assessment, Dartmouth Center for the Advancement of Learning, Rachel Eden, Advisor to First Generation and Low Income Students
- Faculty Diversity representatives: Denise Anthony, Vice Provost for Academic Initiatives and Professor of Sociology, and Michelle Warren, Diversity and Inclusion, Provost’s office, Professor of Comparative Literature
- Rebecca Biron, Dean of the College and Professor of Spanish and Portuguese
- Scot Bemis, Chief Human Resources Officer and Cheryl Josler, Executive Director of HR Services
- Participants in the Faculty, Staff and Student Diversity Working Groups whose work laid the foundations for the Action Plan on Inclusive Excellence
COMMITTEE CHARGE

The External Review Committee is charged by the President to deliver a report with findings and recommendations with respect to the Action Plan by June 30, 2017. The Executive Committee interprets the charge of this External Review Committee 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.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Accountability

Fundamentally, the very existence of a concrete Action Plan and of accountability structures is a success for Dartmouth, and provides a solid foundation on which to build toward a fully diverse and inclusive Dartmouth community. Additionally, a number of specific items in the Action Plan that have already been accomplished, or are underway in a promising manner. Where gains have been less apparent, or where we perceive real obstacles, can be traced back to important challenges with regards to organizational structures that should be addressed or mitigated, as follows:

- Finding: The accountability structure as currently construed has one potentially fatal flaw: While it is clear who is accountable for what, it is not clear to whom they are accountable. This may reflect a culture/tradition that prefers a “soft” or horizontal hierarchy. It may also reflect a structural issue with the college’s organizational chart at the top (see next Finding). It is the sense of this committee that the Executive Team has taken real ownership for the Action Plan. However, one unintended consequence of this ambiguity in messaging about who won’t tolerate failure of the Action Plan is the implication that failure of the Action Plan will be tolerated.

  » Recommendation: Create a leadership organizational chart accompanying the
Action Plan that makes explicit the bidirectional flow of resources on the one hand and accountability on the other. For each item in the Action Plan, in addition to identifying who is the responsible entity (this is already done), indicate from whom are the necessary resources and incentives to be provided, and by whom is the responsible party ultimately held to account.

- **Finding:** Arts and Science is the largest academic unit in the College and thus where the vast majority of tenure-track faculty hiring and retention occurs. There appears to be a nuanced reporting relationship between the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, the Provost, and the President. In particular, the Action Plan situates accountability for faculty diversity in the Provost/President area, however it appears to be broadly understood that in Arts and Sciences it is the Dean of Faculty who holds near-autonomous authority over faculty hiring and retention. It is not clear whether or in what ways the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences is accountable to the Provost or President.

  » **Recommendation:** Clarify these reporting relationships. Ensure committed leadership by the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences in regards to the Action Plan. Ensure responsible execution by the Associate Deans of their faculty hiring and retention functions, as outlined in the Faculty Manual. Facilitate collaborative relationships between the Dean(s) and the Provost office on faculty diversity initiatives through ongoing, regular and long-term engagement, to ensure the charge and culture of promoting diversity is maintained even when personnel changes.

Data collection, analysis, and research, utilizing existing expertise among Dartmouth staff and faculty, is crucial to the ultimate success of the Action Plan:

- **Finding:** The formation of the Dartmouth Assessment and Research Team (DART) is a vitally important success for monitoring progress on the Action Plan and for informing its implementation. However, the constituted group is not formalized and there is not a clear plan for continuity, nor a formal recognition of their time investment. In addition, DART is currently considering a restructuring of their assessment towards a more conceptual understanding of the Action Plan’s goals. This may be more amenable to measurement, as is the stated aim of DART in making this proposal, but this must be done with care or risk diluting the clarity of the intended outcomes.

  » **Recommendation:** Make the functions of the DART team a permanent part of the Institutional Research office, with resources as needed to carry out this vital role.
  
  » **Recommendation:** Provide appropriate incentives, recognitions, and/or
compensation as needed for faculty who contribute crucial scholarly expertise to the DART effort, and to attract potential members and collaborators who may not already be involved, or who can replace participants who need to step away.

» Recommendation: Ensure that any restructuring of the Action Plan’s goals stay true to its original intent and boldness. Some of the original language—such as “increase faculty diversity”—should be retained, even if reorganized within a new scheme that includes more explicit measurable activities. Additionally, DART should consider ways to collect and analyze qualitative data, particularly as related to climate and retention issues.

» Recommendation: Explore ways to gather data beyond race, sex, and ethnicity, to capture broader diversity, such as gender identity, religious affiliation, etc.

Evaluation

Staff

• Finding: Broadly speaking, activity and progress and capacity building toward the goals of the Action Plan in the staff area are excellent. The HR leadership team has created an exemplary materials and tools for tracking progress, identifying responsible parties at a granular level, and creating new mechanisms for regular communications and messaging across the staff domain.

• Finding: The HR team has conducted an expert analysis upon which they have developed a hiring plan to increase staff diversity. This analysis includes granular measures of areas of under-utilization, measures of available hiring pools, and realistic timeframes for increasing staff diversity.

» Recommendation: Spotlight the work and progress and plans in the staff area to help motivate progress in other areas, especially faculty.

» Recommendation: As part of its diversity recruitment effort Talent Acquisition should engage with NASPA (https://www.naspa.org/) and ACPA (http://www.mayacpa.org), two national organizations for student affairs professionals. Both have very diverse membership bodies and open hiring opportunities at their yearly, national meetings. These organizations offer a broader range of student affairs professionals than NCORE.

Students

• Finding: In the area of the Dean of College (i.e., principally undergraduate student life
and programming), we observed strong leadership and progress. Of particular note is the development of the Undergraduate House Communities, which includes deliberate leadership development and embedded programming around difference, diversity, and inclusivity. A robust diversity of faculty and graduate students are currently engaged in these communities. The House Communities appears to be an example of the faculty asserting the responsibility of stewardship over the educational mission of the College, even in the face of some initial resistance by students.

» Recommendation: Only now in its second year, the House Communities initiative should be sustained, and outcomes carefully assessed, including the gathering of robust qualitative data of the House effect on the student community dynamic.

• Finding: It is not clear to what extent there has been engagement of Greek Life within the broad aims of building a diverse and inclusive Dartmouth community.

» Recommendation: From experience at peer institutions, Greek Life communities can be effectively and meaningfully rallied around the cause of building enriched student communities, leadership development opportunities, community service, good citizenship, and religious life.

• Finding: It is not clear to what extent diversifying the graduate student and postdoctoral communities is a goal for the Student Life area. These are small yet vital communities to the mission of the College, but organizationally are situated somewhere between undergraduates and faculty.

» Recommendation: Make explicit where graduate students and postdocs are situated in the Action Plan’s goals and accountability structure.

Faculty

• Finding: The committee heard reports of a successful first round of faculty hiring since the development of the Action Plan, with a very promising recruitment year that suggests the new practices are having an initially useful impact. This was achieved despite the recent challenges surrounding the succession of the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, in part through the provision of incentivizing resources to the respective associate deans.

• Finding: There is a major structural challenge in Arts and Science. While the Office of the Vice Provost appears to be very knowledgeable on best practices, prepared with tools, and well primed by the provost to exert leadership and support to increase faculty diversity and retention, the Office of the Vice Provost is organizationally disconnected from the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, at least (and in particular) with regards to accountability for
outcomes. Depending on the mandate and orientation of the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, the Office of the Vice Provost can be leveraged as a strong and valued partner in faculty diversity and retention, or rendered impotent. If there is a potential single-point failure in the broad area of faculty diversity and retention (in Arts and Sciences), it is in the ambiguous relationship of the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences to the Provost.

» Recommendation: Ensure strong, visionary, committed, and collaborative leadership in the selection of the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences.

• Finding: Dartmouth’s espoused value of faculty as Teacher-Scholar is potent but perilous. This theme appears to be broadly embraced by the Dartmouth community, and value is placed upon it at the hiring stage. But it can become a liability at tenure and promotion, if evaluation processes disfavor the teacher/mentor component to an extent that junior faculty may not realize. It was reported to us by the Vice Provost for Academic Initiatives that an ongoing internal study of retention and tenure rates is underway to examine (among other things) the degree to which underrepresented minority faculty may be more likely than their majority counterparts to leave Dartmouth even before the tenure decision, or more likely than their majority counterparts to be denied tenure. This is an important study. Lack of inclusion, and disillusionment between the rhetoric of student engagement on the one hand and the exclusive emphasis on research productivity at tenure on the other hand, can compound to discourage underrepresented minority faculty. They are seen as critical to the engagement and teaching of an increasingly diverse student body, but this contribution appears to not be currently measured or perceptively valued.

» Recommendation: Support the completion of the Vice Provost’s study on tenure and retention, including especially an analysis of possible disparities in promotion and tenure and how these may relate to the Teacher-Scholar model.

» Recommendation: Decide whether the Teacher-Scholar is truly valued in the Dartmouth faculty, and if so, create more explicit incentives and rewards for faculty who deliver on both facets of this value. In particular, consider seriously how teaching and student engagement outside the classroom are measured, assessed, and valued.

» Recommendation: tenure results, inclusive of denials, disaggregated by gender and ethnicity, should be reported to the Provost along with annual retention rates for faculty, also broken out by gender and ethnicity.

• Finding: The stated goal of 25% underrepresented minority faculty by 2020 is not realistic. It appears to not be based on actual analysis of areas of under-utilization and available national pools. Consequently this central goal of the Action Plan appears destined to fail, and the committee’s conversations with faculty suggest that this is widely understood by the faculty as well.
Recommendation: Conduct an analysis to quantify (a) how long it will realistically take to reach an aspirational goal for faculty diversity, and (b) how aggressive and competitive Dartmouth will need to be with the available hiring pool. We suggest that it is preferable to maintain an equally or even more ambitious goal with a longer timeline, rather than a weakened goal by 2020.

Finding: Assuming continued success with faculty recruitment and hiring, ultimate success of the Action Plan will come down to success with retention. This is a broad area of concern involving multiple strategies and existing best practice that can be adapted and implemented. Data suggest that faculty retention is a specific area in need of capacity building at Dartmouth. We heard very little about retention initiatives, suggesting that much work needs to be done in this area, especially focusing on building a sense of community and helping to foster a sense of belonging. Publication of retention efforts will, in turn, vitally support recruiting efforts.

Recommendation: Create and publicize a mini action plan specific to faculty retention, utilizing both local and external expertise.

Alumni

Finding: It was reported to the Committee that alumni have been broadly supportive of the aims of the Inclusive Excellence effort and of the Action Plan. It is not clear the extent to which alumni have been engaged as emissaries and champions for the current students and faculty.

Recommendation: The global family of Dartmouth alumni and friends is arguably among the most accomplished in the world and the most loyal to alma mater. Adding their voices to the imperative for a more diverse and inclusive Dartmouth community could be a source of propulsion for the entire initiative.

Leadership

At the end of the day, there is no substitute for committed, sustained leadership.

Finding: The executive team appears committed to the aspirations and goals of the Action Plan. There are some easily addressed leadership functional issues that would enhance execution and success of the Action Plan.

Recommendation: Explicitly task one member of the executive team to take responsibility for “rapid response” situations. For example, there have been and will almost certainly continue to be situations on campus, or events around the world, that
warrant rapid communications to the Dartmouth community that reassure and that reaffirm Dartmouth’s values. Someone close to the Provost and President needs to be on alert for such situations and rapidly draft communications as appropriate for the Provost and/or President.

» Recommendation: Convene a “roundtable” of cabinet-level leaders (President, Provost, Deans), perhaps as often as twice per year, to discuss progress, challenges, and opportunities with regards to the Action Plan. This would be an appropriate venue for the planned Diversity Council to report on findings and recommendations, for the DART team to report on metrics, and to prepare for the next visit of the External Review Committee.

» Recommendation: Incorporate updates about progress on inclusivity and diversity into regular communications from senior leadership. Senior leadership possesses a powerful voice that can be used to good effect.

• Finding: The Committee is impressed with the degree to which the Board of Trustees has not only endorsed the vision of inclusive excellence for Dartmouth but is also “walking the talk” by participating in unconscious bias training and other activities.

» Recommendation: Current and/or former Trustees could be a powerful voice for a more diverse and inclusive Dartmouth community, particularly to the extent that Trustees bring perspectives from beyond academia.

Inspiration

From the standpoint of campus buy-in, the rollout of the Action Plan for Inclusive Excellence to the Dartmouth community has had some hits and some misses.

• Finding: Various campus stakeholders appear to be generally aware of the existence of the Action Plan, and there is the sense (in contrast to previous campus exercises around diversity) that this time the administration intends real action.

» Recommendation: Continue to visibly publicize progress on the Action Plan, such as the online dashboard. Consider, too, new strategies for outreach to the campus community and alumni: social media, video messages, creative campaigns, etc.

• Finding: None of the artifacts we inspected included an inspirational articulation of “why diversity and inclusion matter for Dartmouth” nor a clear explanation of “why this matters for Dartmouth now”.

Dartmouth
Recommendation: Create an inspirational narrative to accompany the Action Plan that (a) asserts the value of diversity and inclusive excellence for a great institution that seeks to prepare the future stewards of democracy and the future leaders of our diverse society, (b) conveys urgency and the risks associated with not making progress, and (c) connects the concept of inclusive excellence with Dartmouth’s traditionally unique character and core values (e.g., Teacher-Scholar, etc).

Finding: Some campus stakeholders, especially students (undergraduate and graduate) and staff, feel disconnected from the ongoing deployment and evolution of the Action Plan, yet remain energized and eager to assist.

Recommendation: Develop a communications strategy to accompany the Action Plan, whereby the campus community is regularly informed about successes and progress, and provided with opportunities and mechanisms for continued input and engagement.

There are additional opportunities to inspire and activate the campus community through the Action Plan.

Finding: The Moving Dartmouth Forward initiative appears to have taken hold in the minds of the Dartmouth community and could be utilized as a point of connection for the concept of inclusive excellence.

Finding: The notion of the Dartmouth Teacher-Scholar is a potentially powerful opportunity to enhance recruitment of diverse faculty who are prepared to advance inclusive excellence. However, faculty and students must be rewarded not only for the scholar part, and must not be penalized for the teacher part.

Recommendation: Create policies and procedures to embed the Teacher-Scholar and Inclusive Excellence concepts in faculty searches, faculty recruitment, and faculty tenure and promotion processes.

Recommendation: Clearly articulate how student engagement and mentoring, beyond normal classroom teaching demands, are part of the Teacher-Scholar model. Implement a means for recording this activity and establish criteria for how it is assessed.

Recommendation: Consider developing parallel concepts for students and staff, and incentivize/reward commitments to, and advancement of, diversity and inclusion at Dartmouth.
Finding: Staff across the organization may be an underutilized resource for creating a more diverse and fully inclusive community at Dartmouth. Staff want to contribute to inclusion and diversity in their own units, but lack a clear institutional champion. The office of Human Resources is seen as a support, but there remains a need and an opportunity to identify a leader in this area. The Executive Vice President’s office is likely too remote organizationally for this purpose.

» Recommendation: Create greater opportunities for staff leadership and innovation to influence the efforts at the institutional policy level.

Finding: Staff are eager to be involved, and those with whom we spoke from the Staff Diversity Working Group felt a loss of their voices in an ongoing role, even via participation in the reconstituted Council on Diversity and Inclusion. Further, staff feel that intended gains in faculty diversity may come at the cost of staff diversity, as administrative areas have sustained cuts to free up resources for academic priorities (ongoing budget reallocation process).

» Recommendation: Consider including contributions to the educational mission of the university explicitly in staff hiring where possible. For example, staff at all levels across the organization could be given opportunities to engage with students by telling their stories, explaining their craft, etc. This could provide a large opportunity to diversify the staff, recognize the vital role that staff play in the goal of a diverse and inclusive Dartmouth, and also create a more tightly knit Dartmouth-Hanover community.
APPENDIX

Dartmouth officers, faculty, staff, students who met with the External Review Committee on June 7, 2017.

Inclusive Excellence Executive Committee

- President Phil Hanlon
- Provost Carolyn Dever
- Executive Vice President Richard Mills
- Vice President for Institutional Diversity and Equity Evelynn Ellis

Diversity Assessment and Research Team

- Alicia Betsinger, Director of Institutional Research (chair)
- Yusaku Horichi, Professor of Government and Quantitative Social Science
- Prudence Merton, Associate Director for Faculty for Faculty Programs & Assessment, Dartmouth Center for the Advancement of Learning
- Rachel Eden, Advisor to First Generation and Low Income Students

Denise Anthony, Vice Provost for Academic Initiatives and Professor of Sociology
Michelle Warren, Diversity and Inclusion, Provost’s office, and Professor of Comparative Literature
Rebecca Biron, Dean of the College and Professor of Spanish and Portuguese
Scot Bemis, Chief Human Resources Officer
Cheryl Josler, Executive Director of HR Services

Members of the Faculty Diversity Working Group

- Richard Sansing, Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs, Tuck School of Business
- C. Robertson McClung, Professor of Biological Sciences
- Leslie Henderson, Dean of Faculty Affairs, Associate Dean for Diversity & Inclusion, Geisel School of Medicine
- Kimonee Burke ‘18
Dartmouth

- Adrienne Mehalow, PhD candidate Biochemistry, Geisel School of Medicine
- Jane Seibel, Assistant Dean of Recruiting and Diversity, School of Graduate and Advance Studies
- Sean Nolon, Ombudsman

Members of the Staff Diversity Working Group
- Kate Soule, Director, Finance and Research Administration Arts & Sciences
- Vincent Mack, Program Officer for Co-curricular Programs, Rockefeller Center for Public Policy
- Theodosia Cook, Director of Equal Opportunity & Affirmative Action, Institutional Diversity and Equity
- Ron Shaiko, Associate Director for Curricular and Research Programs, Rockefeller Center for Public Policy
- Kianna Burke ’12, Interim Director, Native American Program

Members of the Student Diversity Working Group
- Reese Kelly, Senior Assistant Dean, Director, Office of Pluralism and Leadership
- Huanping Huang, PhD candidate, Earth Sciences
- Bethany Moreton, Professor of History
- Paul Sunde, Director of Admissions, College of Arts & Sciences