



**REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF
THE PRESIDENT'S DIVERSITY PANEL
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
August 15, 2000**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In January 2000, University of Maryland President C.D. Mote Jr., in consultation with the Campus Senate, appointed a 21-member panel to recommend how to unite our diverse faculty, staff, and students to interact as a community. President Mote provided the panel with a specific charge and goals. In keeping with the President's directives, the panel solicited campus-wide input into its work, and aimed for a fresh look at current campus practices and organization.

The panel made several findings. Foremost among these is the progress the University has made over time to increase the number of individuals in our community from varying racial and ethnic groups. There is also increasing acknowledgement of persons of the varying religious and cultural groups, sexual orientations, socio-economic backgrounds, and those who are differently able. As a result of these gains, identity-based faculty, staff and student groups, and Presidential Commissions have been established on campus. The panel sees these groups and commissions as continuing, positive catalysts for achieving equity for all campus citizens, and as potential contributors to increased inter-group relationships.

While the University's gains have been impressive, some resistance to total acceptance of this diversity exists, resistance which regrettably can surface as acts of hate. While the University cannot legislate human behavior, the University, in its primary role as an educational institution, can educate. Education of the campus not only to accept diversity, but also to welcome it cannot be forced but should be wisely and skillfully encouraged. In this regard, the panel also was impressed with the number of diversity-related research, educational, and recruitment programs and activities now in place on campus. The panel was concerned, however, that these initiatives' effectiveness may be hindered by lack of visibility, and by being insufficiently coordinated and integrated into mainstream campus priorities. In a related finding, the panel concluded that the campus would benefit from a systematic program both to gather data about the status of the campus as a community, and to communicate diversity's educational and community benefits.

The panel particularly wishes to emphasize its finding that community building among diverse groups requires interrelated stages of progress. There is no single solution or quick-fix. Instead, progress will occur by constructing an infrastructure to ensure that no minority or majority group feels threatened by any other, and each is able to pursue its aspirational goals. In addition, the University must continue to build diversity to create a framework of shared strength in and among groups. With these foundations, the University will be prepared to improve the quality of its diversity by drawing on the mutual trust, respect, and common goals of all its members.

Progress will likely be more incremental than dramatic. This should not be grounds for discouragement. The University is working to overcome strongly felt opinions, prejudices, experiences, and the historical legacy of segregation. Throughout this process, the University also must recognize legitimate expressions of individual free speech and demonstrations of academic freedom.

Any action plan designed to lead the University through these stages must rely on collaboration among all campus units to promote as many opportunities as possible for different groups to interact. Success will occur only if there is a system for accountability of measurable outcomes across the highest levels of campus administration. Some on campus, including the Vice-Presidents, expressed concern the University has lost momentum towards becoming a national model of diversity in higher education. Ultimately, the campus must look to the President's leadership to reinvigorate this momentum if it is to forge itself into a diverse community.

Based on these findings, and as further detailed in the report, the panel recommends that the President and the University:

- Create a simple, visible process for reporting incidents which threaten the safety of members of the campus community. Recommendations include identifying the campus police emergency number, 911, as the hate crime/incident reporting mechanism; and centralizing the responsibility for processing and coordinating other appropriate campus units' responses in the Office of Human Relations.
- Require aggressive efforts to recruit a diverse pool of candidates for every hiring opportunity, starting with the highest levels of administration. The University also should pursue increased flexibility in hiring practices, including options such as: "target of opportunity" and "designated" hiring; and pre-doctoral and post-doctoral fellowships or visiting lectureships for advanced graduate students and recent Ph.D.'s.
- Initiate an expanded orientation program for new faculty, and institutionalize a mentoring system for junior faculty.
- Institute grants and scholarships for graduate and undergraduate students awarded on merit measured by indicators other than standardized test scores.
- Recognize the University's excellence in research and scholarship on diversity, multicultural studies, and curriculum innovation, and commit to supporting and publicizing these efforts. The Consortium for Race, Gender, and Ethnicity could be a vehicle for increasing collaboration and heightening the visibility of such scholarship.
- Enhance the curriculum for diversity by initiating a collaborative review of the existing curriculum diversity initiatives; by encouraging development of courses that expand acceptance, and enhance understanding of the value of diversity; and by further designing living/learning centers, first year focus clusters, and small group curricular activities with emphasis on diversity among participants to encourage students to learn better how to live in a diverse society.
- Restructure the administration of campus equity and human relations programs. Responsibility and accountability for this restructured equity system should be at the Vice-President level.
- Establish a clearinghouse for the multitude of existing diversity programs; and consolidate responsibility for program coordination and evaluation, long-term planning, and an organized system for dissemination of program information to the campus.

- Implement surveys at regular intervals to evaluate the status of the campus as a diverse community as well as the effectiveness and benefits of diversity initiatives over time.
- Visibly communicate the University's commitment to diversity at the start of each academic year. This might be done by a consolidated awards ceremony for faculty, staff, and students; by a special diversity or service learning program on the Mall; and/or through enhanced student orientation programs.
- Continue a leadership role in creating a diverse community by, for example, realizing the goal of a campus child care center; prioritizing the accessibility of the Main Administration building; initiating training workshops for all high level administrators; and pressing the Board of Regents for domestic partner and contract employee benefits.



**REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF
THE PRESIDENT'S DIVERSITY PANEL
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
August 15, 2000**

I. INTRODUCTION

A. About the Panel

On January 28, 2000, a panel of 21 members of the University of Maryland community appointed by President Mote began meeting in order to “consider any or all opportunities for enhancement of our experience as a diverse community [and] promote a campus-wide vision that seeks to bring together people with diverse views and experiences.” (See “From a Diverse Campus to a Diverse Community: Vision and Charge,” Appendix A.) The panel itself represented these “diverse views and experiences”-including undergraduate (6) and graduate (2) students, faculty (8), and exempt (1) and non-exempt (4) staff, of whom nine are African American, eight are European American, three are Latino, and two are Asian American. (Appendix B.) Over the course of the semester, three undergraduate students became unable to attend our regular (lengthy) meetings, leaving three, who in their energy and commitment were more than able to assure that student voices would be heard; one non-exempt staff person was also unable to attend. This report, therefore, represents the opinions of seventeen members of the appointed panel.

The size and diversity of the panel presented both challenges and opportunities. The “learning curve” for everyone was steep, since no one of us was situated to have experienced the whole of the university’s community life. On the other hand, we were not only able to learn from each other, but perhaps even more important, we were never permitted to delude ourselves that we instinctively knew what others, situated differently, had experienced on our campus.

The panel was also able to call on many other university members for information and advisement, meeting with administrators responsible for the functions that related to our charge, the heads of the various Presidential Commissions, faculty whose scholarly research focuses on the climate of racially diverse campuses, a number of students pulled together for a useful set of focus groups, and other university employees-ranging from non-exempt staff to the vice-presidents.

B. Defining the Scope and Language of this Report.

Although the president’s charge was much broader than solving, or resolving, the hate crimes that plagued our campus in fall 1999, we kept in mind that these were the incidents that prompted the establishment of the panel, and focused our attention on the campus climate for groups that had been singled out in those attacks-groups that had once been excluded and are still underrepresented on our campus due to legal, social, cultural, and political barriers based on race, ethnicity, religion, gender, sexual orientation, and different abilities. Most of our suggestions, however, are aimed more broadly, either because of legal requirements or because we

believe that the targeted groups would benefit from initiatives that affect the entire University of Maryland community.

Throughout our report we use the term “diversity” to refer to people of, and sometimes research and curricula about, different races, ethnicities, genders, sexual orientations, age, religions, physical ability, and social, economic, or educational backgrounds. As it is commonly understood, however, the term has a meaning that is far more general than ours: “diverse” simply means “unlike in kind” or “varied”; “diversity” simply refers to the fact or quality of difference or variety. Clearly, therefore, our campus is diverse in many more ways than those we intend when we have used the term in this report. Nonetheless, we expect that people will understand our more narrow usage.

We also sometimes use the word “inclusive” or “inclusivity” as a synonym for our particular usage of “diverse” or “diversity.” When, however, we use the term “multicultural” (research or curricula), we are referring to diverse races or ethnicities only. In this report, we also use the words “identity-based” groups: here we are referring to groups that establish community on the basis of their racial, ethnic, religious, sexual orientation, or gender identity.

C. Overall Impressions

In our work, we were first of all struck by the progress that the University of Maryland has made in the past quarter century in becoming a more inclusive campus. In fact, this progress in itself explains some of the discomfort and acts of prejudice that disturb us all. Research indicates that as the number of minority group members increases, the number of acts of prejudice typically increase.¹ Some members of the University community may openly resist, perhaps even with verbal or physical violence, the institutional changes that ensue when campuses become more diverse. Many other students may feel discomfort from their lack of knowledge and experience interacting with students different from themselves. Few students, or faculty and other employees of the university, were raised in communities as diverse as our campus. Given the racialized housing patterns in the U.S., few of our students, faculty, or staff have attended schools with as diverse a population as exists on our campus; nor do public and most private high schools require students to live in such close contact.

We also learned that, outside of certain minority communities, there appears to be a lack of knowledge about the University’s de jure segregated past. Symbols remain from that segregated past that affect the quality of interaction today. For example, the African American students with whom we met made clear their resentment that Byrd stadium honors a former President of the University of Maryland noted for his belligerent stance against desegregation. Many on campus feel that the University’s history of discrimination should be incorporated into curricular and training programs and activities and so be used as a valuable tool in our community building efforts.

The point was brought home to us that the campus, in order to create a community among its diverse population, must do more than end exclusionary recruitment practices; it must actively address the even more complex issues of educating us (in and out of the classrooms and our workplaces) to live with people of varying cultures and ethnicities. A university setting is a perfect environment for such a mission, of course.

The panel was struck, too, by the number of identity-based groups, committees, projects, and commissions on our campus. In examining this matter, and especially the published research considering the effects of campus identity-based groups on the climate at diverse institutions, we became convinced that such groups are essential for community building, and eventually even nourish relationships among diverse groups. This may seem counterintuitive, but the research is clear that a feeling that one is safe, psychologically as well as physically, is crucial to minority students’ willingness to interact beyond the parameters of their own identity-based group, and that the most important elements that enhance psychological safety are the recruitment of increased numbers of minorities and the empowerment of minorities that comes from identity-based support systems.²

The members of the President’s Diversity Panel, in recognizing the immense progress that the University has made, also discovered reasons for concern. The numbers of minority faculty that had been steadily increasing, have leveled off in the past four years. Of equal concern is the recent decline in enrollment of African American students within the past two years and Asian American students within the past five. Of course, this

might simply be a statistical blip: enrollment of African American students has increased 20 percent in the five-year period 1994-1999; Latino students' enrollment increased 35 percent in the same period. Many people on our campus, including the Vice-Presidents, expressed concern to us that the campus was experiencing a loss of momentum in its recruitment of faculty and students of color and dated this either to the court decision in the Podberesky v. Kirwan (Banneker) case or to the University's possible overreaction to that decision, resulting in the halting of our most pro-active minority recruitment programs.

We also found that little effort has been taken to bring diverse groups together across boundaries of identity. We understand that this is a delicate issue because any effort to do so should not undermine the already existing identity-based groups. To the extent that the panel's proposals foster inter-group relationships, we have strived to protect intra-group activities at the same time.

As well, we conclude that the many programs that have been developed at Maryland in the past few decades are not well known to the University community. These programs would benefit from wider publicity, which might enhance their overall effectiveness. Thus, the panel suggests that existing programs should be reviewed for their effectiveness.

The panel discovered that crucial information about campus structures and life is lacking. For example, there has only been one survey of campus climate. Further, this study, done more than ten years ago, was limited to African American faculty. Also, nobody seems to have a handle on the many existing diversity programs; instead we discovered both a lack of information, and a dearth of evaluation that would help us to know which are effective and perhaps ought to be expanded, and which are no longer effective and perhaps should be discontinued.

We came to see the University's efforts to incorporate diversity into every aspect of university life as moving through three stages. The first stage is to assure that each and every member of our university-student or employee-feels safe and free of the fear of physical harassment. The next phase must be that everyone experience the feeling of empowerment that results when minority groups' isolation is reduced. In the third stage, there is the possibility of building a community based on trust and respect.

II. RECOMMENDATIONS

Following are our recommendations, grouped into categories (Physical Safety; Recruitment/Retention of Staff, Faculty, and Students of Underrepresented Groups; Making the University of Maryland a Center of Excellence for Scholarship on Diversity; Enhancing the Curriculum for Diversity; Restructuring the Equity System; From Diversity to Community; Leadership). These, in addition to the sound ideas and goals which are set forth in the University's Strategic Plan (fully endorsed by the President's Diversity Panel), would move us to the third stage.

A. Physical Safety

The Panel has been informed of the many new practices, instituted since the incidents of fall 1999, that will deal more effectively with crimes of hate and prejudice. Most important are the initiatives intended to offer support to victims and other members of the targeted groups on- and off-campus. Also, significant steps have been taken to secure better cooperation and communication among administrative units that share responsibility for responding to hate incidents. The President's Diversity Panel heartily approves of these measures; but we continue to be concerned that students, faculty, and staff, even with the new measures, will not know where to turn first if they are victims of a hate crime, and may still find themselves talking to individuals who will not be knowledgeable about whom to contact.

A1. Well-publicized Emergency Number. We propose that every telephone on this campus include a sticker that reminds us that the campus emergency number is 911, and that that number be monitored always

by someone who is able to connect emergency calls to the appropriate help line or hotline, whether in the Counseling Center, the Health Center, the Police Department, or some other university office. In discussing the need for a well-publicized telephone number for reporting hate crimes, we noted that there is little information about where to turn in any emergency. We considered the idea of a separate number for hate crimes, but decided that the campus needs one single telephone number that we will remember, even when under extreme stress. Crucial is that the emergency number be identified as a campus number, since many people seem to think that “911” (rather than “9911”) connects one to an off-campus emergency service. And it is important that the number be monitored 24 hours/day, 7 days/week.

A2. Emergency Response Training. Training must be provided for persons responsible for monitoring the 911 emergency number so they may direct calls appropriately.

A3. Accurate, Globally Disseminated Emergency Contact Information. The University’s web page should include a very visible icon for emergencies. Through a system of trial and error, we found a site that does inform students (but only students) whom they should contact with particular problems, but this site (under “Information,” and below that, “For Students”) is unmarked and would be useless in case of an emergency. The listing is also outdated and incomplete. What we have in mind is an item as visible as the current “Hot Topics,” but clearly marked “In case of emergency, call. . . .” Clicking this icon will provide a direct link to a listing of various potential problems (including hate crimes) and provide the relevant numbers/offices to contact.

A4. Effective Handling of Complaints for All UM Citizens. Since hate crimes have targeted victims among faculty and other employees of the university as well as students, we propose that authority for handling them should be located in the Office of Human Relations rather than the Office of the Vice-President of Student Affairs.

B. Recruitment/Retention of Staff, Faculty, and Students of Underrepresented Groups

The University of Maryland is deservedly celebrated for its success in increasing the numbers of minority undergraduate and graduate students and faculty. We can be proud, for example, that this University is among the top five (non-historically Black colleges and universities) to graduate African American PhDs. And yet, the recent decline in African American student enrollments, especially at the graduate level, but also at the level of incoming first-year students, and the fact that the number of minority faculty has barely improved in four years, signal the need to reenergize our recruitment and retention efforts. The Diversity Panel proposes that the following measures, some of which have also been identified in the University’s Strategic Plan, be implemented.

B1. Diversity in the Highest Levels of UM’s Administration. Nowhere on campus is the lack of diversity more evident than at the highest level of the university’s administration. We urge that diversity be considered a critical factor in every hiring opportunity at the vice-presidential level that is currently all white men.

B2. Targeted and Designated Hiring. In order to increase faculty diversity, we urge increased flexibility in our hiring procedures. “Target of opportunity” hiring should be encouraged in all Colleges, and the means and import to effect this should be made clear and detailed for department Chairs and more consistently managed by College Deans. “Designated” hiring should be approved, especially when the opportunity exists to recruit senior faculty members. General advertisements (e.g., The Chronicle of Higher Education or the newsletters of professional associations) have not provided adequate notice.

B3. Targeted Fellowships & Visiting Lectureships. Pre- and post-doctoral fellowships or Visiting Lectureships should be established for very advanced graduate students and recent PhDs of exceptional promise whom we may wish to hire, but who are still too junior in their careers to have a research record adequate to

achieve tenure within our 6-year limit. Diversity (as defined above [see Section I.B: “. . .Language of This Report], not only race) should be a criterion for these fellowships; in addition, pre- and post-docs or Visiting Lectureships should be in departments, and in the particular research area, where a hiring opportunity exists. At the end of a fixed period, departments may request permission for a “designated” hire, or may conduct an open search for which the fellow/lecturer may apply.

B4. Expanded, Targeted Faculty Orientation Program. We propose an expanded orientation program for new faculty, run out of the Provost’s office, which continues at least throughout the first year, and provides new faculty with information that will point them in the right direction to succeed on our campus and assists them in establishing supportive networks. (Orientations should also include diversity training and a sexual harassment workshop.)

B5. Mentoring Program for Junior Faculty. We also propose that mentoring systems for junior faculty be institutionalized and that Department Chairs assign every assistant professor, immediately upon his or her arriving on campus, a senior faculty mentor, and advocate, who will offer both encouragement and useful advice for building a record of scholarship, teaching, and service that will result in the granting of tenure.

B6. Realigning Graduate Student Support. For graduate students, we propose the realignment of financial support to allow the creation of a fund to support the recruitment of a more diverse group of graduate students whose records of achievement demonstrate great potential, although certain criteria, especially GRE scores, may not reflect this. Prior to the decision in the Banneker case, grants were awarded on this basis and were very effective in increasing the numbers of minority graduate students who proved to be successful students in our graduate programs. Although those grants have been discontinued, they should be re-instituted in another form that takes into account all forms of diversity (as defined above, Sec. I.B.), which further the institution’s educational mission, not only that based on race.

B7. Diversity Scholarships for Undergraduate Students. Similarly, diversity scholarships should be created for undergraduate students. These should be based on merit measured by indicia other than standardized tests. Other universities within the state of Maryland have implemented scholarship programs for students who, in a variety of ways (not only on the basis of race), enhance the campus’s diversity.

C. Making the University of Maryland a Center of Excellence for Scholarship on Diversity.

The Diversity Panel is fully in agreement with the University’s goal of enhancing its scholarly reputation for excellence. On our campus, one obvious area of excellence is the scholarship on diversity. To some extent, the university is already well-known and respected in this area; with some enhancement to increase collaboration and coordination and heighten visibility, we shall be able to include diversity scholarship each and every time we trumpet our various centers of excellence. The value to the University cannot be overstated; not only is the scholarship on diversity an area very much in the spotlight and highly valued in today’s increasingly multicultural, and globalized, society, but also, in highlighting our contribution to this scholarship, we make visible our grasp of the concept that diversity and excellence are mutually reinforcing.

C1. Enhancement Funds for Diversity Scholarship. Recognizing that the campus already has great strength in scholarship on diversity, we propose that this be further encouraged by the use of funds made available through the campus’s enhancement process. We hope to increase the number of faculty engaged in this research. This is especially important in those departments which do not do so currently but where the possibility exists, given developments nationally in their discipline. Many departments typically seek to enhance areas in which they already have significant strength. We urge them-and the campus-to recognize that an “existing strength” may be across the campus rather than in the one department viewed in isolation. Developing an area

of research specialization in the area of diversity would be invaluable for both the department and for the campus as a whole. Not only is this research cutting-edge in most disciplines and therefore beneficial to the department's reputation for scholarly excellence, but also this would add to the University's reputation as a center of excellence in research on diversity and thus heighten the attractiveness of our institution to minority faculty, even those whose research does not focus in this area.

In order for this to succeed, the University must value multicultural research and interdepartmental collaboration in the tenure review process.

C2. Coordinating Diversity Research Enhancement. The University already hosts a number of centers of research and curricular programs whose focus is the scholarship of diversity. However, there is little coordination and cooperation among the researchers, and the net effect of all this work for Maryland's scholarly reputation for excellence is much less than might be. Although a Consortium for Research on Race, Gender, and Ethnicity was organized last year to encourage cooperation and coordination among the various research centers, academic units, and programmatic committees engaged in this research (and has begun to do so, successfully), with enhanced resources, the Consortium could more effectively serve the campus's need to make this research more visible. The Consortium, in the Diversity Panel's opinion, is best suited for this work because it includes representatives from the many research centers, campus-wide committees and projects, and academic units that focus on this area in their research/scholarship (and intends to include all, once they are identified), but does not subsume or supercede them. Each of the member groups has its own research agenda, sources of funding (especially grants), and has become respected for its particular work; none wishes to bury its identity in a new entity or shift its focus from the work in which it specializes; and none should do so. But some single group should be charged with making the work of all our centers and projects known to each other, to the wider campus community, and to a scholarly audience beyond our campus. With enhancement funds to initiate collaborative work and to widely publicize all the research on diversity that our campus produces, the Consortium can be an effective means to get more mileage from our already existing efforts.

D. Enhancing the Curriculum for Diversity

D1. Coordinating Diversity Curriculum Programs. The University has several initiatives on diversity. These include the CORE diversity requirement; the Curriculum Transformation Project; some of the work that is undertaken by the Center for Teaching Excellence; some of the curricular work that takes place in EDCP 108 or other orientation courses; and some of the work that takes place within the Academic Achievement Program. The Diversity Panel applauds these programs for their efforts, but urges representatives from each to expand the lines of communication. They should work together to rethink old programs and figure out ways to reach faculty who have not yet been exposed to the work of these groups.

D2. Expanding Diversity Orientation Programs. Education Counseling and Personnel Services 108, or equivalent courses sponsored by individual colleges and Honors and College Park Scholars programs, should be used more effectively for providing students with the tools for living in a diverse community. At the moment, these orientation courses reach too few students, and spend too little time (if any) on the issues that arise when studying at a campus as diverse as ours. We, therefore, propose that:

a) more funds be made available for more effective training of instructors for teaching diversity in all of these orientation courses. We are aware that the administrator responsible for the EDCP 108 program has developed a diversity component for its instructors' training program; but in our meetings with both instructors and students who have taken this course, we discovered that in practice too little time is spent on this in the instructors' training program. Consequently, instructors focus little, if any, attention to diversity in their courses—perhaps because they have not been encouraged to take diversity seriously, perhaps because they do not have the knowledge and tools to instruct students in this area.

b) funds be made available to increase the number of sections of EDCP 108, or equivalent courses, so that a 1-credit orientation course may be required of all students on our campus. Sections should also be

developed for incoming transfer students.

D3. Instructional Improvement Grants Targeting Diversity. We propose that the Dean for Undergraduate Studies' Instructional Improvement Grants be made available for faculty to develop many more diversity CORE courses that focus explicitly on the social construction of gender, race, sexuality, ethnicity, and disability, etc. Faculty in both the humanities and the social sciences (many of whom are on our campus) have produced scholarship, theoretical and empirical, which is at the fore, over the past three decades. The objective of these particular courses would be to provide more students exposure to some of the important literature in the field that focuses on the social construction of difference and, similarly, the social construction of prejudice, discrimination, or oppression.

D4. Increasing Living/Learning Centers Attending to Diversity. Learning how to live in an increasingly diverse society may occur outside the classroom. This learning includes social interactions with peers. Thus, we propose that the campus increase the number of living/learning centers and place students within them (and within the already existing living/learning centers) with attention to diversity.

D5. First Year Focus with Diversity Requirement. Undergraduate Studies should create First Year Focus clusters of 3 courses, plus EDCP 108 or the equivalent; one (not more) of the 3-credit courses should be the required diversity CORE course, so that students take this course with a cohort with whom they may develop close ties and an increased comfort level that would facilitate dealing with difficult issues.

D6. Small Group Curricular Activities Attending to Diversity. We propose that Department Chairs and Associate Deans for Undergraduate Studies work with faculty to develop small group curricular activities and place students into these groups with attention to diversity. Students can learn and experience how to live within a diverse society either by living in close proximity to students unlike themselves (see above) or by studying and working closely with a group of diverse students on projects not focused explicitly on diversity. This strategy is especially appropriate for science and mathematics classes where questions of diversity are not addressed in the curriculum, but can be facilitated within labs or other small group learning situations. The body of literature that emphasizes the value of learning in small groups is extensive and well known on our campus. We are suggesting that faculty take this a step further and no longer assign students to these groups randomly, or alphabetically, or by a process of self-selection that likely favors already existing friendships, but rather construct work groups in which students might enlarge their social and learning networks to include students unlike themselves. This provides for life lessons in diversity, beyond formal classroom instruction.

E. Restructuring the Equity System

The Diversity Panel focused much of its attention on the systems in place for assuring equity on our campus. We talked first with the heads of all of the Presidential Commissions (on Women, Ethnic Minorities, LGBT [Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual/and Transgendered], and Disability), followed by meetings with the heads of the Office of Human Relations and the Equity Council, in order to identify their distinctive roles.

E1. Role of the Presidential Commissions. The Presidential Commissions, we came to understand, have a unique role that we believe should not be disturbed. In part advisory to the President, in part advocacy groups for their constituencies, their role is not to oversee or implement the campus's Human Relations Code, but rather to serve as a mechanism for their faculty, staff, and student constituencies to make their concerns known at the highest levels of administration, and the reverse—for the administration to gather information that might guide the administration in setting policy or implementing programs. But the Commissions do not themselves set policy or establish programs; members of the Commission have no power to assure adherence to campus equity policies; they are not administrators responsible for any function related to the Human Relations Code or equity. They are more like "grass-roots" organizations, and their value lies exactly in their independence

from the administration. Over the years, the Commissions have been sometimes more, sometimes less, effective; but this is the nature of voluntary organizations and changing moments of opportunity. Faculty, staff, and students who believe that the Commissions might be more effective can seek appointments. This process should be explicitly stated. For the Commissions, the Diversity Panel proposes only that:

- a) the heads of the various Commissions continue to meet together regularly as they have begun to do this year;
- b) the President continue to meet with the combined membership of all the Commissions at least once/year, as was done this year;
- c) the President make better known to the entire campus the role of the various Commissions and the opportunity for interested persons to volunteer to serve on the Commissions;
- d) and that, because the Commissions are usually the best source of information on the needs and concerns of their constituencies, the current system of advisory briefings by the Commission heads with the President be continued.

E2. Administration of the Human Relations Code. The Panel proposes significant change in the administration of the Human Relations Code. Presently the responsibility for implementing campus policies in this area is divided among the Office of Human Relations, the Equity Council (whose members are dispersed throughout the campus), and the Department of Personnel Services. This structure, we came to believe, is not optimal for an integrated approach. We recommend the system be restructured.

E3. Restructured Equity System. We propose also that a restructured and better integrated equity system be headed by someone who sits on the President's cabinet. Although we expect all the vice-presidents to be sensitive to issues of diversity, one vice-president should have a specialist's knowledge of the research on diversity, a track record of successful implementation of diversity programs, and, of course, the clout to hold others accountable. The Diversity Panel suggests that this be considered when an appropriate opening occurs at the level of the Vice-Presidents.

E4. Neglected Functions for Equity Administration. There are important functions that are not being performed by either office of the current equity system that should be assigned after restructuring:

a) A clearinghouse should be established for the many diversity programs that already exist on our campus, and collaboration and cooperation should be encouraged among the units sponsoring these programs. We were surprised to discover that nobody on this campus has a handle on the multitude of campus programs that are intended to improve the climate for diversity, i.e., how many and what sorts of programs exist. Nor is any one person responsible for evaluating which programs do not work, what improvements are indicated, and what new programs would be beneficial and might be enhanced or duplicated elsewhere. Nor are there adequate mechanisms for encouraging communication or collaboration among interested units, especially the academic departments. The result is that programs spring up everywhere, but most reach only small audiences and have poor visibility and little impact. The Diversity Council, organized by the Office of Human Relations, has been bringing together individuals from some of the units responsible for the major diversity programs on our campus, but collaboration, coordination, and dissemination needs to be expanded. Neither the current personnel of the Office of Human Relations nor the structure of the Equity Council is adequate to set up such a clearinghouse and broader mechanisms for coordination and evaluation, but we propose an enhancement that permits this task to move forward quickly.

b) We also propose that a website be constructed to make this information accessible to everyone on campus. The Panel has viewed the current "Diversity Initiative" website and found it inadequate, although it might serve as a starting point for constructing a site that provides more of the information that this campus needs.

c) The campus needs more information about diversity issues than is now available. We propose that a representative sample of the entire campus be surveyed on some regular schedule to ascertain where there

are areas that the campus should target for special attention. Repeated surveys would identify problem areas where women, persons of color, and gays and lesbians are not welcome, safe, and respected, and/or fairly compensated, and special unit-specific strategies can be developed to change the workplace/classroom/residence culture. Repeating these surveys can also identify change over time and assure that our diversity initiatives are appropriate for the needs of the current moment. This survey would reach all campus constituencies, and not only incoming freshman who are currently being surveyed by the Research Advisory Committee.

d) Re-institute regular equity salary surveys for faculty and staff.

e) The recently redesigned Diversity Accountability and Implementation Plan is an improvement over prior reporting forms, but our examination of some of last year's plans identified continuing problems. Each of the reports included statistical data and a written report. The statistical data was most useful, but the written reports primarily trumpeted the units' successes. Of course, no Department Chair or College Dean wishes to bring attention to failures, but the reports did ask units to set goals for further improvements; this request, however, seems to have been widely ignored.. Surely some of the units on our campus have some areas where the need for some improvement might be identified, goals and a timeline set, and a system for monitoring progress established.

But an even greater problem with the DAIPs is their utter ineffectiveness. Every administrator with whom we discussed the DAIPs expressed frustration that these reports represented a lot of bureaucratic paperwork, but seemed to end up nowhere. We confirmed this: the collection of so much statistical data alone would take any department many worker-hours to gather. However, what happens with these reams of data is unclear. How they are digested and evaluated is unclear. What actions are taken on the basis of the data-gathering is unclear.

There is no accountability for lack of progress in implementing diversity on our campus. The DAIPs simply do not fulfill the function for which they are intended. Accountability can be achieved only by significantly restructuring the entire equity system and creating a mechanism for bringing responsibility for equity and diversity right into the President's cabinet.

F. From Diversity to Community

It is important to understand that the stages of progress (in creating a climate that nurtures a diverse community) that we have identified are "stages" only in the sense that without the first, achieving the second is impossible. However, arriving at a moment when the second or third stage is reached does not imply that we can consider further efforts of the kind expended at earlier stages no longer necessary. Perhaps a better metaphor would be that of a two-story house: what we have called "stage one" can be described as the foundation; "stage two" is the first floor; "stage three" is the top floor. Were maintenance of the foundation or the first floor ignored and these floors allowed to fall into disrepair, the top floor would collapse. The Diversity Panel recognizes that the University is building a sturdy foundation and has been energetic in setting up the first floor. We must continue our work in those areas, but we are now ready to move forward, setting to work on completing our home. This is the third stage: bringing diverse groups together in community.

F1. Web-based Events Calendar. We propose that some unit, perhaps Public Information, set up and maintain a website that lists events as far into the future as they are being scheduled. Already, Outlook includes a highlighted "diversity calendar." What we have in mind would expand this calendar and put it on the web so that units planning relevant events and lectures would know if there are others with whom they may work collaboratively, and thereby enhance their audiences; it would also save units from scheduling events that conflict with events likely to interest the same audience. To be effective, such a calendar should include all events, not only those with a diversity theme. And the university's home page should identify the calendar of events clearly so that the entire university community and the general public will know how to access the calendar.

F2. Unified Awards Ceremony. Currently almost every group on our campus which is interested in some aspect of diversity presents an award to someone who has served that group's interests particularly well. We

propose that a unified awards ceremony be instituted so that the constituencies of all of these groups, and thus a larger audience with a variety of interests, is brought together to learn about the goals of the awarding group and acknowledge the work of the awardee. Some of these groups may still wish to hold their own ceremonies, especially if the presentation of their awards is part of an event of larger purpose, but even these groups could still participate in the campus-wide ceremony. These awards might be presented at the fall Convocation-increasing the audience and enhancing interest in the Convocation; or, if that is too unwieldy, the prizes awarded at Convocation could remain limited to the presidential prizes and recognition of the newly appointed Scholar-Teachers and emeritus faculty, while the other awards could be collectively presented at a second ceremony in the late spring.

A description of all the awards and the work of all of the awardees should be published together and widely distributed on our campus, and perhaps beyond. Also, following the awards ceremony, an announcement should appear on the home page which would link to the texts that introduced the honorees.

F3. Valuing Diversity to Inaugurate Every Academic Year. We came to believe it crucial that diversity be addressed very visibly at the start of every academic year.

a) Orientation of new students should be more effective in encouraging improved inter-group relations: Student Orientation Counselors should be better trained to deal with issues that arise in a diverse group of entering students, and to be able to both facilitate interaction across groups and also help students find and connect with similar students. Current first year students should be included in planning the next year's orientation.

b) We have been told that there is a proposal circulating for a special Diversity event, on the Mall, to take place during the first month of school. Although we have not seen the proposal and cannot endorse it beyond endorsing the concept, this much we can do. Indeed, the concept does seem worthy to us as a way to focus the campus's attention, from the very first moment, on the diversity goals of the University.

F4. Continued Coordination of Commissions & Student Groups. During the past year, both the Presidential Commissions and the various student identity-based groups met together to discuss how they might become more aware of the others' concerns and goals, support each other whenever possible, and collaborate on programs of mutual interest. In response to our queries, we have also been informed that the redesigned Stamp Union will include space which brings the offices of the various student identity-based groups into close proximity. These steps toward inter-group cooperation hold great promise of effectively moving us from diversity to community. We urge both the Commissions and the student groups to continue these meetings and to set up structures that will institutionalize the practice.

G. Leadership

Of all the lessons that the Diversity Panel learned in its semester of existence, none was more certain than that concerning the University's President. He is absolutely central to the campus's efforts to assure physical and psychological safety to every faculty, staff, and student and to build a community in which we might discover shared values and learn to understand and appreciate our differences. He sets the tone for the campus and represents us to the outside world. Were we to identify one single action-the magic bullet-that would most effectively move us from a "diverse campus to a diverse community" it would be the President's articulation of these goals. Although some colleagues have shared with the Panel their concern that the campus has been experiencing a loss of momentum in achieving its equity goals, this year was certainly re-energizing. The President spoke out-loud, clear, and repeatedly-and the campus listened.

We conclude therefore with suggestions intended for the President alone. Many of these may seem symbolic, since even the President has limited powers to effect change in a public university; but their significance should not be underestimated. Moral suasion and support for the whole of our community go a long way in making us proud to be members of this community.

G1. President as Diversity Spokesperson. We urge the President to continue to articulate clearly, and in every possible setting, that a significant aspect of the excellence of University of Maryland is our diverse community, and to include mention of the quality and depth of the research and scholarship on diversity when naming our particular centers of excellence.

G2. President as Enabler of Key Projects. We look to the President to break the logjam holding up completion of projects too long studied, and too long relegated to a back burner:

a) the opening of a daycare center adequate to meet the needs of university employees and students. It appears that the University of Maryland is one of the few left which has yet to provide adequate child care services on its campus.

b) moving forward to make the Main Administration building fully accessible for individuals with physical disabilities. It is not enough to say that there are accessible settings for meetings elsewhere. That the center of power on our campus is still inaccessible to some members of our community is an unfortunate statement about our commitment to community.

G3. Diversity on the President's Cabinet. Every opportunity for increasing the diversity of the President's cabinet should be taken whenever possible. This should be done with all deliberate speed.

G4. Diversity Training for Higher Administration. We note that although training workshops and orientation programs have been held for many employees in mid-level supervisory positions on campus, none have been held for the highest level administrators. We propose that there be ongoing training workshops for the Vice-Presidents, College Deans, and Department Chairs. Such workshops should heighten understanding of the most difficult and important issues emerging from our increasing diversity. In addition to the sensitivity training that is common in these workshops, we urge that there be a discussion of multicultural research and teaching, attention to identifying and dealing with sexual harassment, and practical strategies for effecting change in the climate for diversity among employees and/or students in the settings for which each is responsible.

G5. President as Diversity Advocate before the Board of Regents. Certain issues and concerns were brought to our attention which the Board of Regents alone can resolve. Two issues in particular came up several times: the need for domestic partnership benefits and benefits for contingent workers. We are concerned about the real hardships imposed on some families by the State's current domestic partnership policy, which looks more and more retrograde as more and more corporations and local governments change their practices. And we are concerned about the clear inequity between regular State employees and contract employees and have come to believe that this represents a real barrier to building a diverse community. Although these distinctions would be unfair no matter who was affected, we also point out that persons of color are significantly over-represented among the contingent employees and challenge our attempts to overcome our history as a racially segregated university.

We recognize that changing these policies is beyond the President's power, but we nonetheless urge the President to press the Board of Regents to address these concerns. Articulating this position publicly will make clear that the campus stands together in support of all its members.

References

¹ Sylvia Hurtado (1992), "The Campus Racial Climate: Contexts for Conflict," *Journal of Higher Education* 63 (5): 539-69; cited in Sylvia Hurtado, Jeffrey Milem, Alma Clayton- Pedersen, and Walter Allen (1999), *Enacting Diverse Learning Environments: Improving the Climate for Racial/Ethnic Diversity in Higher Education*, Asher- Eric Higher Education Report, vol.26, no. 8 (Washington, D.C.:The George Washington University, Graduate School of Education and Human Development), p. 20.

² S.L.Mitchell and D.M.Dell (1992), "The Relationship between Black Students' Racial Identity Attitude and Participation in Campus Organizations," *Journal of College Student Development* 33: 39-43; and J.G.Trevino (1992), "Participation in Ethnic/Racial Student Organizations" (Ph.D dissertation, University of California at Los Angeles); cited in Hurtado et al., p. 54.

APPENDIX A

Diversity Panel Vision and Charge

“From a Diverse Campus to a Diverse Community”

We have good reason to be proud of the substantial and increasing diversity of our campus. At the same time, many have observed that we have not taken full advantage of opportunities to bring our campus family together into a diverse community. Some say that we have become a federation of interest groups rather than a union of diverse people. The reasons for this may be partly rooted in university organization, biases, and, of course, in our history as a university and a nation. Or it may be that we, individually and collectively, have simply not been sufficiently determined to bring ourselves together. We now have an opportunity to further consider our culture.

A review of the university that looks over the entire campus can help us identify new opportunities to build more interchange among people of our diverse community. These opportunities may derive from some of our current practices that divide us, or from omission of actions that could enrich the campus experience for faculty, staff, and students.

This panel review should:

be free to consider any or all opportunities for enhancement of our experiences as a diverse community promote a campus-wide vision that seeks to bring together people with diverse views and experiences be open to inputs from across campus, and not be necessarily constrained by current practices and campus organization

The goals of the review are to:

reduce impediments to building understanding and enlightenment across our diverse campus community reduce institutionalized balkanization of the campus, and propose steps to enhance the opportunity for increased interchange and understanding across our diverse community.

The panel was appointed early in January, 2000.

The panel is to conclude its work and deliver a final report by June 30, 2000. Interim reports presenting panel recommendations will facilitate implementation of the findings during the Spring and Summer, 2000.

APPENDIX B

Diversity Panel Members

Dr. Raymond L. Johnson, Co-Chair
Professor, Department of Mathematics

Dr. Claire G. Moses, Co-Chair
Professor and Chairperson, Department of
Women's Studies

Ms. Susan Bayly
General Counsel, President's Legal Office

Ms. Melissa Benjamin
Food Administrator, Dining Services

Mr. Carlos Bennett
President, Graduate Student Government

Dr. Christopher C. Davis
Associate Dean for Gemstone Program and
Professor of Electrical and Computer Engineering

Mr. Daryl Francis
President -Black Student Union

Ms. Jamila Hall
Undergraduate Student

Ms. Jessica Marie Hughes
Undergraduate Student, Leadership Program

Dr. Patricio Korzeniewicz
Associate Professor, Sociology and Latin
American Studies

Dr. Chuan S. Liu
Professor, Department of Physics

Ms. Robin Marie Marcus
Graduate Student

Mr. Andre Marius
Housekeeping Services

Ms. Cecily Morgan
Administrative Assistant/Resident Life

Mr. Lee Patrick ODonovan
Undergraduate Student

Dr. Katheryn K. Russell
Associate Professor, Criminal Justice &
Criminology

Dr. Martha Nell Smith
Professor & Director, Maryland Institute for
Technology in The Humanities

Ms. Monise Stephenson
Undergraduate Student

Mr. Ernest J. Thompson
Maintenance Chief I

Dr. Rhonda M. Williams
Associate Professor and Chair,
Afro-American Studies

Mr. Michael Yu
Undergraduate Student

Ms. Veronica J. Haerer (Midgie)
Staff support, President's Office

Ms. Paula F. Nadler
Diversity Panel Graduate Assistant,
President's Office