

Enriched by our Differences *

**Report from the Working Group of the Board of Trustees of Centre College
to Consider Matters of Diversity
Regarding Membership on the Board
and Among Faculty and Staff**

October 26, 2018

* The title phrase comes from Centre's 1994 Statement on Community

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	ii
Statement on Diversity	iii
A. Centre College Statement of Community	1
B. Background and Charge of the Working Group	1
C. Working Group Membership	2
D. Schedule of Working Group Meetings	2
E. Research on the Benefits of Diversity in Higher Education	3
F. Relevant Demographics of Centre College and Comparator Institutions	3
G. Survey of Board Statements on Matters of Diversity and Inclusion	4
H. Role of Diversity and Inclusion in Centre’s Strategic Plan	4
I. Key Points from the Administration’s “Work Plan for Diversity and Inclusion, Fall 2018 and Beyond”	5
J. Campus Climate Survey Reports	6
K. Recommendations from the Working Group to the Board of Trustees	6
 <u>Appendices:</u>	
1. Summary of Research Articles and Cases on the Benefits of Diversity in Higher Education	10
2. Data Tables for Key Demographic Points	12
3. Survey of Board Statements on Matters of Diversity and Inclusion	20
4. Administrative Work Plan for Diversity and Inclusion	22

Executive Summary of the Report

This Report brings together the materials reviewed and the topics discussed by the Working Group over the period of its operations. In addition, the Working Group, having considered issues pertaining to diversity and inclusion at Centre, has made a series of recommendations to the Board of Trustees to strengthen the College overall.

The Working Group did not begin its work from a clean slate. The College, on prior occasions, has considered how difference and diversity within the community are strengths and opportunities to be celebrated. The populations served by the College have changed dramatically over the 200 years of its existence, and Centre has been enriched by those changes. **Section A** highlights the College's Statement of Community, adopted more than 20 years ago, which speaks to the value of difference. The Working Group was called together to examine the College's position with diversity and inclusion, and to make recommendations for change and improvement. **Sections B, C, and D** record the charge, composition, and meeting schedule of the Working Group.

The Working Group examined data on Centre's progress over the past 20 years, and also reviewed what other institutions are doing in the higher education environment. See **Sections E, F, and G**. Matters of diversity and inclusion have been part of the strategic planning process at Centre in recent years. The Working Group examined how the plan addresses those needs, as described in **Section H**.

After the Conversations of May 2-4, 2018, when a group of students demonstrated for change and improvement, the College developed a Work Plan for Diversity and Inclusion. The Work Plan did not arise out of the activity of this Working Group, but many initiatives within the Work Plan fell within the purview of the Working Group as it formulated further recommendations, such as education, training, changes in policies and reporting. See **Section I**.

Also separate from the work of the Working Group but related to its charge, the College conducted a climate survey, the results of which were received in July 2018 (for the student report) and in September 2018 (for the faculty and staff reports). The Working Group did not have an opportunity to have a meaningful review of these reports, but **Section J** briefly discusses how the Working Group recommends the Board use these data in its ongoing discussions.

In order to bring about important changes and make progress in diversity and inclusion efforts, the Working Group offered a set of recommendations. They include a new Statement on Diversity by the Board of Trustees – found below and, arguably, representing the primary work of the Working Group in declaring diversity and inclusion as important values to the Board. In addition, the Working Group offered up seven other recommendations – all of which are either a part of the College's current effort and/or fall into the category of best practice. The recommendations focus on retaining and engaging new trustees; efforts to keep the conversations about diversity and inclusion in front of the Board and ways to help guide the Board in this work; directions for the review of the Climate Assessment by the Board; directions to the administration about reporting to the Board about diversity initiatives and incidents; and a plan to

communicate the work of the Working Group and its initiatives, as approved by the Board. See **Section K**.

Statement on Diversity

As the body entrusted with the overall governance and stewardship of Centre College, the Board of Trustees pledges continuing efforts to build and strengthen a community enriched by the differences of its members and founded upon our common humanity. We also affirm that the values of diversity and inclusion are critical to the fulfillment of the mission of higher education in general, and Centre College in particular. To that end, we welcome into the Centre community individuals of different backgrounds, viewpoints, races, faith traditions, nationalities, sexual orientations, and experiences. These differences enrich our search for truth, our understanding of our fellow human beings, and make each of us more effective leaders and actors in this world. Because Centre honors the American ideals of access and social mobility through education, we are committed to not only welcoming into the Centre community persons who have traditionally been underrepresented, but also fostering their full participation in the community. Further, we are dedicated to creating a college community known for its honesty, strength, compassion, and commitment to the greater good.

We Trustees hold this to be true for all parts of the Centre community – The Board of Trustees, the faculty, the staff, and the student body. Pertaining to the Board of Trustees itself, we affirm that diversity and inclusion are critical to the Board’s effectiveness in leading the College. Thus, as the Board exercises its responsibility to select the best and the brightest individuals to serve as trustees, we recognize that diversity in its membership is an essential priority. In addition, the Board will endeavor to set policies, identify resources, and encourage sound practices designed to achieve diversity among the faculty, staff, and the student body.

Enriched by our Differences

A. Centre College Statement of Community

Centre has long committed itself to embracing difference as a strength of the community. As a way of announcing and articulating these values, the College adopted a statement describing the commitment to a welcoming community:

We pledge continuing efforts to build and strengthen a community enriched by our differences and founded upon our common humanity. Centre respects the right of all members of the community to express their individuality in a manner that is consistent with the dignity and welfare of others. Centre strives to create an environment where differences are celebrated rather than discouraged, where individuals have the opportunity to exchange ideas and share in the richness of mutual experience. By valuing the individual's total character over any single characteristic, Centre will maintain its unique community.

(Adopted by Centre College in 1994.)

Though Centre was begun by the work of the Presbyterian Church in 1819, as a college training young men for the ministry, Centre is today a college with a student body reflecting a greater diversity in race, ethnicity, religious faith, gender identity, sexual orientation, geography, political affiliation, and socioeconomic status than at any time in the College's history. These differences can bring challenges, but our Statement of Community reminds us that our differences enrich us all.

B. Background and Charge of the Working Group

In the fall of 2017, a group of alumni brought to the attention of President Roush and the Board of Trustees their concerns about the need for more diversity among the Board, and the senior administration. Acknowledging some progress in making the campus more diverse, especially among the student body, the alumni called for increased attention to attracting more women and people of color into positions of leadership and influence. Soon after the October 2017 meeting of the Board of Trustees, where this topic was discussed, Chair Mark Nunnally decided to appoint an ad hoc "Working Group to Consider Matters of Membership Diversity on the Board, Faculty, and Staff" to explore in more detail how the Board and the College are progressing in terms of diversity and what recommendations might be made to increase the efforts.

President Roush said the task of the Working Group should include:

- establishing a working definition regarding diversity;
- analyzing the College's more recent work and initiatives to increase diversity in the student body, faculty, and staff, to include the developments associated with the current grant from the Mellon Foundation;
- collecting data from peer and aspirant institutions, as well as looking at best practice inside and outside of the academy; and

- reporting to the Committee on Honorary Degrees and Nominations at that Committee's regularly scheduled meetings in January 2018 and April 2018, with the hope of completing its work by the fall meeting of 2018.

C. Working Group Membership

The following individuals served on the Working Group:

- John Barton, Trustee
- Anita Britton, Trustee
- Sheila Burks, Trustee
- Bobby Elliott, Trustee
- Angie Evans, Trustee
- Tao Le, Trustee
- Crit Luallen, Trustee and Co-Chair
- James Smith, Trustee
- Andrea Abrams, Staff
- Brian Cusato, Staff
- Kay Drake, Staff
- Stephanie Fabritius, Staff
- Lori Hartmann, Staff
- Rodmon King, Staff, and
- Jamey Leahey, Staff and Co-Chair

Chair Mark Nunnely, Vice Chair Jim Seabury, and President John Roush served as *ex officio* members. Trustees David Grissom and Tom Meeker also participated in the meetings. Yvonne Morley and Patrick Noltemeyer provided administrative support to the working group.

Chair Nunnely also invited several individuals to attend the meetings to act as representatives of constituent groups: the president of the Staff Congress (Shana Schepman for 2017-18, and Anne Evans for 2018-19); the president of the Student Government Association (Kirby Fitzpatrick for 2017-18, and Walker Morrell for 2018-19); and Ms. Kathleen Wooldridge Overlin, representing the alumni group.

D. Schedule of Working Group Meetings

The Working Group met on these dates:

- January 26, 2018 (in conjunction with the regular meeting of the Board);
- March 14, 2018, teleconference;
- April 12, 2018, (in conjunction with the regular meeting of the Board);
- July 9, 2018, teleconference;
- October 9, 2018, teleconference.

E. Research on the Benefits of Diversity in Higher Education

The Working Group explored what data exist to demonstrate how diversity and inclusion benefit institutions of higher education. While there have been some individuals, groups, politicians, and others to question the benefit of diversity, the vast majority of research that has been done on the question has concluded there are many benefits to the college or university, in terms of student development, greater learning, more effective teaching, and better decision making, among others. In the course of recent legal challenges to admissions policies at the University of Michigan and the University of Texas, the United States Supreme Court has issued decisions on the topic, having had the benefit of dozens of briefs filed in support of diversity by researchers, national and international groups of institutions, leading technology companies, Fortune 500 companies, and branches of the United States military.

Appendix “1” includes a brief summary of some key points of research in recent years to highlight empirical analysis of the benefits of diversity within the higher education setting.

F. Relevant Demographics of Centre College and Comparator Institutions

The Working Group reviewed data on the progress of increasing the diversity of trustees, faculty, staff, and students, as well as comparing Centre’s progress against that of benchmark and aspirant colleges (our comparator institutions). Dr. Noltemeyer, as the institutional researcher, conducted comparisons of data about Centre from 1997 to 2017, looking over a 20-year period for changes. The most striking growth in diverse populations is seen in the student body, having grown from five percent of students, in 1997, identifying as a racial or ethnic minority to 27 percent of students so identifying in 2017. Noting that the student body has also grown in overall size, Dr. Noltemeyer showed that the number of minority students has grown significantly, too, from 46 in 1997 to 390 in 2017. Some of this growth is attributable to the increasing population of international students, as well. Looking in particular at the change in percentage and number of African American students, the data show a change in percentage from three percent to five percent over that 20-year period, but also raw number of change of 29 students to 73 students. These data points show Centre in line with the benchmark institutions and slightly behind aspirant institutions.

Centre’s Board of Trustees is slightly larger than the average board of comparator institutions, and it grew from 28 trustees in 1997 to 36 in 2017. The Board now has three more women than in 1997, and the percentage of women trustees (28 percent) is a little lower than the average percentage at comparator institutions of around 30 percent. In terms of racial diversity, the Centre Board has become more diverse over the last 20 years, moving from having one person of color on the Board in 1997 to four persons of color in 2017 (11 percent of the Board).

Faculty and staff data also show some changes, though less dramatic than that of the student body. In the 20-year period studied, the overall faculty population increased by 52 percent, and the staff population by 52 percent, as well. The percentage of full-time faculty who are women has more than doubled in 20 years, from 26 women to 57. The number of racially diverse faculty has also changed, moving from only two faculty in 1997 to 13 in 2017. Among the staff, the increase in the number of women was significant, moving from 97 women in 1997 to 160 in 2017. The number of racially diverse staff went down between 1997 and 2017 (from 11 percent

of staff to 7 percent of staff), but the proportion of diverse staff who are salaried professional staff has increased, from 35 percent in 1997 to 67 percent in 2017.

For a complete review of the data tables, please see Appendix “2.”

G. Survey of Board Statements on Matters of Diversity and Inclusion

As the Working Group began to discuss adopting a new statement of diversity, the Group sought inspiration and wisdom from what other colleges and university boards have adopted. Most institutions have a general statement on diversity or nondiscrimination, but it was more difficult to find statements specifically issued by boards about the diversity and inclusion of the board itself.

The Working Group did find several statements, though, that offered insight into the importance of diversity on other campuses and their boards from the following institutions:

- Amherst College;
- Claremont McKenna College;
- Dartmouth College;
- Muhlenberg College;
- University of Pennsylvania;
- Pepperdine University;
- Scripps College; and
- Washington & Lee University.

Portions of the statements from these institutions are set forth in Appendix “3.”

H. Role of Diversity and Inclusion in Centre’s Strategic Plan

The College’s current strategic plan, *The Centre Saga: Lives Examined, Lives Empowered*, approved by the Board on October 24, 2014, has two key priorities and five strategic directions.

The first strategic direction, “Life Examined, Life Empowered: The Centre Experience,” **highlights the importance of Centre having a diverse faculty and staff**. Specifically, the plan states that the College should “Develop a faculty and staff whose diversity of backgrounds and experiences better reflects the world in which our students will work, serve, and lead.”

The second of the strategic directions, “A Place of Opportunity,” **highlights the importance of recruiting a diverse student body**. Specifically, the narrative of the second direction indicates “We must also appeal to and serve young people from ever more diverse backgrounds, from within the U.S. and from around the globe. Colleges and universities that ignore this trend will limit their own futures, as well as the contribution they can make to our society. More broadly, social and cultural diversity encompasses all aspects of the world in which our students will work and live. Our students’ comfort in different cultural settings, their ability to communicate with people from many backgrounds, should set them apart from their peers, empowering them to lead richer and more fulfilling lives. Centre will also seek enrollment levels that serve the

College’s overall mission, most especially maintaining and enhancing an intensely personal educational experience.”

Each of these strategic areas of improvement for the College were **reiterated as high priorities by the campus Planning and Priorities Committee**, through campus forums, as this team prioritized the long list of potential action items that could be taken to advance the strategic plan.

The work of the Diversity Working Group is judged to be in line with the College’s overall strategic plan.

I. Key points from the Administration’s “Work Plan for Diversity and Inclusion, Fall 2018 and Beyond”

After students, in spring 2018, brought forward concerns related to diversity on Centre’s campus (the “May 2-4 conversations”), the Work Plan was drafted by the administration in order to implement changes, policies, and practices to make Centre a better and stronger campus. The Plan includes actions agreed to during the conversations with students, but also identifies and highlights other plans and initiatives already in place or planned outside those conversations.

The Plan is organized around four primary themes on which the College will take action, or has already begun to take action, beginning in the summer of 2018 and continuing into the 2018-19 academic year and beyond. The Work Plan is set forth in full in Appendix “4.”

The four themes are:

Education & Training

- Continue existing efforts and expand the commitment, in appropriate ways, to education and training related to diversity and inclusion.
- Extend training to faculty, staff, and students in ways that will focus broadly on issues of diversity and inclusion.

Department of Public Safety & Student Life Matters

- Continue existing efforts and expand the College’s commitment to diversity and inclusion in the areas of student safety and student life in general.
- Focus on changes and training in the Department of Public Safety, as well as measured attention with Sodexo (our food service provider), the creation of an Intercultural Space in the Campus Center, and further conversation about the best way to handle student convocation attendance focused on diversity.

Transparency, Recruiting, & Reporting

- Continue existing efforts and expand its commitment to transparency, recruiting, and reporting on issues related to diversity and inclusion.
- Improve matters of reporting, communication, and transparency, as well as strengthen staffing in the areas of diversity and inclusion.

Directional & College-Wide Themes

- Continue existing and expand, where appropriate, the commitment to directional and college-wide themes related to diversity and inclusion in a variety of areas, to include First-Year Orientation, regular campus-wide events, the report and the recommendations that come from the Board's Working Group on Diversity, and the actions of the larger Board.

J. Campus Climate Survey Reports

Partnering with the Associated Colleges of the South, and pursuant to a grant from the Mellon Foundation, Centre contracted with researcher Dr. Anita Davis, then at Rhodes College, to design and conduct a survey of the climate at Centre, asking students, faculty, and staff questions about diversity and inclusivity. The survey was conducted with students in fall 2017, and the administration received a report on the results of that portion on July 17, 2018. The report on the results of the faculty and staff survey were received by Centre on September 28, 2018, and the administration has not had a sufficient opportunity to analyze these results, looking at them together with the student survey results, for meaningful action planning at this time. However, the results underscore the need for additional attention to diversity and inclusion initiatives, as outlined in the Work Plan. The Working Group recommends that a standing committee of the Board, the Committee on Academic Affairs, review the survey reports in full and work with the administration to determine the appropriate plan of action around the results. Please see Recommendation 6 in Section K, hereafter.

K. Recommendations from the Working Group to the Board of Trustees

1. Adoption of Statement on Diversity by Board of Trustees

Given the importance of the values of diversity and inclusion to the entire Centre College community, the Working Group recommends that the Board issue, in its own voice, a statement to stand alongside the institution's existing Statement of Community. In this statement, the Board affirms not only the values of diversity and inclusion, but also the central role they play in strengthening the College:

The Working Group recommends that the Board adopt the following statement:

As the body entrusted with the overall governance and stewardship of Centre College, the Board of Trustees pledges continuing efforts to build and strengthen a community enriched by the differences of its members and founded upon our common humanity. We also affirm that the values of diversity and inclusion are critical to the fulfillment of the mission of higher education in general, and Centre College in particular. To that end, we welcome into the Centre community individuals of different backgrounds, viewpoints, races, faith traditions, nationalities, sexual orientations, and experiences. These differences enrich our search for truth, our understanding of our fellow human beings, and make each of us more effective leaders and actors in this world. Because Centre honors the American ideals of access and social mobility through education, we are committed to not only welcoming into the Centre community persons who have

traditionally been underrepresented, but also fostering their full participation in the community. Further, we are dedicated to creating a college community known for its honesty, strength, compassion, and commitment to the greater good.

We Trustees hold this to be true for all parts of the Centre community – The Board of Trustees, the faculty, the staff, and the student body. Pertaining to the Board of Trustees itself, we affirm that diversity and inclusion are critical to the Board’s effectiveness in leading the College. Thus, as the Board exercises its responsibility to select the best and the brightest individuals to serve as trustees, we recognize that diversity in its membership is an essential priority. In addition, the Board will endeavor to set policies, identify resources, and encourage sound practices designed to achieve diversity among the faculty, staff, and the student body.

2. Specific Actions to Increase Diverse Recruiting of New Trustees

The Board of Trustees has, through the Committee on Honorary Degrees and Nominations, been working to increase the diversity of the Board for many years, including identifying and nominating more women, more persons of color, and younger candidates in particular. The Working Group identifies this effort as a key to bringing about increased diversity of the Board, and recommends the following actions or practices be adopted by the Board, all of which would fall in the category of best practice:

(a) Members of the Board and the administration will intentionally and actively identify more high quality candidates who are women, persons of color, and other individuals who would add different characteristics to the Board to ensure a more robust pipeline of trustee prospects;

(b) The administration will create more opportunities, such as affinity groups and donor councils, to allow a broader range of individuals to build their relationship with the College, especially non-alumni individuals; and

(c) The administration will make greater efforts to identify from among the parents and family members of current and recent students potential leaders for the College, given the greater diversity of today’s student body compared to the student bodies of decades ago.

3. Specific Actions for the Engagement of All New Trustees

Once the Board has been successful in attracting the newer, younger, diverse trustees, it is imperative to get them engaged in the work of the Board quickly, and to optimize the use of their skills, talents, expertise, and networks on behalf of the College. In order to make sure the trustees are fully engaged, the Working Group recommends the following actions, all of which would fall in the category of best practice:

(a) Board officers and committee chairs, as appropriate, commit to reaching out to all new members two or three times in the first year of service, encouraging full participation, inviting new ideas, and answering questions;

(b) Board officers and administration commit to identifying opportunities for newer trustees to assume positions of leadership and engagement in tasks, committees, projects, campaigns, and other ongoing or special activities of the Board; and

(c) As a way of tracking and assessing the success of these initiatives, the administration will create a mechanism to track the engagement of newer trustees in the life and activities of the Board and the College. This mechanism will be shared with the Committee on Honorary Degrees and Nominations.

4. Specific Actions for the Continued Focus of the Board on Matters of Diversity and Inclusion

So that the Board of Trustees will continue to discuss, set policy, or take action on issues related to diversity and inclusion, the Working Group recommends:

(a) That the Board assign responsibility for discussion and action on matters of diversity and inclusion to standing committees of the Board, including but not necessarily limited to, the Committees on Academic Affairs, Administrative Services, Honorary Degrees and Nominations, Planning, and Student Life and Enrollment Management. The committees are then responsible to report back to the Board on the issues discussed and actions recommended; and

(b) That the Board seek and the administration provide reports and information on progress under the Work Plan for Diversity and Inclusion, and other initiatives and efforts of the College.

5. Educational Opportunities for the Board of Trustees

To inform the Board about best practices and insights into matters of diversity and inclusion, the Working Group recommends:

(a) That the Board obtain and receive guidance from an outside consultant with expertise in diversity and inclusion matters. This consultant would not only inform and guide the Board in its efforts, actions, and deliberations, but also provide guidance to the administration on the execution of the Work Plan and the creation of goals and initiatives beyond the Work Plan.

(b) That the Board utilize plenary sessions and other opportunities to engage in conversations about diversity and inclusion, which might include reports from the administration on progress on the Work Plan or an outside speaker at a plenary session on the changing nature of American higher education.

6. Learning from the ACS Climate Survey Reports

Because the Climate Survey Reports arrived in late September 2018, the Working Group did not have a meaningful opportunity to discuss the findings or make recommendations. However, the Board should remain involved in the review of the Reports and in the discussion of steps that ought to be taken as a result. Therefore, the Working Group recommends that the Committee on Academic Affairs undertake a review of the Reports and be charged with sharing conclusions

and recommendations, in cooperation with the consultant hired by the College to advise on matters of diversity and inclusion.

7. Enhanced Reporting to the Board of Trustees of Actions and Outcomes for Administrative Policies and Practices

So that the Board remain informed of the progress of the administration under the Work Plan on Diversity, and other initiatives undertaken in diversity and inclusion, the Working Group recommends that the administration develop an annual report to the Board on items undertaken and achieved, and those in progress, as well as aggregate data on bias incidents and the resolution of incidents.

8. Communication Plan for the Report of the Working Group and Recommendations

So that the wider Centre College community can learn about, understand, and appreciate the work of the Working Group, its Report, and the recommendations accepted by the Board (particularly the adoption of a new Statement on Diversity by the Board of Trustees), the Working Group recommends that the administration create a plan for communication, including a Centre Website story, campus messaging, and other appropriate steps.

Approved and adopted by the Working Group of the Board of Trustees of Centre College to Consider Matters of Diversity Regarding Membership on the Board and Among Faculty and Staff on October 9, 2018.

Approved and adopted by the Board of Trustees of Centre College on October 26, 2018.

Appendix “1”

Summary of Research Articles and Cases on the Benefits of Diversity in Higher Education

Anthony Lising Antoni, et al., “Effects of Racial Diversity on Complex Thinking in College Students,” 15 *Psychol. Sci.* 507, 507-510 (2004). (“Studies have shown that heterogeneous groups are able to achieve greater insight in class discussions than homogeneous groups.”) (cited in Amici Curiae brief to U.S. Supreme Court in *Fisher v. U. Texas at Austin* (2016), filed in support of race-conscious admission policies, by leading research universities: California Institute of Technology, Carnegie Mellon University, Case Western Reserve University, Emory University, George Washington University, Northwestern University, Rice University, Tulane University, University Of Rochester, and Washington University in St. Louis). Found at <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.0956-7976.2004.00710.x?journalCode=pssa>

Elizabeth Aries, *Race and Class Matters at an Elite College* 66 (2008) (A study on the “critical mass” necessary to achieve the benefits of diversity, which analyzes decades of diversity-related research, also shows that to leverage the benefits of diversity, an institution must not just admit racially diverse students, but must also promote a healthy racial climate, provide a welcoming environment for all students, prevent harms due to racial isolation, diminish feelings of tokenism, and promote cross-racial interactions.) Found at <https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt14bt20n>

Nicholas A. Bowman, “College Diversity Experiences and Cognitive Development: A Meta-Analysis,” 80 *Rev. of Educ. Res.* 4 (2010) (explaining that “college diversity experiences are associated with gains in cognitive skills,” including “critical thinking and problem solving”). <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.3102/0034654309352495>

Mitchell Chang *et al.*, “The Educational Benefits of Sustaining Cross-Racial Interaction Among Undergraduates,” 77 *J. of Higher Educ.* 430, 430-431 (2006) (“[D]iversity-related benefits are far ranging, spanning from benefits to individual students and institutions in which they enroll, to private enterprise, the economy, and the broader society.”) (cited in Amici Curiae brief to U.S. Supreme Court in *Fisher v. U. Texas at Austin* (2016), filed in support of race-conscious admission policies, by leading liberal arts colleges: Amherst, Allegheny, Barnard, Bates, Bowdoin, Bryn Mawr, Carleton, Colby, Connecticut, Davidson, Dickinson, Franklin & Marshall, Grinnell, Hamilton, Hampshire, Haverford, Lafayette, Macalester, Middlebury, Mount Holyoke, Oberlin, Pomona, Reed, Sarah Lawrence, Simmons, Smith, St. Olaf, Swarthmore, Trinity, Union, Vassar, Wellesley, and Williams Colleges, and Bucknell, Colgate, Tufts, Washington & Lee, and Wesleyan Universities). Found at: www.jstor.org/stable/3838696

Denson, N., & Chang, M., Racial Diversity Matters: “The Impact of Diversity-Related Student Engagement and Institutional Context,” *American Educational Research Journal*, 46(2), 322-353 (2009) (explaining that “being in an environment where students are more engaged with diversity has significant positive educational effects” that extend to “all students,” including improving “students’ general academic skills.”) Found at <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40284795>

“The Dynamics of Race in Higher Education,” ed. Mitchell Chang et al., *Equity and Excellence in Research Education*, Vol 32. No. 2 (September 1999). (It examines the research base that can

contribute to the current debates on racial diversity in colleges and universities, and to help move the deliberation toward a data-based process. It synthesizes and interprets this significant body of research. This synthesis of the research provides evidence and objectivity that can be used to inform litigation and practice, and to develop a research agenda for this important area of work) https://web.stanford.edu/~hakuta/www/policy/racial_dynamics/Chapter5.pdf

Patricia Gurin, Eric Dey, Sylvia Hurtado, and Gerald Gurin (2002) “Diversity and Higher Education: Theory and Impact on Educational Outcomes.” *Harvard Educational Review*., Vol. 72, No. 3, pp. 330-367 (September 2002) <http://hepgjournals.org/doi/pdf/10.17763/haer.72.3.01151786u134n051>

Patricia Gurin, et al., “Diversity and Higher Education: Theory and Impact on Educational Outcomes,” 72 *Harv. Educ. Rev.* 330, 351 (2002) (study showed that “informal interactional diversity was especially influential in accounting for higher levels of intellectual engagement and self-assessed academic skills.”)

Katherine W. Phillips, “How Diversity Makes Us Smarter,” *Scientific American*, October 1, 2014. Found at: <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/how-diversity-makes-us-smarter/>

U.S. Supreme Court’s majority opinion in *Grutter v. Bollinger* 539 U. S. 306 (2003) (Univ. of Michigan Law School case, permitting consideration of race and ethnicity, among other factors in admission): Quoting from page 330: “In addition to the expert studies and reports entered into evidence at trial, numerous studies show that student body diversity promotes learning outcomes, and ‘better prepares students for an increasingly diverse workforce and society, and better prepares them as professionals.’ Brief for American Educational Research Association et al. as *Amici Curiae* 3; see, e.g., W. Bowen & D. Bok, *The Shape of the River* (1998); *Diversity Challenged: Evidence on the Impact of Affirmative Action* (G. Orfield & M. Kurlaender eds. 2001); *Compelling Interest: Examining the Evidence on Racial Dynamics in Colleges and Universities* (M. Chang, D. Witt, J. Jones, & K. Hakuta eds. 2003). These benefits are not theoretical but real, as major American businesses have made clear that the skills needed in today’s increasingly global marketplace can only be developed through exposure to widely diverse people, cultures, ideas, and viewpoints.” In the Supreme Court’s opinion in *Fisher v. Univ. of Texas at Austin* (2016), these points were quoted from *Grutter* as justifications for a university’s efforts to enroll a diverse student body.

Fisher can be found: <https://utexas.app.box.com/s/56du71r34s9hjd0wrp1n7u8dfztyow5>

Grutter can be found: <https://www.law.cornell.edu/supct/html/02-241.ZO.html>

Appendix “2”

Comparative Demographic Data

Compiled by Patrick Noltemeyer

Updates as of April 12, 2018

- **Breakdown of student demographic information by additional racial categories.**
- **Revised minority student data based on review of IPEDS data.**

Summary

The tables below capture two data elements:

- 1.) Demographics of Centre’s population in 1997 compared to its population in fall 2017;
- 2.) A “snapshot” comparison of Centre’s fall 2017 population to the fall 2016 population data for benchmark, aspirant, and regional institutions. Fall 2016 data is the most recent data available for comparison institutions via the Integrated Postsecondary Educational Data System (IPEDS).

The data show an increase of diversity within the student body, the faculty, and the Board of Trustees at Centre, with the greatest increase coming at the student level. The percentage of international students enrolled at Centre has shown the greatest increase in the last twenty years, and Centre’s efforts to diversify continue to improve the percent of minority students enrolled at the College overall.

Additional summary notes are provided after each table. A list of aspirant, benchmark, and regional institutions is included at the end of this document.

Questions regarding this data may be directed to:

Patrick Noltemeyer

Chief Planning Officer

Special Assistant to the President for Institutional Research and Special Events

Email: patrick.noltemeyer@centre.edu

Office: (859) 238-5218

*Data was collected from Centre College Registrar Reports, the Common Data Set, institutional surveys, and IPEDS.
Last update: April 12, 2018*

Trustees

Centre College	1997	2017	# Change	% Change
Total Trustees	28	36	8	29%
White Trustees	27	32	5	19%
Non-White Trustees	1	4	3	300%
Male Trustees	21	26	5	24%
Female Trustees	7	10	3	43%
Alumni Trustees	20	30	10	50%
Non-Alumni Trustees	8	6	-2	-25%
Life Trustees	2	4	2	100%
Diversity %	4%	11%		
Female %	25%	28%		
Non-Alumni %	29%	17%		

Notes:

- Centre's Board has increased by a total of eight individuals since 1997, representing a growth of 29%. This total does not include the four Life Trustees.
- The diversity of Centre's Board has increased by seven percent since 1997, with the addition of three individuals, who identify with a minority race.
- Centre has three more female trustees in 2017 than in 1997, representing a 43% increase.

Comparative Data	Centre	Benchmark	Aspirant	Regional
Variable				
% Diverse Trustees	11%	14%	25%	7%
% Female Trustees	28%	31%	34%	23%
% Non-Alumni Trustees	17%	27%	16%	18%
Average # Trustees	36	33	35	33

Notes:

- Centre's Board is slightly larger than average at 36 members (not including our four Life Trustees). Kenyon has the most trustees (43) while Sewanee and Whitman tie for the fewest (20).
- Centre's Board (11% diverse) is less diverse than our benchmark (12%) and aspirant (21%) institutions, but more diverse than regional institutions (7%). It is notable that several of our benchmark institutions are much less diverse than Centre: Sewanee (0%), Southwestern (3%), Transylvania (3%).
- The percentage of females on Centre's Board (28%) is comparable to the percentage at benchmark (29%) and regional (23%) institutions, and six percent lower than aspirant institutions (34%). Grinnell has the most female trustees (48%), followed closely by Rhodes (46%). Milligan (10%), Georgetown (13%), and Furman (19%) have the fewest.
- Benchmark institutions have the most non-alumni on their Boards, on average (29%). Centre (17%) is very similar to aspirant institutions (17%) and regional institutions (18%).

Trustees (cont.)

Centre Trustee Age Distribution (as of 2/7/18)	
Range	Count
30-39	1
40-44	2
45-49	3
50-54	3
55-59	8
60-64	7
65-69	5
70+	7
Total	36

Notes:

- Comparative age data is unavailable, so Centre trustee age data is presented independently.
- The average age of Centre's Board of Trustees is 60, as of February 7, 2018.
- This distribution and average does not include the College's four Life Trustees, all age 70+. Average age including the four Life Trustees is 61.75.

Faculty and Staff

Centre College	1997	2017	# Change	% Change
Total # FT Faculty	85	129	44	52%
# FT Diverse Faculty	2	13	11	550%
% FT Diverse Faculty	2%	10%		
# African-American Faculty	0	3	3	300%
% African-American Faculty	0%	2%		
# FT Female Faculty	26	57	31	119%
% FT Female Faculty	31%	44%		
Total # FT Staff	188	286	98	52%
# FT Diverse Staff	21	19	-2	-10%
% FT Diverse Staff	11%	7%		
# African-American Staff	20	12	-8	-40%
% African-American Staff	11%	4%		
# FT Female Staff	97	160	63	65%
% FT Female Staff	52%	56%		

Notes:

- Centre's full-time faculty has grown by 52% since 1997, an increase of 44 individuals.
- Centre's full-time staff has grown by 52% since 1997, an increase of 98 individuals.
- The proportion of full-time female faculty members has grown by 31 individuals, or 119%.
- With the addition of 11 more faculty members who identify with a minority race, the diversity of Centre's faculty has increased by 550%.
- Though the overall percentage of African-American staff has decreased, the majority (67%) of full-time staff who identify as African-American in 2017 are professional staff members compared to 35% in 1997.
- The 2017 Diverse Faculty count includes six non-resident aliens; The 1997 Diverse Faculty count includes one non-resident alien.

Faculty and Staff (cont.)

Comparative Data	Centre	Benchmark	Aspirant	Regional
Variable	(2017)	(2016)	(2016)	(2016)
% Diverse Staff	7%	17%	15%	8%
% Diverse Faculty	10%	19%	24%	13%
% African-American Staff	4%	9%	6%	4%
% African-American Faculty	2%	4%	4%	3%
% Female Staff	56%	56%	54%	56%
% Female Faculty	44%	46%	45%	50%
Average # Faculty	129	167	212	136
Average # Staff	286	344	506	258

Notes

- Centre's full-time staff is slightly less diverse (7%) than regional institutions (8%), and approximately 10% less diverse than benchmark (17%) and aspirant (15%) institutions.
- The diversity of Centre's faculty (10%) has increased this year due to recent hires. This percentage is in line with regional institutions (13%) though short of benchmark (19%) and aspirant (24%) institutions.
- Centre has slightly fewer female faculty (44%) than benchmark (46%) and aspirant (45%) groups.
- There are very small differences between the percentage of female staff at Centre (56%) and the percentage at comparison institutions.

Students

Centre College				
Variable	1997	2017	# Change	% Change
Total Student #	997	1450	453	45%
Minority Student #	46	390	344	748%
International/Non-Resident Alien Student #	11	110	99	900%
American Indian/Alaska Native #	1	3	2	200%
Asian or Pacific Islander #	5	68	63	1260%
Black, non-Hispanic Student #	25	74	49	196%
Hispanic Student #	4	78	74	1850%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	N/A	1	1	
Race/ethnicity Unknown #	0	17	17	1700%
Two or more races	N/A	45	45	4500%
White, non-Hispanic student total	951	1060	109	11%
% Minority Students	5%	27%	22%	
% International Students	1%	8%	7%	
% American Indian/Alaska Native Students	0%	0%	0%	
% Asian or Pacific Islander Students	1%	5%	4%	
% Black, non-Hispanic Students	3%	5%	2%	
% Hispanic Students	0%	5%	5%	
% Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Students	N/A	0%	0%	
% Race/ethnicity Unknown Students	0%	1%	1%	
% Two or more races Students	N/A	3%	3%	
% White, non-Hispanic students	95%	73%	-22%	

Notes: Data retrieved from annual IPEDS surveys.

- The number of minority students is calculated by subtracting the total number of White, non-Hispanic students from the total student number.
- While the total student body has increased by 45% in twenty years (an average growth of 2.25% annually), the percentage of minority students has increased at a much faster rate (37.4% annually).
- The largest increase in student diversity has been the addition of international students, increasing by 900% in 20 years.
- The percentage of African-American students in the student body has almost doubled from being two and a half percent of the student body in 1997 to slightly more than five percent in 2017.
- Federal racial and ethnic descriptive categories changed between 1997 and 2017. The 1997 “Asian or Pacific Islander” category has changed to “Asian” and “Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander” in 2017. “Two or more races” is an additional category added since 1997. “Hispanic” has been delineated as an independent category in 2017 data.

Students (cont.)

Comparative Data	Centre (2017)	Bench. (2016)	Aspirant (2016)	Regional (2016)
Variable				
Total Student #	1450	1748	1428	1683
% Minority Students	27%	27%	35%	23%
% International Students	8%	5%	9%	4%
% American Indian/Alaska Native Students	0%	0%	0%	0%
% Asian or Pacific Islander Students	5%	3%	6%	1%
% Black, non-Hispanic Students	5%	5%	5%	7%
% Hispanic Students	5%	7%	7%	4%
% Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Students	0%	0%	0%	0%
% Race/ethnicity Unknown Students	1%	2%	3%	4%
% Two or more races Students	3%	4%	4%	3%
% White, non-Hispanic students	73%	73%	65%	77%

Notes:

- Of Centre’s comparative institutions, Grinnell College boasts the most international students (18%), followed by Beloit College (14%). Regional institutions host the fewest international students with Bellarmine (1%) and Georgetown (1%) tying with Wofford College (1%).
- The percentage of minority students at Centre has increased from 15% to 27% since 2012. Comparatively, the average minority student enrollment at benchmark institutions increased by two points (25%-27%) from 2012-2016, while the average minority student enrollment at aspirant institutions increased by one point in the same time frame (34%-35%).
- Haverford and Davidson Colleges report the highest percentage of African-American undergraduates (7%) within aspirant and benchmark groups, with Whitman (1%) and Colorado (3%) report the fewest. Regional institutions Maryville College (12%) and Campbellsville (11%) report the highest African-American undergraduate enrollment.

Aspirant Institutions

1. Bates College
2. Carleton College
3. Colby College
4. Colorado College
5. Davidson College
6. Grinnell College
7. Hamilton College
8. Haverford College
9. Lafayette College
10. Middlebury College
11. Trinity College
12. Washington and Lee University

Benchmark Institutions

1. Beloit College
2. DePauw University
3. Furman University
4. Kenyon College
5. Rhodes College
6. Sewanee-The University of the South
7. Southwestern University
8. Transylvania University
9. Whitman College
10. Wofford College

Regional Institutions

1. Asbury University
2. Bellarmine University
3. Campbellsville University
4. Carson-Newman University
5. Denison University
6. Georgetown College
7. Maryville College
8. Milligan College
9. Otterbein University
10. University of the Cumberlands
11. Wittenberg University

Appendix “3”

Survey of Board Statements on Matters of Diversity and Inclusion

Amherst College: The 1997 Statement by the Board of Trustees, emphasized the centrality of diversity to the mission of the College, of bringing to the community “the broadest and deepest range of talents that people from many different backgrounds can bring to us.” Also, they explained why they are committed to inclusion: “Because the best and the brightest people are found in many places, not few, because teaching and learning at their best are conversations with persons other than ourselves about ideas other than our own.”

Claremont McKenna College: In a statement passed by the Board in 2007, the Board values diversity to be sure they are preparing students for lives of leadership and work in the larger world. Diversity is key to the achievement of strategic goals, as well. About the Board itself: “Having a diverse Board of Trustees is also essential for our ability to execute our mission. The Board has made it an ‘important priority’ to expand the pool of trustee candidates to improve the diversity of the Board with respect in particular to gender, race, and ethnicity.”

Dartmouth College: At a 2016 meeting of the Board, the Board heard reports of initiatives on diversity and inclusion, and demanded rigorous accountability measure to track progress. The Board also “committed to participate in diversity training to ensure that it realizes the full commitment to diversity and inclusion to which it holds the campus.”

Muhlenberg College: In a 2014 statement affirmed by the Board of Trustees, the Board committed to creating an environment that supports all students, encourages conversations and academic programs that foster dialogue about diversity and inclusion. “Doing so means that some community members, especially those from majority groups, may experience moments of disequilibrium. The College believes that these moments are productive opportunities for teaching and learning; they are consistent with Muhlenberg’s dedication to providing living, learning, and working spaces that are safe and welcoming.”

Univ. of Pennsylvania: Resolution adopted by the trustees. “Penn rejoices in the rich diversity of persons, groups, views, and academic disciplines and programs that grace the campus of the nation’s first university. Tapping our diversity to strengthen ties across all boundaries enriches the intellectual climate and creates a more vibrant community. Fostering and nourishing this diversity, especially among students, faculty, staff, and trustees, must remain central to the core missions of the University.”

Pepperdine University: The strong Christian mission of Pepperdine calls each member of the institution to love their neighbors, to see Christ in others, and to live as brothers and sisters among equals before God. “The mission’s Christian focus, even more than its focus on academic excellence, requires the study of diverse worldviews and cultures.”

Scripps College: The College strives to be a community that does not simply have a representative or two from each racial, ethnic, religious, or other group, but many, so that everyone can learn that “one’s viewpoint is not synonymous with one’s race, ethnicity, neighborhood, religion, etc.”

Washington and Lee University: The Board of Trustees issued a more general statement on diversity for the institution, but also adopted new nominating criteria for its own membership. Their first criterion focuses on diversity: “The board will strive to achieve greater diversity of race, gender, religion, geography and nationality.”

Appendix “4”

Centre College Work Plan for Diversity & Inclusion Fall 2018 and Beyond

The College’s Work Plan for Diversity & Inclusion not only includes actions agreed to during the conversations with students on May 2-4, 2018, but also other plans and initiatives already in place or planned outside those conversations. This Work Plan, developed at the request of the Board of Trustees following “May 2-4,” as it has come to be known, presents four primary themes on which the College intends to take action, to include several underway before May 2-4, as well as several begun in the summer of 2018 and continuing into the 2018-19 session. If you have specific questions, you are invited to contact either Jamey Leahey or one of the College officers listed beside each of the four primary themes.

Education & Training (Andrea Abrams, Brian Cusato, Kay Drake, Brad Fields, Randy Hays, Brian Hutzley, Jamey Leahey)

This first item may be the most pervasive and important theme coming out of the May 2-4 conversations. While much of it was or is already in play, this work will require additional attention by the College.

Training focused broadly on issues of diversity and inclusion for all areas of our campus (faculty, staff, and students), much of which was already in the plans for faculty and staff development.

Special attention to education and training for the Department of Public Safety, which has begun this summer and will carry into the 2018-19 session; Sodexo staff, our dining services provider, which has begun this summer and will carry into the 2018-19 session; staff involved in Title IX investigations, which has begun this summer and will carry into the 2018-19 session; athletics staff, much of which was already planned, has begun this summer, and will carry into the 2018-19 session; and faculty and staff, which has begun this summer and will carry into the 2018-19 session.

Special attention will be given to how we organize the reporting and follow-up on matters related to diversity and inclusion, and the diversity and inclusion staff will stand ready to assist with any and all aspects of this effort, as appropriate.

Department of Public Safety & Student Life Matters (Andrea Abrams, Brian Cusato, Randy Hays, Brian Hutzley, Patrick Noltemeyer)

- A. Several matters related to the Department of Public Safety having to do with student safety have been addressed this summer, specifically the issue of communicating more regularly with students (planned for fall of 2018) and the possibility of having a person on post at the DPS Office at all times (which was reviewed and set aside for the time being).
- B. A number of issues related to dining services and our current food service provider, Sodexo, were addressed immediately, and Sodexo and the College have committed and/or are prepared to consider implementing others as well. The College will continue to monitor Sodexo’s progress and student response to their good-faith efforts.
- C. The matter of creating an “Intercultural Space” in existing Campus Center space was already in conversation and will be in place by fall of 2018.

- D. Plans are in place to be certain that there are, as has been true in recent years, a robust number of convocations related to diversity and inclusion. The prospect of requiring students to attend a certain number of such convocations is being considered through the regular College governance process.
- E. Working with the diversity and inclusion staff, the administration will seek ways to educate and communicate broadly to students about diversity and inclusion issues – allowing students the opportunity to share ideas and concerns directly with the administration.

Transparency, Recruiting, & Reporting (Andrea Abrams, Brian Cusato, Kay Drake, Randy Hays, Jamey Leahey, Patrick Noltemeyer, Michael Strysick)

The College will continue to be certain it meets its obligation to select the most qualified candidate for openings on the faculty and staff by advertising strategically, conducting open searches, and using the talents of its current faculty, staff, and students to recruit those candidates invited to our campus.

The College will pay particular attention to being transparent with research efforts related to diversity and inclusion and to sexual misconduct – communicating more regularly with its faculty, staff, and students. Moreover, the administration will conduct and design surveys to be certain the College secures credible information that is valuable to improving the lot of all students.

The College’s recruiting practices have been and will remain in line with the spirit and the letter of our desire to have a diverse workforce. Centre’s membership in the Higher Education Recruitment Consortium (HERC) will also assist.

The administration will create survey mechanisms to allow students to provide feedback on diversity and inclusion efforts, and will use these data to inform planning, programming, or specific actions. One new mechanism will be in place by fall of 2018.

To communicate more broadly about actions taken by the administration, the College plans to create new reporting mechanisms, including reports of bias incidents and the outcome of investigations – mindful of student and employee privacy concerns.

The College has moved forward to add an FTE in the Office of Diversity. This appointment is scheduled for completion by the beginning of the 2018 school year.

The College will create and publish by the fall of 2018 an online reporting tool for bias incidents to be used in all aspects of Centre’s operation, which will be supervised by Dr. Andrea Abrams and a team of other key staff in a position to assist.

Directional & College-Wide Themes (Brian Cusato, Randy Hays, Jamey Leahey, Yvonne Morley)

First-Year Orientation provides us with a rich opportunity to “start right,” and it will be our plan to be sure that these new students understand the importance of Centre being a welcoming community, open to difference of opinion, accountable, and encouraging – a place where we are able to disagree without becoming disagreeable, where diversity of thought is also welcomed, and where students can challenge and be challenged.

We have a time-honored tradition for campus-wide events, often including guests who afford us the opportunity to think about diversity, inclusion, freedom of speech, gratitude, social justice, moral and ethical leadership, compassion, accountability, etc. In this next year and beyond it will

be important for us to be all the more intentional with these events – being sure that our convocation schedule is one that is “wide” and invites each of us to learn and grow.

The College will continue to encourage freedom of speech and expression and, as noted in other parts of this Work Plan, will redouble its effort to provide students opportunities to “be heard.” At the same moment, and in the interest of protecting the institution’s academic and general student life programs, we will work to prepare “standards for engagement” for the members of our community that fit within the College’s tradition for civil discourse. These standards will need to be measured and clear and in line with Centre’s culture where new ideas are welcomed and where all members of the community are treated with respect. They will be intended to clarify what students can expect from the administration and what the administration can expect from students in terms of communication and dialogue. So that members of the Centre College community are fully aware of these expectations and their responsibility to adhere to them, these standards will be in hand before the fall of 2018.

The Trustee Working Group on Diversity will continue its work on a Board Statement on Diversity and Inclusion, scheduled for consideration in October 2018.

President Roush, working with the Board Officers, will secure professional assistance from a person of proven stature in the areas of diversity and inclusion who might offer advice and counsel as Centre attempts to do those things that put us in position to add quality and strength, since such matters are an important part of college life.