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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In August 2015, Vanderbilt University Chancellor Nicholas S. Zeppos announced the goal of a more diverse and inclusive Vanderbilt community as the university’s top priority. He empaneled this committee on Diversity, Inclusion, and Community with the charge of developing a holistic vision of diversity and inclusion on campus with actionable items. These recommendations will build upon existing strengths and boldly move Vanderbilt toward greater diversity, inclusiveness, and community connectedness equal to Vanderbilt’s aspirations “to shape the future of higher education and to foster the creation of knowledge that together improve the human condition,” as well as fulfill Vanderbilt’s commitment to “ensuring diversity of all forms in the pursuit of excellence in learning and discovery.”

Diversity and inclusion have represented both promise and challenge for Vanderbilt since the time of the university’s founding. The only major philanthropy of the northern industrialist Cornelius Vanderbilt, the university was founded in 1873 as a gift to the Reconstruction era South with a hopeful vision of inclusion: that the university would “contribute to strengthening the ties which should exist between all sections of our common country.” Yet at the same time, just two miles away, the Fisk Jubilee Singers had already set out on their world tour to raise funds to save the only university in Nashville that would admit newly freed Blacks.

This same promise and challenge has remained with us over the nearly 150 years since. Indeed, as described in the history section of this report, Vanderbilt has continuously struggled with diversity and inclusion—sometimes clumsily, sometimes quite shamefully, but at other times bravely. For example, Vanderbilt would admit its first Black student a year before Brown v. Board and would admit the first Black student athlete in the entire Southeastern Conference.

Vanderbilt’s commitment to diversity and inclusion has steadily grown, and by engaging more of the Vanderbilt and Nashville communities in this work, Vanderbilt has begun to stake out a leadership position on diversity, inclusion, and access. For example, the Vanderbilt School of Medicine and Medical Center, which has had an office focused on diversity since 1991, now has underrepresented minorities making up 20-25% of its entering class and was the first hospital in Tennessee to be designated as a Healthcare Equality Leader by the Human Rights Campaign. Twenty years ago, the Vanderbilt Carpenter Program became the first divinity program of its kind, focused on the intersection of religion, gender, and sexuality. Vanderbilt’s joint graduate programs with Fisk University have made Fisk the nation’s leading awarde of master’s degrees in physics to African Americans, and Vanderbilt is one of the nation’s leading awarde of PhDs to African Americans, Hispanics, and Native Americans in the physical and biomedical sciences. And in 2008, as Lehman Brothers filed the largest bankruptcy in US history in the wake of the near-total collapse of the economy, Vanderbilt boldly recommitted to the promise of affordable access to education through its signature financial aid program, Opportunity Vanderbilt.

Today, the struggle for diversity and inclusion has even greater salience, in ways that affect us all at Vanderbilt every day and in ways that inform how we must prepare our students to succeed and lead in the world. Indeed, on the Sunday just prior to this report’s delivery to the Vanderbilt chancellor, articles appeared in the New York Times reporting: the unintended negative impact of some family leave policies on women faculty; racial and gender biases in the face-recognition apps that are used for everything from advertising to policing, arising from a lack of diversity among those who train artificial-intelligence algorithms; the impact on electoral politics of demographic changes in the relationship between race and religious practice; the disparate impact on performance evaluations for managers of different genders and races who promote equality in the workplace; the counterintuitive psychology behind the health impacts of various representations of female beauty in advertising; the previously untold story of the Black slave who actually taught Jack Daniel how to distill whiskey; and new neuroscience and psychology research that helps explain differing reactions to victims of sexual assault.

These are the types of issues that Vanderbilt must be poised to confront. These are the types of challenges that our scholars must help find solutions to, and this is the world that our students must be equipped to competently operate within. It will require all of us—faculty, staff, students, and administrators—across all identity categories and all disciplinary backgrounds—from computer science to political science, from history to psychology, from medicine to divinity—to lead the way.

This report works from the premise that never before in our history has Vanderbilt had so much capacity and collective will to do just that. We return to the Commodore’s original hope for a university that leads as it heals and unites. We speak in this report with urgent and critical self-analysis because we at Vanderbilt have been given much, and so of us much is expected. Let us acknowledge our past but turn purposefully now to focus on the hard, important work of forging that path ahead.

This report and recommendations are the result of the committee’s intensive, year-long effort to broadly consult students, staff, and faculty across the many communities and organizational units that comprise the university through numerous venues and conversations. The report outlines the methods by which the committee engaged the Vanderbilt
community and the larger world of higher education in order to present a set of proposals that are uniquely targeted to Vanderbilt University—our past history, our present, and our ambitions for the future.

This Executive Summary condenses the report’s hopeful vision of what Vanderbilt can become in the next 15 years, addresses the question of why diversity is integral to Vanderbilt’s aspirations toward excellence, and finally provides a summary of the report’s high-level recommendations. A mapping of the recommendations to the Academic Strategic Plan, a suggested prioritization and implementation timeline, cost estimates, and markers of success, are presented in Section VII in the main body of the report.

### A. Toward a Vision of a More Diverse and Inclusive Vanderbilt

By renewing our collective commitment to creating a diverse and inclusive Vanderbilt community, we believe that Vanderbilt will be poised to meet the aspirations, needs, and challenges articulated in Vanderbilt’s Academic Strategic Plan specifically and Vanderbilt’s core mission more generally. In this report, we reaffirm a vision of Vanderbilt as a great institution of higher education and scholarship. We seek a diverse and inclusive Vanderbilt campus that better prepares its students for ethically engaging with local and global communities and creates a context for improved research and innovation. Achieving the goal of diversity and inclusion will enhance our ability to deliver on our mission, and position Vanderbilt for leadership, distinction, impact, and significance for decades to come.

As a leading institution of higher education founded with the purpose of advancing a united American democracy, there is perhaps nothing more philosophically fundamental to our mission than advancing learning and citizenship, which are two of the main benefits that emerge from diverse living and learning environments. Building on the work of Patricia Gurin at the University of Michigan, we consider the role of diversity, broadly defined, as having “far-ranging and significant educational benefits for both learning and democracy outcomes, and that these benefits extend to all students, non-minorities and minorities alike.” The goals of learning and citizenship are also closely connected to higher education’s historically grounded mission of teaching, research and service.

The educational benefits have been bolstered by fundamental social psychological research that has pointed to the ways in which student performance improves in diverse settings. As Claude Steele, one of the leading researchers in this field, noted: “A central policy implication of the research discussed here is that unless you make people feel safe from the risk of these identity predicaments in identify-integrated settings, you won’t succeed in reducing group achievement gaps or in enabling people from different backgrounds to work comfortably and well together.” And of all the ways to make students feel wanted and safe is to have a professoriate that is as diverse as the students and society they serve, according to the findings of Doug Massey and his collaborators. Moreover, the effects of diversity pay off both in the near- and long-term, creating richer learning environments and more productive contributors to society.

Indeed, a robust research literature has emerged on the power of diversity—our differences of identity, experience, education, and training—in order to: 1) make organizations generally better able to innovate, solve problems, and increase productivity; 2) lead universities to deliver better research, generate new forms of scholarship and creativity, and enhance the academic success of students; and 3) make individuals smarter and better equipped to succeed and to lead in a variety of contexts: in their communities, in their careers, in government, in places of worship, and in service. Key to these benefits of diversity is the centrality of cognitive and intellectual diversity—diverse sources of knowledge, diverse forms of expertise, and diverse ways of knowing, including neuro-diversity—for innovation, creativity, and productivity.

At the same time, research shows that diversity of identities and backgrounds in an organization can cause discomfort, difficult interactions, less trust at the outset, greater perceived interpersonal conflict, more difficulty with communication, less cohesion, more concern about disrespect, and other problems. In light of recent tensions centered on differences of identity and background at many colleges and universities—including Vanderbilt—why would we invite discomfort? Because excellence and true leadership require it. It is because the mark of a truly great university is not comfort; rather, it is the sustained engagement with challenging social and intellectual issues that creates and maintains excellence.

The friction that naturally arises when individuals with different identities, backgrounds, experiences, and worldviews interact is a necessary part of learning, of becoming more equipped with diverse tools for success. In short, diversity makes us smarter, stronger, and more intellectually agile. As an institution entrusted to educate, prepare for global citizenship and leadership, and as a great university that strives to model and inculcate the habits of excellence, Vanderbilt must give our students the hard earned benefits of living, learning, and engaging in a truly diverse and inclusive campus community. Vanderbilt’s academic strategic plan emphasizes interdisciplinary and transformative discoveries toward solving...
the world’s most pressing challenges, as well as immersive experiences for students to prepare them for leadership in the world. Thus Vanderbilt risks institutional failure if we neglect to harness the full power of human diversity throughout the institution—in our students, our faculty, our staff, and our university leadership, including our Board of Trust.

In short, building a truly diverse and inclusive Vanderbilt community is imperative at this time in our history. Diversity and inclusion are critical to:

- **Vanderbilt’s mission and values**—excellence in scholarship, teaching, service
- Solving problems and addressing questions that are **ambitious, innovative, and inspiring**
- Addressing our complex and painful histories while creatively **forging an inclusive future**
- Cultivating a vibrant, diverse, and inclusive intellectual community where those of all backgrounds feel **valued and respected** and whose contributions are recognized
- Engaging with diverse communities in Nashville, the nation, and around the globe to **build a just and humane world**

We imagine that Vanderbilt will become—ideally by our goal year of 2030—a more diverse, inclusive, university community, which will have been achieved through the efforts of all its constituents on campus and beyond. We look forward to a campus that is home to a highly diverse and dynamic intellectual community where the free and vigorous exchange of ideas exists alongside a humane, civil, and welcoming culture where all of its members share in a sense of belonging and respect. Beyond the campus itself, the Vanderbilt we envision is a more engaged partner with communities in Nashville and throughout the region, solving social problems, contributing more fully to building a just world, and furthering discovery and education through collaborative inquiry with diverse interests.

B. What Makes this Report and its Recommendations Unique?

This report contains over 100 recommendations divided into six areas: 1) Culture and Climate, 2) Faculty and Students, 3) Teaching and Curriculum, 4) Staff, 5) Community Engagement and Research Centers, and 6) Administration, Governance, Accountability. Each area has a driving theme that encompasses the many recommendations it contains. Of all the recommendations, the Committee agrees that those regarding accountability are paramount. Without a well-developed system of accountability, there is no progress.

We strove to have all of our recommendations connect clearly to the university mission. We also sought to make the recommendations driven by evidence, both of current successful practices at Vanderbilt, and of benchmarks or best practices elsewhere in higher education. For us, the best evidence comes from activities that already support diversity, inclusion, and community, on the Vanderbilt campus. The report labels these Vanderbilt activities a best practice and urges additional enthusiastic funding and support. When there was no program on campus, we looked to best practices across the nation always with a view for compatibility with a major research university.

As we pursue these goals, we also want to ensure that we are benchmarking not toward the average, but toward the best. One of the most effective ways to increase faculty action toward diversity is to convince them not only of its importance but its achievability; one way to do this is to benchmark performance against peer and aspirant institutions that have achieved high success in this area.¹⁵

---

¹⁵ The Committee has reviewed dozens of reports and programs from throughout the United States, all meant to enhance diversity. We are proud that this report is unique in a number of ways including our emphasis on diversity as a living concept, our inclusion of staff and non-tenure track faculty, and our sincere attempt to bring together as many community voices as possible.

Especially unique areas of approach:

- **Inclusion of reports on non-tenure track faculty and staff**: Because of our emphasis on diversity as a broad and encompassing topic, our report includes sections on staff and on non-tenure track faculty that are almost always absent from most diversity reports.

- **Dedication to the voices of the Vanderbilt community**: We understand that we are charged to be the eyes and ears of the Chancellor and the Board of Trust. Our goal is to paint as accurate a picture as possible of what various members of the Vanderbilt community experience as they make their way through the university. From those portraits we derived the recommendations that we present to you now. We hope that we have met our goal of being an accurate, transparent, and honest translator of the campus community.
C. Summary Recommendations

Our discussions and interactions across the Vanderbilt community led to more than 100 specific recommendations that we detail and prioritize in the main body of this report. Here we summarize the high-level recommendations organized into six broad areas. We provide a suggested prioritization, estimated costs, and initial implementation timeline in Section VII. Our goal is that each recommendation will help create a truly diverse and inclusive Vanderbilt community.

Culture and Climate

The culture and climate of a university is highly complex and challenging to define, encompassing shared values, beliefs, knowledge, customs, and their many expressions throughout campus life. In diverse educational institutions that are continually changing, cultures are rarely monolithic or universal, but instead multiple and conflicting, with tenuous if powerful forms of community and belonging. It is the work of an inclusive campus culture to allow a diverse array of individuals and groups to find opportunities for belonging and growth, while providing a common life in which all may work to create an inspiring and caring community for learning. Fundamental to this is a respect for diverse views as a means of creating excellence in higher education. This challenge of negotiating unity and difference in the academy occurs in every school and department, every dorm and common space. Therefore, what follows is a set of recommendations that have emerged from this committee’s many efforts to listen to the needs and aspirations of its many students, staff, and faculty; and its endeavor to shape a diverse and inclusive culture of which all of Vanderbilt can be proud. Whether in regards to the ways that we first welcome incoming freshmen to campus, or the symbols across our campus that speak to our values, or the physical and informational accessibility of the campus, or the ways in which we prepare all members of the university community to engage with one another meaningfully and respectfully, Vanderbilt’s culture and climate convey who we are, who we aspire to be, and who is welcome here.

1. Shepherd students throughout their experience with mentoring and coaching

Vanderbilt’s athletics programs provide a successful example of support and mentoring throughout the undergraduate experience. Based on the Vanderbilt model, we recommend a summer bridge program prior to the start of the freshman year that provides early orientation for students to provide them extra academic and social support. Staff and alumni, as well as faculty and graduate students, will serve as advisers and coaches. The program would include placement tests to guide academic counseling and course-taking during the freshman year as well as mentoring and academic/professional coaching throughout the undergraduate experience. Adopt a similar early orientation and mentoring for incoming graduate students as they begin their graduate and professional programs. Make use of, learn from, and support extant student-led mentoring and orientation initiatives.

2. Ensure that undergraduate students succeed in the major of their choice

Vanderbilt’s incoming freshmen are exceptionally well-qualified by all standard measures; indeed, incoming Vanderbilt students at the low end of the distribution today exceed the credentials of typical incoming Vanderbilt students admitted in decades past. A student deemed admissible to one of Vanderbilt’s undergraduate colleges or schools should have real opportunity to pursue and succeed in any major offered by that college or school.

Recommendation: Make all majors accessible to students in each college/school. Provide prerequisite courses as needed so that students representing the normal range of incoming high school preparation can on-ramp to the major of their choice. Provide freshman research immersion experiences as a best practice demonstrated to enhance retention, especially in STEM for underrepresented groups.

3. Mental health and wellness resources

Mental health and wellness resources are crucially important for all members of the Vanderbilt community to perform at their very best.

Recommendation: Explore the value and feasibility of a full-scale on-site mental health and wellness services for students, and increased treatment services for staff and faculty.

4. Employ sensitivity in creating symbols and environments

The symbols and names that are used across campus—the
name of a building, road, scholarship, or images placed on walls—should reflect and represent an inclusive and just Vanderbilt as we wish to be known.

Recommendation: Regularly revisit existing names, symbols, and images across campus to ensure consistency with Vanderbilt’s values. Start by renaming Confederate Memorial Hall. As new naming opportunities arise, consider former Vanderbilt students, staff, and faculty across diverse groups that reflect the best of Vanderbilt’s diverse campus culture and vision for the future. Ensure adequate space for students, staff, and faculty to display inclusion-affirming symbols.

Update information systems to allow for all students, faculty, and staff to be called by their preferred names and pronouns.

Whether for reasons of gender, culture, or other aspects of identity, all individuals have the right to have their preferred names and pronouns recognized and respected.

Recommendation: Update all information systems on campus in order to facilitate the use of preferred names and pronouns.

5. Expand support for multiple faiths
Throughout campus life, religious diversity is elemental to a dynamic and inclusive culture, and therefore the needs of religious groups should be better supported. Students in various religious groups cite the challenges they face finding suitable spaces and food compatible with their traditions.

Recommendation: We therefore recommend creating expanded religious spaces and dining services so that they may remain faithful to their traditions.

6. Start collecting data needed to serve the LGBTQI community
Vanderbilt needs to create a more comprehensive way to collect information to enable it to support the LGBTQI community. More complete information would enhance Vanderbilt’s ability to serve the needs of the LGBTQI community.

Recommendation: Update data systems to provide opportunities for voluntary self-reporting across all identity categories, thus enabling (de-identified) tracking of university performance with respect to previously unreported groups.

7. Provide support for international students and scholars
Although Vanderbilt University has a dedicated office of international students and scholars, that office is not staffed to enable it to make Vanderbilt a welcoming environment for international students and scholars. For these reasons and many more, our international students and scholars can feel apart from the University.

Recommendation: Provide additional resources for International Students to integrate into the larger community while maintaining cultural values. Consider an extension of Opportunity Vanderbilt to make a Vanderbilt education more accessible to international students.

8. Require unconscious bias and diversity education as part of orientation for new students, faculty, and staff
If we are to create a welcoming community, we must identify and address whatever prevents us from the open and supportive behavior we seek to exhibit. In order to help all of us—faculty, students, staff, administrators—address the assumptions and preconceptions that stand in the way of an open community, research suggests that, when done correctly, diversity education can be effective in helping reach diversity goals, alongside recurring education around difference, inequality, intercultural communication, conflict resolution and other topics.

Recommendation: Provide diversity educational forums around issues of unconscious bias, inequality, social differences, inclusive communication, conflict resolution, and other subjects to assist all members of the Vanderbilt campus to have greater capacity to build a diverse and inclusive community.

9. Create an Ombudsman Office
Students, staff, and faculty who experience marginalization or exclusion related to issues of difference are in need of additional resources to privately discuss problems privately and explore strategies of constructive mediation and conflict resolution.

Recommendation: Create a Vanderbilt Ombudsman who is available to all students, faculty, and staff affiliated with Vanderbilt University, a neutral, independent, impartial, caring, and safe counselor who can provide useful information on policies, practices, options, and referrals. The Ombudsman should work closely with EAD and the Chief Diversity Officer to act as an advocate for fairness and equity throughout the university.

10. Make the Vanderbilt campus more accessible
Despite Vanderbilt’s compliance with federal, state, or local regulations, the lived experience of our community is that the campus is daunting for disabled individuals. Vanderbilt should strive for excellence in creating a campus where all members of our campus can easily access all classrooms and buildings and where handicapped parking is available and in close proximity.

Additionally, in order to best support the needs of those in the gender non-conforming community, or others who
are best served by gender-neutral restrooms: family style, unisex, or single-user restrooms (often called handicapped restrooms) should be incorporated into all future plans for building construction / renovation in order to offer better accessibility.

**Recommendation:** The University's Land Use Planning process provides a timely opportunity to reach for a campus that is easily navigable and universally accessible. That process should prioritize accommodating the populations named above by identifying existing restroom facilities in all buildings appropriate to their needs and providing signage to direct people to them. This includes the reinstitution of a shuttle service for students, staff, and faculty, so that the campus becomes more accessible to all.

**Faculty and Student Recruitment and Retention**

**FACULTY**

A diverse and inclusive faculty and student body are at the core of any great university. Our student and faculty diversity is integral to our scholarly aspirations, global impact, and recognized excellence. Vanderbilt has taken enormous strides over the past few decades in diversifying the undergraduate student body. Indeed, Vanderbilt's undergraduates rival their peers at the most selective, top ranked universities in the nation in all measures of excellence, and at the same time represent a diversity of backgrounds that broadly mirrors American society. In contrast, the faculty who teach and mentor these students are much less diverse, especially with respect to race and ethnicity in most fields, and also with respect to gender in most STEM fields. (We suspect the same is true of LGBTQI individuals and those with disabilities, although these data are not currently collected.) The pace of progress in faculty diversity hiring will in many disciplines be limited by the small numbers of underrepresented faculty in the PhD pool; it will be essential to be aggressive in efforts to increase the diversity of Vanderbilt's applicant pool and to institutionalize best practices in order to enable steady progress over the long term. Enable increases in the number of faculty applicants who are interested in Vanderbilt through efforts such as opportunity hiring, cluster hiring, and a signature postdoc-to-faculty bridge fellowship program.

### 3. Avail ourselves of the diversity of the South East United States

**Recommendation:** Create stronger connections between Vanderbilt and regional sources of underrepresented faculty, such as HBCUs in Nashville and beyond, through strategic partnerships.

**STUDENTS**

1. **Create Experience Vanderbilt**

   Opportunity Vanderbilt has been a stand-out success story, both in terms of projecting a bold, positive and welcoming Vanderbilt brand and in terms of real impact on the lives of highly qualified students and their families who might not otherwise be able to afford to bring their diverse talents to Vanderbilt and to benefit from the upward mobility of a Vanderbilt education. Yet, too many students—especially international students and students from lower socio-economic backgrounds, find upon their arrival at Vanderbilt that many aspects of the Vanderbilt experience such as study abroad, alternative spring break, Greek life, immersive research, and community engagement, remain inaccessible in practice due to cost. Moreover, students of all backgrounds express a desire for greater experiences and engagement with issues of difference and marginalization as preparation for future success in the real world. The need for additional funds in order to give students a true Ivy League experience has been documented in the *Washington Post*. 17

   **Recommendation:** Launch Experience Vanderbilt, in order to enable full participation in student life.

2. **Expand Opportunity Vanderbilt to Professional students**

   Undergraduate students at Vanderbilt have Opportunity Vanderbilt. Graduate students at Vanderbilt are usually supported through the Graduate School, their College, or their Department. Professional students, on the other hand, often give up employment and pay high tuition without the prospect of high paying jobs. The lack of compensating salary to make up for the real financial cost of pursuing a professional degree is particularly true at the Nursing School, the Divinity School, and Peabody College where a larger portion of the professional student population is female. These professional students are in need of support along the lines of Opportunity Vanderbilt.

   **Recommendation:** Extend *Opportunity Vanderbilt* to include graduate and professional students.
3. Make Vanderbilt the leading producer of PhDs and other terminal graduate degrees from underrepresented groups

**Recommendation:** Make Vanderbilt the leading producer of PhDs and other terminal graduate degrees from underrepresented groups across all disciplines and professions, thus becoming a source for the nation’s needed diverse faculty talent for the future. There are multiple strategies to accomplish this recommendation. First, scale up signature efforts such as the Initiative for Maximizing Student Diversity and Fisk-Vanderbilt Masters-to-PhD Bridge Program, and extend the best practices of these efforts across Vanderbilt’s graduate and professional degree programs. Second, build a truly diverse, inclusive, immersive, trans-institutional graduate community on the Vanderbilt campus, and incorporate support and community for students throughout the graduate experience. Given the real estate market in Nashville, graduate student housing is likely to become an even greater need for recruiting and retaining diverse PhD students. Consider establishing graduate and professional housing and/or a Graduate Student Commons.

4. Make Vanderbilt a leader in the efforts of holistic review in graduate admissions

Vanderbilt’s nationally-leading, diverse graduate programs have demonstrated the importance of holistic review in graduate and professional admissions processes. In particular, research gathered by the committee from the published literature shows that over-reliance on standardized test scores may be behind an ongoing lack of diversity in many graduate and professional programs at many universities. Holistic admissions approaches—including tools developed at Vanderbilt—select students with much better completion rates, stronger long-term outcomes and excellence, and much more diversity.

**Recommendation:** Make Vanderbilt a leader in a national effort to transcend the emphasis on standardized testing in graduate admissions by incorporating best practices in holistic admissions developed at Vanderbilt in the office of undergraduate admissions and in the Fisk-Vanderbilt Masters-to-PhD Bridge Program. Position the Graduate School to lead the national conversation in excellence through diversity in graduate education, and to work with us toward a more inclusive national landscape for graduate education that emphasizes inclusive excellence.

---

**Teaching and Curriculum**

Teaching practices and curriculum are foundational for any educational institution and are absolutely essential to Vanderbilt’s mission and identity as a leader in higher education. The achievement of excellence through diversity is impossible without efforts to ensure that the curriculum and teaching practices of the university foster a diverse, dynamic, and inclusive intellectual community.

1. Periodic Reflection on Curriculum

The curriculum should reflect the needs and interests of an increasingly diverse student body, evolving disciplines, and the demands of a changing world in which issues of difference and inequality are central.

**Recommendation:** Every five years, the faculty of each unit - with input from students and other identified stakeholders - should undertake a process of intentional, careful reflection on their existing curriculum to determine what innovations and changes are necessary to meet complex and multiple needs.

2. Curricular Innovation

Vanderbilt students, both undergraduate and graduate, state more forcefully than ever that, if they are to be prepared for success and leadership in a diverse society, they are in need of a curriculum that attends more carefully to issues of difference and inequality. Students across campus crave rigorous understanding of the social challenges associated with these concerns, and they want to achieve expertise to contribute to meaningful changes towards diversity, inclusion, and justice. While Vanderbilt offers many opportunities for just this form of education, it could do far better for its students and the world they will create.

**Recommendation:** Ensure that faculty have the necessary time, resources, and professional development opportunities to innovate courses and curriculum.

**Recommendation:** Create a program of small grants to faculty for innovative diversity programming, including development and deployment of innovative pedagogies and/or novel approaches to recruitment and advancement of underrepresented groups.

**Recommendation:** Each school should review its general education requirements and core curriculum requirements in order to determine whether they sufficiently support rigorous undergraduate and graduate education around issues of difference and inequality.

**Recommendation:** Schools should consider developing optional curricula that enhance understanding of issues related to difference and inequality, particularly ones that incorporate rigorous trans-disciplinary and immersive
learning experiences and enhance student capacities for public scholarship, intercultural expertise, and leadership. Connect these curricular offerings to career and workforce development—help students recognize the value to their future career prospects in developing core competencies related to understanding and promoting diversity. This may include introductory, intermediate, advanced, or capstone offerings for either undergraduates or graduate students. Capstone curricula present an especially appropriate opportunity to encourage immersion and reflection, and therefore consolidate and extend learning on issues of difference.

3. Inclusive Teaching for Students and Faculty
All students bring unique abilities, challenges, experiences, and knowledge to the classroom, but all should be treated with dignity and be able to fully participate in all learning opportunities regardless of their differences of race, gender, sexuality, religion, nationality, language, ability, mental health, learning preferences, or any other difference. All faculty bring unique abilities, knowledge, and teaching styles into the classroom, and when they are evaluated by students, unconscious bias can affect a student's evaluation of the course and the instructor. Those biases often lead to lower evaluations of female faculty from underrepresented groups.

Recommendation: Vanderbilt instructors should have access to a wide variety of professional development opportunities, including an expanded set of programs and fellowships dedicated to pedagogies of inclusion at the Center for Teaching. In addition, departments and programs should have resources to develop their inclusive teaching forums that are tailored to their specific teaching needs, possibly with the CFT and outside facilitators.

Recommendation: Ensure that every unit uses student evaluations of teaching, particularly their evaluation of instructor effectiveness in inclusive teaching, to assess and improve their teaching practices. Ensure that students are educated about unconscious biases that may affect their evaluations of faculty.

Recommendation: In their annual reports on teaching, research, and service, instructors should include how they have contributed to the university's diversity and inclusion mission.

Recommendation: Support all instructors in the incorporation of universal design principles into their teaching by making teaching spaces, course websites, course management systems, and other instructional technologies fully accessible to all students.

Staff
Every day, thousands of individuals living in and around Davidson County come to the Vanderbilt campus for work, with responsibilities for everything from coordinating student programs to beautifying the grounds to keeping the computers working to cooking the food—and innumerable other tasks. Indeed, it is no exaggeration to say that the university could not function without the staff, and that Vanderbilt would lack programs or services that deliver on diversity and inclusion without staff involvement. Staff are the primary direct connection between Vanderbilt and Nashville's diverse community, and Vanderbilt's reputation in the community is driven in large part by the ways in which Vanderbilt treats its staff members. This in turn communicates Vanderbilt's true values.

1. Recognize staff contributions
The charge of this committee was to enhance “community” at Vanderbilt. Every day, thousands of members of the Nashville community come to the Vanderbilt campus for work that enriches every aspect of Vanderbilt life. Indeed, Vanderbilt could not function without the Nashville community members who make up the Vanderbilt staff.

Many students identify with staff members, find community and cultural connection with staff members, and turn to staff members for help, advice, and support. These crucial connections for students are not limited to those staff members with functional responsibilities for student services. Students also speak of invaluable support, counsel, and care received from janitors, grounds keepers, and dining workers. Staff across all job titles deliver on Vanderbilt’s mission to educate the whole person. Further students explicitly tell us that Vanderbilt communicates its values through its treatment of staff and that the Nashville community also judges Vanderbilt by how we treat their friends and neighbors.

Recommendation: Create explicit opportunities for staff of all job descriptions to meaningfully contribute to the educational mission. Recognize and place value on those contributions.

2. Provide opportunities for training and education
Currently, staff have limited opportunities for ongoing education. Staff members desire more opportunities for career growth and education.

Recommendation: Enhance staff training opportunities and increase the staff tuition benefit so that it is possible to obtain a degree while working at Vanderbilt for reasonable cost.
3. Define more clear pathways for advancement up the job ladder
Staff members report few clear pathways for advancement.
**Recommendation:** Define more clear pathways for advancement up the job ladder and salary pay scale.

4. Pay a living wage
Many of the staff members who contribute to Vanderbilt’s educational mission work two or three jobs to make ends meet. Some make as little as $7.85 an hour.
**Recommendation:** Conduct a study of the true living wage required to live in Davidson County and establish a living wage at Vanderbilt of no less than $15/hour.

5. Shared governance
Staff are too often left out of true decision making and/or campus communications, and this limits the extent to which the Vanderbilt community can be fully inclusive of staff.
**Recommendation:** Enhance staff representation and involvement in shared governance. Include staff in communications about campus events, programs, and news, including especially news about students.

6. Commit to diverse recruiting in the hiring process
Vanderbilt’s commitment to diversity must also be reflected among the recruiting and hiring process for its staff. Diversity should be increased among the professional, administrative, and academic staff.
**Recommendation:** Increase representation of underrepresented groups among the staff, particularly in professional, administrative, and academic roles through recruiting and outreach efforts to increase the diversity of the applicant pool.

**Community Engagement and Research Centers**

Given the centrality of diversity to Vanderbilt’s ability to tackle and solve important problems, diversity should become a more vital part of Vanderbilt’s focus on trans-institutional and community engaged research.

1. Build up existing programs so that innovation can take place
Over the years, Vanderbilt has established a number of programs, institutes, and centers that have helped make the campus a more diverse and inclusive environment. For a variety of reasons, many of these units are not staffed and funded as required for them to both provide expected services and also innovate new programs.
**Recommendation:** Work with deans and other heads of units to increase support for existing academic and community programs and centers with a record of fostering diversity, inclusion, and community. Include student-led programs in these considerations.

2. Develop the Vanderbilt Institute for the Study of Civil and Human Rights
Many pressing questions and grand intellectual and social challenges center on difference, power, and marginalization. Given our history and our strengths, Vanderbilt could become a world-class center of exploration and discovery for many of these nationally and globally relevant questions, and we could do so through an Institute for the Study of Civil and Human Rights. Such an institute could become a leader in scholarly studies of difference and inequality in both the region and the world. It could develop a curriculum that ties together the many complicated histories and problems faced by underrepresented groups throughout our society. It could build its intellectual aspirations on a foundation rooted in the historic importance of Nashville and the South in the struggle for equality. It could hold as a primary mission the engagement with communities of underrepresented groups in Nashville and beyond.

As the Committee explored the relationship of the University to Nashville, we heard again and again that the University must be better connected to our neighbors and our neighborhood, and to our region. The Institute for the Study of Civil and Human Rights will serve as a way for the Vanderbilt community to consistently interact with the Nashville community and to commit to the idea that a great university contributes to the creation of a great city.
**Recommendation:** Explore the creation of an Institute for the Study of Civil and Human Rights.
Administration, Governance, Accountability

Although accountability is listed last in this summary, the entire committee agreed that it is by far the most important of all the recommendations. Without a system of shared accountability across the university, our recommendations will not be achieved. The envisioned accountability structure is summarized in the chart below.

1. Install a system of shared governance and accountability throughout the organization chart

Recommendation: Empower students, staff, and faculty within units across the university to articulate goals and metrics regarding diversity, inclusion, and community as appropriate for each unit. These goals and metrics should be developed in collaboration with chairs and unit heads, and up to deans and other major unit leaders. Engage the faculty senate as well as staff and student advisory councils in developing these goals and diversity plans.

The provost and the other vice chancellors should then support their units with resources, toolkits, and supports— including a new vice provost for faculty diversity and development actively involved in all aspects of faculty recruitment and promotion, unit-level diversity liaisons—and should monitor the metrics and hold their units accountable for making progress toward their goals. Diversity plans and measures of progress generally should be made public as part of the university’s open accountability to its own stakeholders as well as to the community.

Recommendation: Position the Chief Diversity Officer as a convener of the university’s top leadership to regularly brainstorm, troubleshoot, plan, strategize, and discuss diversity and inclusion across the Vanderbilt community.

Recommendation: Provide the Chief Diversity Officer with a standing Working Group to help more fully engineer and advise on the implementation of these recommendations, and with a Diversity Council of representative students, faculty, staff, and administrators for ongoing advice and input.

Similarly, it is important for rank-and-file faculty, staff, and students to connect with one another horizontally across the organization chart in order to share experiences...
and ideas. Ultimately, while not all individuals should expect to have a vote on all decisions at all times, it is imperative to have a structure that encourages and enables a voice for all constituencies.

**Recommendation:** Make sure that diversity is not just a top-down affair by ensuring that faculty, staff, and students have venues for communicating with the administration either directly or through the Chief Diversity Officer.

Just as important as a structure for accountability, each level of the university must demonstrate a true commitment to diversity and inclusion born of an understanding by each unit of its own purpose and of the commitments required to deliver on that purpose.

**Recommendation:** Following the example of the Divinity School, Deans should lead their units in developing statements of commitments and principles that articulate high-level goals for creating a diverse and inclusive community within their units and that link diversity and inclusion to the broader mission of the unit. They should periodically review, revise, and recommit to these principles. Deans should lead by example in invoking these principles in all actions (faculty recruiting and hiring, curriculum design, etc.) and in holding themselves and the unit to account according to these principles.

2. **Collect the data needed to monitor diversity**

Data collection broadly speaking is an area in need of enhancement at Vanderbilt. Currently, data collection is largely limited to data which are collected and analyzed for compliance purposes.

**Recommendation:** Increase data collection and analysis beyond compliance, and conduct data collection in a manner consistent with our aspirations for organizational excellence.

Vanderbilt should collect comprehensive data—both quantitative and qualitative—across all identity categories, academic and non-academic titles and levels, job descriptions, units, etc., in order to enable meaningful, granular analysis of progress and challenges over time. In gathering data, we recognize that some members of the community may wish to not identify themselves as to some of the categories for which the university seeks to collect data (e.g., religion, sexual orientation, disability status) and accordingly such data must be gathered in a way that allows people to provide the data only voluntarily and in a way that is cognizant of the university’s legal obligations not to discriminate.

**Recommendation:** Enable and empower faculty, staff, and students with appropriate venues such as Councils or Roundtables to discuss and share successes, best practices, challenges, needs with respect to diversity and inclusion, and provide appropriate mechanisms for communication with university leadership, perhaps with and through the Chief Diversity Officer.
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I. INTRODUCTION: BUILDING ON OUR PAST AND FORGING THE PATH AHEAD

In fall 2015, Chancellor Nicholas Zeppos established a Committee on Diversity, Inclusion, and Community, charging 22 faculty members from diverse backgrounds with the task of presenting a thorough, actionable report which recommends ways to achieve the goal of a diverse, inclusive, equitable Vanderbilt. For six months, the committee met with a wide variety of Vanderbilt students, faculty, and staff in order to gain a broad understanding of the current experience and state of diversity on campus, and to request input about the best way to improve our efforts toward diversity and inclusion. The committee also met with some administrators to discuss these issues. In order to remain focused on students, faculty, and staff on campus, the committee chose at this time not to meet with alumni, funding organizations, or other donors. In addition, committee members pursued independent research into Vanderbilt’s unique history, best practices across the country, and where Vanderbilt stands on a number of different diversity metrics.

Diversity and inclusion have represented both promise and challenge for Vanderbilt since the time of the university’s founding. The only major philanthropy of the northern industrialist Cornelius Vanderbilt, the university was founded in 1873 as a gift to the Reconstruction era South with a hopeful vision of inclusion: that the university would “contribute to strengthening the ties which should exist between all sections of our common country.” Yet at the same time, just two miles away, the Fisk Jubilee Singers had already set out on their world tour to raise funds to save the only university in Nashville that would admit newly freed Blacks.

This same promise and challenge has remained with us over the nearly 150 years since. Indeed, as described in the history section of this report, Vanderbilt has continuously struggled with diversity and inclusion—sometimes clumsily, sometimes quite shamefully, but at other times bravely. For example, Vanderbilt would admit its first Black student a year before Brown v. Board and would admit the first Black student athlete in the entire Southeastern Conference.

Vanderbilt’s commitment to diversity and inclusion has steadily grown, and by engaging more of the Vanderbilt and Nashville communities in this work, Vanderbilt has begun to stake out a leadership position on diversity, inclusion, and access. For example, the Vanderbilt School of Medicine and Medical Center, which has had an office focused on diversity since 1991, now has underrepresented minorities making up 20-25% of its entering class and was the first hospital in Tennessee to be designated as a Healthcare Equality Leader by the Human Rights Campaign. Twenty years ago, the Vanderbilt Carpenter Program became the first divinity program of its kind, focused on the intersection of religion, gender, and sexuality. Vanderbilt’s joint graduate programs with Fisk University have made Fisk the nation’s leading awardee of master’s degrees in physics to African Americans, and Vanderbilt is one of the nation’s leading awardeers of PhDs to African Americans, Hispanics, and Native Americans in the physical and biomedical sciences. And in 2008, as Lehman Brothers filed the largest bankruptcy in US history in the wake of the near-total collapse of the economy, Vanderbilt boldly recommitted to the promise of affordable access to education through its signature financial aid program, Opportunity Vanderbilt.

Today, the struggle for diversity and inclusion has even greater salience, in ways that affect us all at Vanderbilt every day and in ways that inform how we must prepare our students to succeed and lead in the world. Indeed, on the Sunday just prior to this report’s delivery to the Vanderbilt chancellor, articles appeared in the New York Times reporting: the unintended negative impact of some family leave policies on women faculty; racial and gender biases in the face-recognition apps that are used for everything from advertising to policing, arising from a lack of diversity among those who train artificial-intelligence algorithms; the impact on electoral politics of demographic changes in the relationship between race and religious practice; the disparate impact on performance evaluations for managers of different genders and races who promote equality in the workplace; the counterintuitive psychology behind the health impacts of various representations of female beauty in advertising; the previously untold story of the Black slave who actually taught Jack Daniel how to distill whiskey; and new neuroscience and psychology research that helps explain differing reactions to victims of sexual assault.

These are the types of issues that Vanderbilt must be poised to confront. These are the types of challenges that our scholars must help find solutions to, and this is the world that our students must be equipped to competently operate within. It will require all of us—faculty, staff, students, and administrators—across all identity categories and all disciplinary backgrounds—from computer science to political science, from history to psychology, from medicine to divinity—to lead the way.

This report works from the premise that never before in our history has Vanderbilt had so much capacity and collective will to do just that. We return to the Commodore’s original hope for a university that leads as it heals and unites. We speak in this report with urgent and critical self-analysis because we at Vanderbilt have been given much, and so of us much is expected. Let us acknowledge our past but turn purposefully now to focus on the hard, important work of forging that path ahead.

From these conversations, observations, and studies, the
Committee has become all the more convinced of the importance of this project to the long-term success of Vanderbilt as an institution. It has also identified several principles and goals, as well as a large number of actionable steps toward this end. This report summarizes the committee’s findings and recommendations.

A. The Committee Members
B. Committee Charge

The Chancellor’s Committee on Diversity, Inclusion, and Community developed for itself the following charge. The Chancellor’s Committee is charged with providing the Chancellor and the Board of Trust with guidance on what steps to take, and what programs to implement, in order to achieve the vision of diversity, inclusion, and community contained in section entitled “A Vision for a Diverse and Inclusive Vanderbilt in 2030.” The Chancellor’s Committee is charged to structure its report so as to address the actions needed to confront any lack of diversity, inclusion and/or community among Vanderbilt staff, students, faculty, administrators, and alumni, members of the Nashville Metro area, and Vanderbilt university supporters and friends.

In developing its suggestions, the Committee is charged to address the full scope of Vanderbilt University history and that history’s impact on diversity, inclusion, and community now and going forward. The Committee recognizes a particular obligation to attending to issues of race and racism as well as to any perceived discrimination based on class, sex, gender identity, sexual orientation, ability, or religion.

Finally, the Committee is charged to extend its investigations and recommendations to faculty and students within the Medical Center to the extent that these faculty and students are within the jurisdiction of the Vanderbilt University Provost.

C. Committee Procedures

In order to fulfill our charge, we investigated and reported on:

1. Vanderbilt University’s unique history in relation to issues of race, racism, and discrimination based on class, sex, gender identity, sexual orientation, ability, or religion.

2. A vision of Vanderbilt University should the Committee’s recommendations achieved their desired results. That vision was the guiding star for all our investigations. The Committee’s vision statement is included in this report.

3. What is going on in the rest of higher education in regards to diversity, inclusion, and community. The Committee’s outline of current Best Practices is attached to this report as Appendix C.

4. What we know about Vanderbilt University already from the data that the University collects and what other types of information are required in order to most effectively address our charge. The Committee’s collection of data on diversity from VIRG is attached to this report as Appendix B.

5. What we heard about Vanderbilt University from the voices of its members.
   - Intimate conversations with groups of community members who were joined together by some status such as staff, undergraduate student, or graduate student.
   - Forums where participants were asked to address hard questions; for example, what is diversity?
   - Town halls aimed at students and staff
   - Department and staff meetings
   - Presentations to faculties across the ten schools

Committee members circled back over and over again with notes from these meetings until reports emerged that we believe express the true message that each group would like to share with the Chancellor and the rest of the campus about who they are and what they need in order to feel themselves full members of the Vanderbilt community.

The voices that we present here are a unique expression of the Vanderbilt University community.

D. Methodology

Starting with the Chancellor’s announcement of the committee’s work at the fall faculty assembly on Aug 25, 2015, the committee proceeded as follows over the next 10 months toward the final goal of a report with recommendations by July 1, 2016. The committee embarked on the work with the overarching goal to provide the chancellor with an ambitious, hopefully visionary, set of recommendations that would represent architectural blueprints for the long-term (we estimate 15 years) path ahead.

After an initial phase of organization by the committee co-chairs in September, the committee began regular monthly meetings of the full committee in October. The committee outlined the scope of work and structured the work timeline into three Phases: (1) Data collection, research, and listening
sessions with multiple campus stakeholders, (2) development of draft recommendations for sharing with the campus community for additional input, including discussions with key members of senior university leadership, and (3) preparation of the final report and recommendations.

Soon after the start of the committee’s Phase 1 work, a number of colleges and universities across the country experienced significant episodes of student protest surrounding the need for more diverse and inclusive campus communities. Vanderbilt’s students protested also, and delivered a number of demands to the administration, including a request for this committee to conduct its work with urgency. The committee felt it was important to communicate early with students and the rest of the university community about the committee’s intentions, and thus issued an open letter to the campus on Dec 7, 2015. The committee also created a website with a mechanism for any member of the Vanderbilt campus to contribute ideas and provide feedback.

For the Phase 1 work, which was conducted from November to January, the committee organized itself into several subcommittees: (1) A Vision and Charge subcommittee articulating the report’s vision statement, thus focused on the question, Where are we going? (2) a History subcommittee examining the university’s past in regards to diversity and inclusion, focused on the question, Where have we been? (3) an Analytics subcommittee examining quantitative and qualitative institutional data, focused on the question, Where are we now? and (4) a Best Practices subcommittee reviewing institutional practices at Vanderbilt and elsewhere, focused on the question, Where do we want to be?

The Phase 1 subcommittees requested and examined existing institutional data where available, amassed and reviewed a large body of the published literature, and supplemented these with new qualitative survey data commissioned for this report. Importantly, the subcommittees spent significant time listening to the Vanderbilt community as a form of data collection but also to help guide the committee’s priorities and nascent recommendations. These listening sessions included Town Hall meetings (two for all students, one for graduate and professional students, and one for staff), a presentation to the Faculty Senate, three meetings with a representative group of students empaneled by the committee, four meetings with the Staff Advisory Council, one-off meetings with groups focused on specific issues (race/ethnicity, class, sexual orientation, women, gender, religious minorities, and disability), and five task force groups to provide focused thinking on questions of particular importance to the committee’s work: (1) What is Diversity? (2) Academic Freedom and Freedom of Speech, (3) Institutional Culture and Climate, (4) Ensuring Accountability for Diversity and Inclusion Goals, (5) the Salience of Race. Much of the collected work from Phase 1 appears in the Appendices of the report.

Based on the work resulting from Phase 1, the committee identified six broad areas for development of recommendations. In February, 2016, the committee reorganized itself into six new subcommittees, each focused on developing draft recommendations with justifications emerging from the Phase 1 work. The six subcommittees were: (1) Culture and Climate, (2) Faculty and Students, (3) Staff, (4) Teaching, (5) Administration and Accountability, and (6) Community Engagement and Research Centers. In developing these recommendations, the committee gave preference to those for which evidence of success (or potential for success) was already available from past or current experience here at Vanderbilt. Other recommendations were prioritized on the basis of evidence from examination of other institutions’ best practices. And still other recommendations were prioritized on the basis of multiple expressions of support during the Phase 1 listening sessions.

An important element of the committee’s work that emerged at this stage was a series of mini-reports that we refer to as “voices” from the Vanderbilt community. These mini-reports represent the committee’s best effort to faithfully capture various perspectives and opinions and suggested recommendations from across the Vanderbilt community. While the committee did not choose to formally recommend every one of the many suggestions received, the committee believed it was important to give voice to these perspectives and suggestions, which may provide additional useful recommendations for consideration in the future. The “voices” mini-reports are further described below and are included in Appendix A.

With the completion of the Phase 2 work in early April, 2016, the committee conducted nearly 30 “draft recommendations rollout sessions” with the university leadership and with stakeholders across campus, including: the vice chancellors, the deans, other members of the senior leadership, student leaders, the faculty senate, representative students and staff and faculty in the various schools and colleges, student town halls, staff town halls, the university staff advisory council, individual departments, and the office of development and alumni relations. These sessions were used to gather added feedback, reactions, suggestions for improvement of the recommendations, identification of key recommendations that may have been overlooked, and opportunities to provide additional examples of exemplary practice at Vanderbilt. These rollout sessions were completed in early May and the committee implemented changes to the draft recommendations as needed over the ensuing weeks.

At the end of May, the committee began to work directly with the university’s general counsel for a careful review of the full draft report to ensure compliance with stipulations for data sharing, anonymity of attribution, and other legal requirements. The committee continued to iterate with general counsel throughout the final phase of work until the report’s completion. The committee also met with members of the
administration who could provide some guidance on cost estimates for a number of the recommendations.29

In early June, the committee met separately with two distinguished groups: (1) an external visiting committee comprising academic and administrative leaders from other colleges and universities, leaders representing businesses, government, and organizations from the Nashville community, and others, tasked with providing broad input on the draft report; and (2) an internal group of Vanderbilt faculty specifically tasked with critical review of the draft report. The input received from both groups resulted in a number of important changes to improve the structure and clarity of the report, as well as a small, but important, set of additional recommendations.

The committee also voted on a prioritization of the full set of recommendations. This was a particularly difficult task, owing to the sense that all of the recommendations were elevated to the level of formal recommendation because they are important and worthy of adoption. Nonetheless, the committee felt it was important to provide the chancellor with guidance on where to begin, and thus has included in this report a ranking of the recommendations both according to the committee’s sense of absolute importance and according to the committee’s sense of opportunity for rapid accomplishment. And while the committee did not see it in its charge to engineer a detailed implementation plan over the 15-year timeframe of the recommendations, the committee did develop a plan for the first year, focused on rapidly establishing the necessary frameworks and capacities for the long-term success of this plan.30

The committee held its final meetings on June 24 and 28, 2016, to approve the final report and implement final corrections. The report was delivered to the chancellor as requested on July 1, 2016.

E. PHASE 1 Subcommittees: Laying the Groundwork

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VISION/CHARGE</th>
<th>HISTORY</th>
<th>ANALYTICS</th>
<th>BEST PRACTICES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Where are we now?</td>
<td>Where have we been?</td>
<td>Where are we now?</td>
<td>Where do we want to be?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen Armour</td>
<td>Katie Crawford, Chair</td>
<td>Tony Brown</td>
<td>Joe Bandy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly Moran, Chair</td>
<td>William Luis</td>
<td>Anjali Forber-Pratt</td>
<td>André Churchwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Dickerson</td>
<td>Edward Wright-Rios</td>
<td>Rolanda Johnson</td>
<td>Donna Ford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Dobson</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jana Lauderdale</td>
<td>Sankaran Mahadevan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesse Ehrenfeld</td>
<td></td>
<td>William Robinson</td>
<td>Ebony McGee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiffany Patterson</td>
<td></td>
<td>Keivan Stassun, Chair</td>
<td>Greg Melchor-Barz, Chair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| F. PHASE 2 Subcommittees: Draft Recommendations |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Climate &amp; Culture</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Faculty &amp; Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anjali Forber-Pratt</td>
<td>Donna Ford</td>
<td>Joe Bandy, Chair</td>
<td>Jana Lauderdale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory Melchor-Barz, Chair</td>
<td>Rolanda Johnson</td>
<td>Katie Crawford</td>
<td>Ebony McGee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly Moran</td>
<td>Keivan Stassun, Chair</td>
<td>Tony Brown</td>
<td>William Robinson, Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiffany Patterson</td>
<td>Edward Wright-Rios</td>
<td>Frank Dobson</td>
<td>Keivan Stassun</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Administration, Governance, and Accountability | Community Engagement & Research Centers | |
|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------| |
| Andre Churchwell | Ellen Armour, Chair | |
| Dennis Dickerson, Chair | Joe Bandy | |
| Jesse Ehrenfeld | William Luis | |
| Beverly Moran | Sankaran Mahadevan | |
II. VOICES OF THE VANDERBILT COMMUNITY

The work of creating a diverse, inclusive, and just community at Vanderbilt could never be successful if the process of envisioning our future was not open to the many voices that compose our campus community. The diverse voices of Vanderbilt represent an invaluable resource for the university in its efforts to fulfill its mission and strive to be an example of excellence in higher education. However, hearing and heading all campus voices is absolutely critical to Vanderbilt’s efforts to foster a dynamic and diverse intellectual community, and to build a place of belonging for all students, staff, and faculty. Vanderbilt cannot achieve inclusion and the trust that community requires without listening to all voices and dedicating itself to supporting the growth and development of all members of the community.

Therefore, it was exceedingly clear to the Committee on Diversity, Inclusion, and Community that we must honor the goals of diversity and inclusion in the very process that is designed to achieve them, or else we will fail in our efforts. With this principle driving us, the Committee embarked on a process to hear from as many voices on campus as possible in this year of work, and to rigorously investigate a wide array of diversity and inclusion issues that were brought to our attention.

Specifically, we engaged in several types of forums to hear a variety of community voices on issues of diversity, inclusion, and community. From these many forums the Committee has received a world of knowledge that has informed every aspect of our work and the creation of this report.

Most important, our recommendations for a more diverse and inclusive Vanderbilt community have been generated through these forums in which we learned of challenges and opportunities for Vanderbilt’s growth. However, every component of the committee’s full report has been shaped by the input of partners and allies across campus, and thus represents a collective spirit of change for Vanderbilt. Some of the results of these forums are present in the Appendices in the form of reports. Please see below in the list of these forums for guidance to specific appendices.

Forums for hearing community voices:

**Town Hall Meetings.** We held six town halls across campus, including two for all students, one for graduate students, two for staff, and one for the Faculty Senate. Each was advertised widely and held in varying places and times to ensure greater attendance.

**Special Topics Meetings.** Throughout the Fall and Spring we held meetings for different campus constituencies of students, faculty, and staff to discuss multiple issues of equity and inclusion on campus, including race/ethnicity, LGBTQI, gender, religion, disability, class, and occupational status (particularly staff and non-tenure track faculty). These group-specific concerns and issues, as well as proposals for change, are present in Appendix A.

**Task Force Discussions of Tough Questions.** The Committee identified several important questions that were particularly challenging for the Vanderbilt community and the work of furthering diversity and inclusion on campus. For each question, we asked a group of students, staff, and faculty to come together and discuss them. These questions were:

- How do we define “diversity?”
- How do diversity and inclusion support or challenge academic freedom?
- How do we define a culture and climate that is supportive of diversity, inclusion and community?
- How might we ensure accountability to the goals of diversity, inclusion, and community?
- How do we understand the salience of race among all of our efforts to support a diverse and inclusive community?

**Focus Groups.** In the Spring of 2016, the Committee had Sirota Consulting conduct three focus groups for each of the following subgroups: undergraduate students, graduate students, faculty, and staff. The purpose was to discuss each group’s thoughts about the climate of diversity, inclusion, and community at Vanderbilt. These data collected through the focus groups is present in Appendix B.

**Rollout Discussions.** Throughout the Spring and Summer of 2016, the Co-Chairs and Executive Chair held over 40 discussions with representatives from every unit on campus including the Chancellor, all Vice Chancellors, the Deans of all Colleges and Schools, Senior Leadership, Student Leadership, the Faculty Senate, Community Town Halls, the University Staff Advisory Council, the Dean of Students Staff, the Staff and Faculty of the Martha Rivers Ingram Commons, as well as the leadership of Greek Life, the Margaret Cuninggim Women’s Center, the KC Potter Center, the Bishop Johnson Black Cultural Center, and many other units across campus. These discussions offered opportunities for all campus constituencies to offer criticisms and suggestions to amend our recommendations.
III. A VISION FOR A DIVERSE AND INCLUSIVE VANDERBILT IN 2030

This section envisions the diverse, inclusive, university community Vanderbilt can become by 2030 through the efforts of all its constituents on campus (students, staff, faculty, to administrators) and beyond (from the Nashville community to the University’s worldwide alumnae/i). This is NOT a description of where we are but of what we want to become. In an effort to capture what diversity looks like in practice we use present tense language in this section in the hope that each statement will be true for Vanderbilt in 2030.

A. Visioning Community

When people throughout the world look at Nashville they see a leader in finding solutions to 21st century problems, with a lot of the credit for Nashville’s social transformation going to Vanderbilt University. Each College and subdivision within the University works to bring Vanderbilt University and the surrounding Nashville community the best that the world has to offer. Key drivers of the University’s success include its need-blind undergraduate admissions process combined with the promise of debt-free graduation, and its approach to residential learning as exemplified by the Peabody Commons and Kissam Quad. Because of the example of what class sensitive admissions produced on the undergraduate level, the University committed to additional funding for graduate students and increased its financial aid for professional students as well.

Because Vanderbilt University focuses on community, there are no borders between the University and the Metro Area/county: Vanderbilt University researchers, and their partners at the other institutions of higher education in the region—in particular Nashville’s historically Black universities (Tennessee State University, Fisk University, Meharry College of Medicine and Dentistry, and American Baptist College)—enrich and investigate the Nashville economy. This has helped drive and sustain Nashville’s embrace of demographic diversity and support for economic and cultural creativity, factors that have turned Nashville into the model city for the 21st century. As they did in earlier times, students from Vanderbilt and Nashville’s Historically Black Colleges and Universities’ learn together as shuttle busses run daily between the campuses and students routinely take courses at all five institutions (along the lines of the five college consortium made up of Amherst, Hampshire College, Mount Holyoke, Smith, and the University of Massachusetts Amherst and in Southern California at Claremont Colleges including Pitzer, Pomona, McKenna, Harvey Mudd, and Keck Graduate College).

One Vanderbilt contribution that everyone points to as immensely transformative of the Metro area is the decision to pay every Vanderbilt staff member a living wage. Vanderbilt’s recognition that the University depends on the labor of all its workers fueled its decision to take all necessary steps to ensure that every staff member makes a fair wage and that the children of the lowest paid Vanderbilt workers are the largest subgroup of employee children that receive tuition support. Vanderbilt students contribute to Nashville through tutoring, working at an active on campus day care center, big brother and sister relationships, and other forms of engagement many of which involve the young children of Vanderbilt University staff.

In addition to a living wage for all University workers and tuition benefits flowing to staff members and their families, Vanderbilt created affordable housing for its students, faculty, and staff near the University and worked with the Metro Nashville government to support an easy to use and well managed public transportation system. The affordable housing was used by professional students, graduate students, and staff members thereby increasing the sense of a unified Vanderbilt community.

Each year, the University performs a satisfaction survey of faculty, students, and staff. The survey also monitors salaries by race and sex. Each year the University confirms that it is aware of its commitment to treat faculty and staff fairly and each year faculty and staff confirm that they feel valued at the University and that it is hard to move people from the jobs and communities that Vanderbilt helped build. The survey was one of many ways that the Vanderbilt community was able to make Greek life even more relevant and vibrant on campus. As the Vanderbilt community explored its history of exclusion and helped create its path towards inclusion and excellence, Greek life on campus did the same. Many of the programs that bring the Vanderbilt community together come from Greek life and the many other student organizations that grace the campus and that have learned to create community. Even fundraising flourishes at Vanderbilt University as alums are eager to give back to the university that created such a rich, diverse, and inclusive residential environment for them to learn in and grow.
B. Visioning Inclusion

Because brilliance is equally distributed throughout the planet, a fact reflected in the population of the United States, Vanderbilt University looks like the United States and everyone who arrives on campus feels that they have finally come home. No matter their language, religion, area of specialization or learning style—no matter the body they inhabit or the country that they come from—the world knows that Vanderbilt University is where serious work gets done and all people are respected and cherished. Vanderbilt is a shining example where diversity has led to a stimulating, productive learning environment, leading to solutions to the most challenging problems that face the United States.

Vanderbilt University commits to attracting and producing the best scholars, teachers, students, and staff in the world. Through technology, sophisticated networks, and relentless recruiting, Vanderbilt University has crafted creative and innovative admissions and recruiting processes that ferret out students, teachers, and staff that other universities often miss, until we have assembled the best and most diverse community that the world has to offer.

C. Visioning Diversity

Diversity supposes a human, humane and welcoming community. To achieve such a community, Vanderbilt committed itself beginning in 2015 to defining and implementing a set of initiatives aimed at realizing and sustaining concrete and specific goals in demographic diversification and creating a more inclusive campus culture. Vanderbilt sought and seeks to realize this vision without compromising free speech and freedom of ideas, which are central to an intellectually rigorous and humane community of faculty, staff and students.

Every institution has a past and that past is each school’s foundation. Whatever comes after, whatever change is made, is laid over that past history. Thus, fulfilling those goals required that Vanderbilt University confront its complex history; one marked, like most elite institutions in the U.S., for much of its existence by practices that were not inclusive and, more recently, by attempts to provide more inclusive opportunity for all members of our community, regardless of race, class, gender or sexual identity, religious affiliation, or ability status. In 2016, the University adopted an ambitious set of benchmarks and a timetable by which to measure its success at diversification and inclusion. Those goals have been met on schedule. Sustaining those achievements, however, requires ongoing vigilance with regard to historic forms of discrimination and emergent ones. It requires, as well, honest appraisals of what’s working and what’s not, and a long-term commitment to innovation where necessary. The University has put in place a robust system of accountability headed by the University’s Chief Diversity Officer that runs throughout the different schools and the different levels of the University community. The University continues to examine and challenge its educational practices, its training of graduate and undergraduate students in all fields, and its hiring and retention practices to ensure that they embody the values on which humane community rests.

D. Attributes of Vanderbilt 2030

Vanderbilt in 2030 is characterized by certain attributes that serve to promote diversity and inclusion. They include:

1. An educational mission that integrates commitment to diversity of perspective as well as demographic diversity at every level

2. The expectation that every community member brings excellence to the institution. Title and status reflect not a hierarchy of privilege, but a distribution of labor and responsibility. At Vanderbilt, all workers learn and all learners work. Every voice is valued without regard to rank, race, ethnicity, religion, nationality, class, gender or sexual identity, or ability status.

3. A curriculum that constantly educates toward the world in all its diversity

4. Curricular and co-curricular activities that teach each member of the Vanderbilt community to work together and to delight in open, respectful, and enlightened conversation across differences

5. A community that values emotional intelligence and uses that intelligence consistently when addressing issues of race, ethnicity, religion, nationality, class, gender or sexual identity, or ability status

6. A community that values different ways of learning and communicating
7. Vanderbilt students who graduate as global citizens with wide cultural competency. The alumnae/i—undergraduate, professional, and graduate—are known for welcoming diversity and helping to create inclusive, thriving communities and institutions. In recognition, portrait galleries and building nomenclature now honor not just Vanderbilt’s patrons and former leaders, but alumnae/i who exemplify the University’s goals of producing change agents.

8. Vanderbilt University’s best practices include honesty and transparency regarding exclusion: what it is, how it takes place, how it is maintained, and how it is overcome. For example, after much discussion, the former Confederate Memorial Hall was renamed, but its history has not been forgotten or glossed over. Instead, a portion of the building has been repurposed as a gallery that acknowledges and contextualizes the building’s history.

E. Drivers that Helped to Create Vanderbilt 2030

1. Recognition that facets of identity like class, race, sexuality, ability status, religion, and gender are conditioning categories that can undercut and negatively impact other social factors such as education or income.

2. A vision of diversity that was broad and specific, global and local. Vanderbilt recognized that its diversity efforts must attend to specific demographic subgroups so that all subgroups are considered equally when it comes to admissions, hiring, retention or mentoring.

3. The University also sought to expand its commitment to welcoming the full spectrum of diversity in sexual orientation and gender identity/expression and in ability level. For example, it quickly moved to establish policies and procedures that officially recognized the self-identified gender and chosen name of transgendered students, faculty and staff and the University extended these procedures to other community members who wished similar services for a variety of reasons. As a self-insured entity, the University ensured that its health care benefits provide financial and medical support for a wide variety of services without regard to sexual orientation and gender identity/expression. In addition to being Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certified, the University committed itself to making all buildings fully and easily accessible to people with mobility and sight impairments.

4. At various points in its history, Vanderbilt had established programs and centers aimed specifically at promoting diversity and supporting inclusion. In recognition of the important role these programs would continue to play, the University greatly expanded the financial resources provided to these programs to ensure that they continue to advance teaching and scholarship and extend Vanderbilt’s reputation as an established leader in cultivating exemplary practices of diversification and inclusion.

5. Faculty, staff and students have regular and routine access to education in best practices for promoting inclusion outside and inside the classroom. For example, through the Center for Teaching, faculty learn how to model inclusion of gender non-conforming students, multimodal pedagogies for addressing different learning styles, and strategies for turning difficult classroom situations into productive “teaching moments.”

6. The University includes openness to and competence with difference as part of its metrics for each employee’s evaluation process.
IV. DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION: WHAT IT IS, WHY IT IS IMPORTANT, AND HOW TO ACHIEVE IT

This section outlines the research basis for why diversity and inclusion are essential to Vanderbilt’s performance and bottom line as an institution that strives for excellence. But before we discuss “why diversity,” one of most basic questions that must be addressed is what we even mean by “diversity” and “inclusion.” Which identities/categories are implied by “diversity,” who is to be “included,” in what, and when?

A. What is Diversity and Inclusion?

The committee takes a very broad view of what diversity means for a great university community like Vanderbilt—race, color, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, age, disability, religion, national origin, genetic information, military service, gender identity, gender expression, and class (socioeconomic status)—and thus the term diversity provides a convenient shorthand for these various identities and categories, and it provides a useful way for talking about equity.

By itself “diversity” does not get at underlying issues of marginalization, privilege, and power. Ultimately, we seek a commitment to justice, which means a willingness to name injustices and to identify when and where ongoing exclusions occur. As a community we must also not lose sight of the need for representation by all groups at Vanderbilt.

To us, diversity and inclusion are not simply shorthand for “all are welcome” but also—crucially—lenses through which we as an institution ask of ourselves a series of tough, pointed questions motivated by justice and equality and by the expectation that we should always seek to hold ourselves to the highest standards: Who currently does not feel welcome here, and how can we do better? Who currently feels excluded, and how can we do better? Which voices and perspectives have not been heard, and how can we do better? Have contributions gone unrecognized or undervalued, and how can we do better?

Connected to these questions are the questions of privilege and intersectionality. We all enjoy certain privileges based on the degrees to which we hail from or identify with the majority or dominant identities in our society. At the same time, most people are not simply privileged or not, but rather experience a complex mix of privilege, power, and marginalization based on the real complexities of our identities. For example, in today’s society, a Black gay student from a college-educated, upper class family knows the financial freedom and strong preparation to succeed at an elite, private university but may have experienced ostracization on the basis of sexual orientation and the constant fear of racial profiling. A white woman tenured professor in the sciences may have the luxuries of being in the majority racially and of having job security, but may have experienced the discrimination and sexism in a male-dominated profession. The Latino Christian employee who knows the advantages of affiliation with the religious mainstream may also have felt the discrimination of racism and the indignity of earning less than a living wage. All of us occupy identities and social positions that are multiple and complex, bearing forms of privilege and marginality. Therefore, to create opportunities for full participation in campus life, we all must be mindful of the many complexities of power and privilege operating on campus.

To be sure, a great university is ultimately about ideas, academic freedom, and the pursuit of truth. Therefore, intellectual diversity is central to Vanderbilt’s educational and scholarly mission, and there can be no place at Vanderbilt for intolerance of ideology or denial of free expression of ideas. A truly diverse and inclusive Vanderbilt community will welcome and engage the full range of diverse human identities, backgrounds, experiences, and perspectives, and this will further enhance our collective intellectual and ideological depth and breadth.

For all of these reasons, examining our diversity from the standpoint of demographic identity does matter. Representation is not about quotas or mere “diversity by numbers.” Yet, if all are welcome in principle but the data show that certain groups are missing or remain underrepresented, how can we reap the benefits of a campus that is diverse in practice? If all are free to express their ideas in principle, but the data show that certain groups do not feel comfortable expressing their views, how can we claim to be truly inclusive? Throughout this report, more and better collection and analysis of quantitative and qualitative data—who is represented and who is missing, who experiences a respectful climate and who doesn’t—feature prominently in our recommendations.

We must also acknowledge that an inclusive community does not necessarily mean that everyone has a seat at every table at all times. Any organization has hierarchies of responsibility and authority and accountability; not everyone gets a vote in all decisions, yet we can strive for shared governance in which all have voice. Any vibrant, pluralistic, broadly inclusive institution will have affinity groups and micro-communities that provide essential supports and belonging, especially for those in the minority; not everyone has to belong to everything, yet we can insist on mutual respect and tolerant co-existence as well as providing opportunities for meaningful
interchange and dialogue and learning through cross-pollination of ideas.

Finally, then, inclusivity may ultimately be something that is known when it is seen. In that spirit, we suggest the following as markers of a truly inclusive Vanderbilt community:

- Every person feels respected and physically safe at Vanderbilt
- Every person feels that they belong at Vanderbilt
- Every person feels that they are a valued, contributing, and needed part of Vanderbilt
- Every person enjoys the freedom to challenge and the responsibility to be challenged
- Every person can affirmatively answer the following questions:
  - "I have the privilege of…"
  - "I have the power to…"
  - "I can make decisions about…"
  - "I have voice in …"

**B. Emphasis on Diversity as a Living Concept**

As times change, so must our definition of diversity. If we froze our definition in the 1980s, for example, we might not have included gender identity, but in 2016 our understanding of diversity includes gender identity issues. Accordingly, instead of creating a limiting definition of diversity centered on a set group of people or practices, we believe that a better approach is to acknowledge that diversity of all types leads to Vanderbilt University’s core value of nurturing and reproducing excellence.

Thus, for example, when we took our recommendations to the community, we were challenged to include political viewpoint diversity, international students and scholars, class, and non-tenure track faculty, within our charge. We happily expanded our investigations to include these topics.

We believe that our work is stronger for our refusal to define diversity in a static way, and we believe the university must continually examine itself, its people, its practices and culture, to ensure that diversity and inclusion and excellence remain central to the university’s core values—in every generation.

**In short:** Diversity seeks the inclusion of the experiences, perspectives, and identities of all groups and individuals. This inclusivity obligates the university to forge out of this diversity a community of learning, respect, and human mutuality.

**C. Why Diversity and Inclusion Are Priority**

In this report, we reaffirm a vision as a great institution of higher education and scholarship in the world, of creating a diverse and inclusive university community at Vanderbilt: We seek a diverse and inclusive Vanderbilt community because it will make Vanderbilt even greater, because it will enhance Vanderbilt’s ability to deliver on its mission, and because it will position Vanderbilt for leadership and distinction and impact and meaning—to make the world a better place—for decades to come. It is the right and moral and just thing to do, and it also happens to be a key to our bottom line.

As a leading institution of higher education founded with the purpose of advancing a united American democracy, there is perhaps nothing more philosophically fundamental to our mission than advancing learning and citizenship, which are two of the main benefits that emerge from diverse living and learning environments. Building on the work of Patricia Gurin at the University of Michigan, we consider the role of diversity, broadly defined, as having “far-ranging and significant educational benefits for both learning and democracy outcomes, and that these benefits extend to all students, non-minorities and minorities alike.”31 The goals of learning and citizenship are also closely connected to higher education’s historically grounded mission of teaching, research and service.32

The educational benefits have been bolstered by fundamental social psychological research that has pointed to the ways in which student performance improves in diverse settings. As Claude Steele, one of the leading researchers in this field, noted: “A central policy implication of the research discussed here is that unless you make people feel safe from the risk of these identity predicaments in identity-integrated settings, you won’t succeed in reducing group achievement gaps or in enabling people from different backgrounds to work comfortably and well together.”33 And of all the ways to make...
students feel wanted and safe is to have a professoriate that is as diverse as the students and society they serve, according to the findings of Doug Massey and his collaborators. Moreover, the effects of diversity pay off both in the near- and long-term, creating richer learning environments and more productive contributors to society.

Indeed, a robust research literature has emerged on the power of diversity—our differences of identity, experience, education, and training—to achieve many standards for organizations of all types, including but not only universities: 1) make organizations generally better able to innovate, solve problems, and increase productivity; 2) lead universities to deliver better research, generate new forms of scholarship and creativity, and enhance the academic success of students; and 3) make individuals smarter and better equipped to succeed and to lead in the real world. A recent McKinsey analysis showed that companies in the top quartile of gender- and ethnically-diverse companies were more likely outperform those in the bottom quartile by 15% and 35% respectively: in short, diversity correlates positively with market success.

Key to these benefits of diversity is the centrality of cognitive and intellectual diversity—diverse sources of knowledge, diverse forms of expertise, and diverse ways of knowing, including neuro-diversity—for innovation, creativity, and productivity.

But does diversity cause, or merely correlate with, success? As Katherine Phillips explains, there is evidence for the former:

Large data-set studies have an obvious limitation: they only show that diversity is correlated with better performance, not that it causes better performance. Research on racial diversity in small groups, however, makes it possible to draw some causal conclusions. Again, the findings are clear: for groups that value innovation and new ideas, diversity helps.

Remarkably, this study suggests, the positive effects toward creative problem-solving in diverse groups occur even when the group members do not bring new information; rather, simply the presence of difference and the perception that others might think differently are catalysts toward creativity and innovation. When, therefore, social diversity is in fact coupled with cognitive and intellectual diversity—diverse sources of knowledge, diverse forms of expertise, and diverse ways of knowing, including neuro-diversity—we can expect all the more innovation, creativity, and productivity.

In The Difference: How the Power of Diversity Creates Better Groups, Firms, Schools, and Societies, Scott Page (in reference to U.S. Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia’s retort that the University of Michigan Law School seemed to desire diversity on the one hand and to be “super duper” on the other hand), sums up the emerging evidence for the benefits of diversity this way: “Diversity and super-duperness can go hand in hand… If we believe that differences in race, gender, ethnicity, physical ability, religion, sexual orientation, and so on correlate with cognitive diversity [e.g., diversity of experience], then being super-duper may require some identity diversity. And, moreover, super-duperness may always require identity diversity, long after discrimination ends.”

In an academic setting, this is critical. Diverse university faculties have been linked to: more effective, more feasible, and more innovative research outcomes with greater productivity; extending the range of scholarship in traditional disciplines, developing new areas of study, and increasing intellectual breadth; and increasing the success of diverse students. Moreover, a diverse faculty plays a key role in setting the intellectual tone of the university: “We cannot achieve the widest and best range of carefully reasoned, independent views—all the while recognizing the role of consensus and community—without a diverse faculty.”

“If we limit the physics classroom to white students, or students whose presence in the classroom we leave unquestioned, we also limit the production of new information about the world... If that’s the case, then we all lose.”

—JEDIDAH ISLER

There are numerous examples of the ways that working with, and among, individuals from diverse backgrounds enhances intellectual diversity, creativity, problem solving, and other research goals; provides opportunities for more effective and thorough intellectual critique from a variety of viewpoints; and raises awareness of values such as fairness, equity, empathy, and civil disagreement. Moreover, at a university, having a more diverse faculty sets a tone for diversity that expands to enable the recruitment and success of a diverse student body.

The benefits of diversity in the classroom are likewise compelling. According to a recent Supreme Court brief, diverse classrooms helped minority students avoid stereotypes and discrimination which can impede achievement, and also encourages key educational benefits. Research also shows that exposure to diversity can also change the ways we think and the effectiveness of individual performance. The “friction” that naturally arises when individuals with different identities and backgrounds and experiences and worldviews interact is in reality a necessary part of learning, of becoming more equipped with diverse tools for success, and indeed of learn-
ing how to learn to become so equipped. As an institution entrusted to educate and to prepare for global citizenship and leadership, and as a great university that strives to model and inculcate the habits of excellence, Vanderbilt must not succumb to intellectual laziness or to coddling comfort by not giving our students the ultimately empowering—if hard-earned—benefits of living and learning in a truly diverse and inclusive campus community.

In response to U.S. Supreme Court Chief Justice John Robert’s question about what “benefits of diversity [does] a minority student bring to a physics class”, Vanderbilt’s own Dr. Jedidah Isler—a decorated astrophysicist who is also an African American woman—wrote in The New York Times:

The purpose of the classroom is to build a tool kit and to understand what we know in the hopes of uncovering something that we don’t. It’s the door through which we create new physicists. If we limit the physics classroom to white students, or students whose presence in the classroom we leave unquestioned, we also limit the production of new information about the world—and whose perspective that world will reflect. If that’s the case, then we all lose.45

Isler’s view is in concert with studies demonstrating the importance of recruiting a diverse student body and the value of diversity to educational processes.46 Moreover, in order to keep pace with larger trends, our diversity efforts must be ongoing and even increasing in order to keep pace with larger trends and remain engaged with the upcoming pool of potential students. According to a recent special report in The Chronicle of Higher Education, “If they continue to fall short of diversity efforts, colleges risk disconnecting from the larger culture. By 2020, minority students are expected to account for 45 percent of the country’s public high-school graduates, up from 38 percent in 2009.”47

Yet the benefits of diversity are not limited to the intellectual work of faculty and students. Workplace cultures that are intentionally inclusive are associated with improved communication, productivity, teamwork, and innovation—not to mention employee satisfaction, loyalty, and retention.48 Altogether, the benefits of a diverse community can affect all corners of the living, learning, and working environments of all members of our community.

This all sounds good, but we know from experience that diversity doesn’t come easily. Research shows that diversity of identities and backgrounds in an organization can cause discomfort, difficult interactions, less trust at the outset, greater perceived interpersonal conflict, more difficulty with communication, less cohesion, more concern about disrespect, and other problems.49 In light of recent tensions centered on differences of identity and background at many colleges and universities—including at Vanderbilt—why would we invite discomfort?

“If they continue to fall short of diversity efforts, colleges risk disconnecting from the larger culture. By 2020, minority students are expected to account for 45 percent of the country’s public high-school graduates, up from 38 percent in 2009.”

—BETH MCMURTRIE

Moreover, there is evidence that many of the most readily and easily implemented initiatives to increase diversity—such as diversity education or evaluations—actually have minimal effects.50 To be sure, there are also scholars who believe it to be critical to a diverse environment. Sustainable, lasting, and systemic change within universities requires a more large-scale effort involving many members of the community.51 In light of the fact that achieving this level of sustained support and adoption of new programs will be difficult and perhaps costly, why would we invest our resources to this end?

We must invite discomfort because the mark of a truly great university is not comfort, it is excellence. And we must prepare to dedicate all necessary time and resources because the mark of an initiative worth pursuing is not ease of implementation, it is value. If Vanderbilt is going to be a great university that excels in its collective and individual intelligence and in its capacity for innovation and leadership, and that pursues what is valuable, we need diversity.
**D. The Case for Increasing Diversity at Vanderbilt Now**

Numerous recent initiatives have pushed academic institutions toward thorough, thoughtful, and decisive action for diversity and inclusion. “Universities need to take on a strong leadership role that unambiguously states a commitment to diversity in their mission statements,” states one guidebook for STEM educators. Recent initiatives at Vanderbilt are in line with this potential new movement, and indeed are poised to make Vanderbilt a leader in this area.

In an address to the faculty, Chancellor Nicholas Zeppos announced in August 2015 that “if Vanderbilt does not address issues of diversity, inclusion and culture...it will fail as an institution”; he noted that these issues were his “most important” priority. In November 2015, George C. Hill joined Vanderbilt as Chief Diversity Officer and Vice Chancellor for Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion. And throughout the 2015-2016 academic year, both as assembled by the Committee on Diversity, Inclusion, and Community, and also on their own initiative, numerous student, faculty, and staff groups have come together to think strategically about these needs—and effective ways to achieve them—within our community.

This report contains detailed findings of the committee, including a survey of our university’s past and present standing in regard to diversity and concrete recommendations of steps to move toward our vision for a diverse community for all Vanderbilt faculty, staff, and students. Through its various research summaries, subcommittee reports, and recommendations, it provides a wide set of views through which to understand and pursue diversity. Altogether, these components emphasize the importance and relevance of diversity to the Vanderbilt community, and they provide a path toward that goal.

Of course, diversity and inclusion may be an ideal worth considering, but can we realistically expect substantive progress toward these goals in a university setting in the current political, social, and cultural climate? Our answer is, resoundingly, in the affirmative: creating a diverse, inclusive campus is achievable. Moreover, Vanderbilt’s success or failure to do so will have a marked impact on the overall success of the university for years to come.

One clear example of both the possibility to increase diversity, and the positive results of doing so, is in the case of faculty hiring. There are methods to do so which are accepted and embedded into the regularly compliance applicable to universities. As one report put it:

If there is one area where universities are on solid legal ground in promoting diversity efforts, it may be faculty recruitment and hiring. As federal contractors, universities are still bound by Executive Order 11246, which carries a requirement to develop an Affirmative Action Plan that includes an analysis of the utilization and underutilization of minorities and women... It also requires that contractors reach out to a diverse pool of candidates, although the actual selection of an employee should be done regardless of race or ethnicity. In other words, not only are universities able to recruit based on diversity, they are required to do so!

The same ability, and indeed imperative, to increase diversity and inclusion within the ranks of our faculty extends throughout our community. In the Recommendations section below, we outline practical, actionable steps that Vanderbilt—as it is now, and as we hope it will become—can take to reach these goals.

This is a moment of opportunity for Vanderbilt. By taking strategic action to increase diversity now, we will not merely pursue an internal goal, but also have the opportunity to lead. In a survey of institution-wide strategic plans or diversity web pages from 178 universities, roughly half did not have a specific plan for diversity and inclusion. Although there is progress being made at many universities, it is by no means a wholesale move. By taking strong steps in this direction, Vanderbilt can quickly position itself as a national and international leader in this area.

“...not only are universities able to recruit based on diversity, they are required to do so!”

—STANDING OUR GROUND REPORT

For additional background, the committee’s members with content expertise in this area produced a summary review of the relevant research literature in Appendix C.

Diversity is important. This is the conclusion from decades of research in organizational science, psychology, sociology, and economics. Diversity enhances creativity because it encourages the search for novel information and perspectives, leading to better decision making and problem solving and to unfettered discoveries. At a time when Vanderbilt has issued a new, visionary strategic plan that emphasizes interdisciplinary and transformative discoveries toward solving the world’s most pressing challenges, and that emphasizes immersive experiences for students to prepare them for leadership in the world, Vanderbilt risks mission failure if we fail to tap the full power of human diversity—in our students, our faculty, our staff, and our university leadership including our Board of Trust.
E. An Enduring Architectural Approach to Diversity and Inclusion

Because increasing diversity at Vanderbilt is a complex task that requires sustained change from across our campus, we cannot take steps haphazardly, and we cannot allow certain areas to be overlooked even while other areas are making gains.7 Rather, we must plan and act in a thoughtful, intentional way. In other words we must approach this task with a structure—an “architecture”—that will help us achieve these results.50 An architectural approach would include orienting each small change toward larger, systemic changes, and ensuring that all parts of the institution are cooperating and benefiting from these changes.

The goal of this architecture is to enable the full participation of all individuals across the university. Because full participation is normally constrained by “cultural dynamics that reproduce patterns of under-participation and exclusion” it requires a commitment to change existing institutional structures, sometimes in a wholesale way.51 However, projects toward this goal “often proceed on separate tracks, without ongoing or collaboration among them.”52 An architectural approach can systematize change in ways that allows the goal of full participation to be realized across a university by considering various initiatives “in relation to the systems within which they operate, the structures that shape their actions, the design that creates the structures, and the spaces within which they work.”53

Moreover, a careful architecture for diversity and full participation allows more intentional and wholesale changes: not merely the “first-order” changes which improve on existing initiatives but ignore core problems, but also “second-order” changes that are transformational to the institution as a whole.62 An architectural approach enables this more wholesale change by, first of all, identifying “organizational catalysts” who can facilitate cross-institutional connections.

Moreover, we submit these recommendations in view of this architectural redesign: not as small changes to existing programs here and there, but rather as an effort to fully shape the way that Vanderbilt views itself and achieves its mission. The changes we suggest in each individual set of recommendations below depend upon simultaneous growth in each of the other areas. Only by addressing our problems through a holistic, architectural, institution-wide lens can we truly say that we have made effective and lasting changes.

Many of our existing and envisioned catalysts for success in increasing diversity include the idea of “bridging” either explicitly or implicitly. Bridging involves enabling people to move from their current place to another place they hope to reach in the future.

In this sense, the entire university experience is about bridging. Vanderbilt enables admitted undergraduates, typically just out of high school, to attain the skills, knowledge, and experiences necessary to reach new educational and career attainments after graduation. Likewise, through bridging methods including appropriate mentoring, funding, research time, and more, Vanderbilt enables promising junior faculty to become internationally-recognized leaders in their fields of study. In this sense, Vanderbilt provides bridges for all its community members, including students and faculty as well as staff, to reach their goals. Yet our proven, existing bridges—paths that have functioned to enable many individuals to move forward—have limitations. Not all paths to success may be accessible or useful for all people.

“Theese full participation projects often proceed on separate tracks, without ongoing interaction or collaboration… An architectural approach invites consideration of these initiatives in relation to the system in which they operate, the structures that shape their actions, the design that creates the structures, and the spaces within which they work.”

- SUSAN STURM, ET AL.

For this reason, Vanderbilt must look to expand the ways in which it can create accessible bridges to success for all its community members, and even expand the reach of its bridges to admit new constituencies. One example of a bridging program to be expanded include the Fisk-Vanderbilt Masters-to-PhD Bridge Program. This program has proven to provide excellent students in certain natural science departments the opportunity and resources to excel in doctoral programs at Vanderbilt and other top universities. Another example is the Athletics Department’s summer Bridge Program for incoming student athletes, which has achieved a record of student athlete academic success that is the envy of the NCAA. Still another example is the pre-orientation bridge program for international students offered by the Owen School. At a number of other universities, bridging programs for postdocs to faculty have been developed, and we recommend the creation of such a program in this report.
Yet these programs have great potential to grow from just a few disciplines into a full spectrum of available paths for excellent students who need just such a bridge in order to fulfill their academic goals. There are innumerable more ways that Vanderbilt can expand existing bridges, and develop new ones, to assist a broad range of community members in meeting their diverse needs as they pursue paths of excellence.

In its report, *America's Unmet Promise: The Imperative for Equity in Higher Education*, the American Association of Colleges & Universities (AAC&U) frames the architectural approach to building diverse and inclusive campus communities in terms of the “equity-mindedness” of campus leaders: “Equity-minded leaders are aware of the historical context of exclusionary practices in higher education and recognize the impact of this history. They recognize the contradiction between the ideals of democratic education and social, institutional, and individual practices that contribute to persistent inequities in college outcomes. Equity-minded leaders also reject the ingrained habit of blaming inequities in access, opportunity, and outcomes on students’ own social, cultural, and educational backgrounds. Equity-minded leaders use this mindset to act for change. They recognize the need for systemic transformation... They invest their time, effort, and political capital into discussing these issues and mobilizing institution-wide efforts and community partnerships to address them.”

The AAC&U report recommends a set of principles for an architectural approach to “equity by design.” The first principle is that clarity in language, goals, and measures is vital to effective equitable practices. In this report, we assert that measurable goals, and the data to measure progress toward those goals, are of paramount importance to the architecture of this whole undertaking. The second principle is that “equity-mindedness” should be the guiding paradigm for language and action. This principle embodies the commitment to “fix the institution, not the individual.” As an example, in this report we recommend making academic sequences more accessible for all entering students. A third principle is that enacting equity requires a continual process of learning, disaggregating data, and questioning assumptions about relevance and effectiveness. In this report, we take the stance that organizational excellence demands that we continually interrogate what we think we know, and be honest and vigilant about what we do not know. For example, are there disparities in advancement to tenure for different groups of faculty by race and/or gender? If we do not know, what structures or processes must be put in place so that we can know in the future? The final principle is that equity must be enacted as a pervasive institution-wide ideal. Many of this report’s recommendations focus on concretely embedding equity into core university management operations such as budgeting, hiring and promotion policies, assessment, and internal accountability indicators.

Finally, it takes an entire campus to achieve this type of truly transformative change. Whether we belong to a minority or majority group, “we are all part of a community bound by shared history. We must use our understanding of that history to... ensure a bright future for all students and for our nation. That is America’s promise.” Thus, the work of creating a truly diverse and inclusive Vanderbilt community must be taken up as a project of the entire community—engaging our heads to understand, our hearts to care, and perhaps most importantly our hands to perform this vital labor for a better Vanderbilt and a better world. *Mens, cor, et manus.*
VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY

V. VANDERBILT’S HISTORY IN THE CONTEXT OF DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION

Vanderbilt University was founded in 1873 by virtue of Cornelius Vanderbilt’s gift to Central University. The Commodore’s stated goal for his gift was sectional reconciliation after the Civil War although he later added that he wanted to do something for the South because he married one of its noblest daughters. At the outset, the Methodist Episcopal Church, South church played a significant role in Vanderbilt’s structure. Board President Holland McTyeire and Chancellor Landon Garland were both Methodists, and while the school was Methodist sponsored, it was not denominational. At the same time, Southern Methodists made up much of its early constituency, and one aim of many supporters of the university was to improve the education of Methodist ministers.

Vanderbilt’s gift, while enabling the university to establish a basic structure that continues to grow and thrive to this day, also put in place patterns that continue to affect the faculty, student body, and general philosophy of the university. Local investment in the university lagged, and enrollment leaned heavily toward affluent, white families in and near Nashville. As such, the university tended to favor a relatively staid, conservative elite. This has meant that a reticence to embrace social and cultural change marks Vanderbilt’s founding history. Broader national trends, such as opening educational opportunities to women and minorities, arrived relatively late to the university, first resisting before giving way to acquiescence and later attempting to catch up. In short, Vanderbilt has been a latecomer to issues of diversity. Its past reveals an abiding tendency to follow.

The cornerstone for Kirkland Hall, the university’s first building, was laid in April, 1874. Initially, Kirkland Hall housed all the academic programs including engineering, Biblical Department, law, and medicine. Vanderbilt University awarded its first two Bachelor’s degrees in 1877 along with seven graduates from the 2-year non-degree Biblical program. In 1878 the numbers rose to five Bachelor’s degrees and six Bible graduates; and in 1879 there were 23 graduate students in residence with 12 Bachelor’s degrees awarded along with two MA’s and 2 PhDs. Phi Delta Theta received a charter for its Vanderbilt chapter in 1876 although the first dormitory was not erected until 1885. By 1886, there were eight fraternities on campus.

Originally, Vanderbilt University was meant to address educational standards by offering opportunities to white southern men. Many university supporters wanted Vanderbilt to improve education for Methodist ministers. Although Vanderbilt was Methodist sponsored, it was not denominational and did not house an actual seminary. Nevertheless, at the outset, the Methodist church played a significant role in Vanderbilt’s structure. Board President Holland McTyeire and Chancellor Landon Garland were both Methodists, and Southern Methodists made up much of the university’s early constituency. Enrollment leaned heavily toward affluent, white families in and near Nashville. As such, the university tended to favor a relatively staid, conservative elite which became reticent to embrace social and cultural change. From Cornelius Vanderbilt on, the university’s mission was education in a benighted land—the impoverished and defeated South. Images of regional inferiority made small achievements seem like major triumphs and possibly accounts for the self-congratulatory tone contained in many early university reports.

Although Vanderbilt’s gift enabled the university to establish a basic structure that continues to grow and thrive to this day, its size also put in place patterns that continue to affect the faculty, the student body, our neighbors in Davidson County, and the University’s general philosophy. In some ways, the publicity afforded Vanderbilt’s gift meant less money from southerners for southern education and fewer educational opportunities for Southern Blacks.

The early student body was almost entirely white and male. No white woman matriculated until 1895, but at least one white woman attended Vanderbilt classes every year from 1875 onward. Ward-Belmont College and Nashville College for Young Ladies sent some women to take classes at Vanderbilt and Kate Lupton—notably the daughter of a chemistry professor—began her classes in 1875. By 1879, Kate Lupton had met all requirements for an MA which she was awarded in a separate ceremony.

In 1887 the faculty asked the Board to admit women on the same basis as men but the student body objected, and the faculty withdrew the proposal. In 1889, the Vanderbilt Board of Trust declined the faculty’s request. Yet, the Board’s decision did not stop women from entering degree programs in very small numbers. In 1891, Dora Johnson became the first woman since Kate Lupton to receive her Bachelor’s degree. Also, in 1891, Annie Paschall received a scholarship to study at Vanderbilt University. But it was not until 1892 that Vanderbilt began regularly allowing women to receive degrees.

In 1894, Vanderbilt hired its first female instructor to teach voice to the Glee Club. In 1895, three women graduated in one year—then a record. In 1897, women formed a basketball team. In 1900, four women graduated and a woman from the Pharmacy Department won the Founder’s Medal.

The twentieth century saw advances for women, religious minorities, and Blacks at Vanderbilt. In 1915, Jewish students formed the Menorah Society and in 1928 Vanderbilt got its first Jewish Fraternity.
World War I and World War II saw Vanderbilt follow a national pattern. Facing sharp declines in male enrollment due to military enlistment, Vanderbilt temporarily allowed women a more prominent role on campus. In 1911, Eleanor Richardson won the Founder’s Medal. In 1913, 78 women (about 20% of the total university enrollment) were students. Only 22 of these women were from outside Nashville. The 56 Nashville women lived at home. Although Chancellor Kirkland resisted full co-education, a university Committee investigation in 1914-1915 reported out for an advisor for women, equal recognition of female students, a dean of women, and a social center or house for women. Around this time, Vanderbilt students produced their first play with Pauline Townsend of Belmont College as their director, instructor, and star. In 1913, Vanderbilt had a female librarian (Doris Sanders) and a female registrar (Mary W. Haggard). In 1918 Kate Tillet served as a history instructor and half of her students were women. At this time, the editor of The Commodore was a woman named Dorothy Bethurum, four women served as reporters for The Hustler, Stella Vaughn continued to coach a women’s basketball team, and a female student served as president of the senior class.

As the 20th century matured, women were increasing their numbers at Vanderbilt while winning many honors. The female students’ academic average was significantly above the men’s academic average. As women assumed more prominent, even dominant, role in campus activities and academics, a quota was instituted so that women would never take up more than 20% of the class. From 1921 to 1976, enrollment of female students was restricted. In 1920-21, women were excluded from student council and Honor Council. Instead of co-educational units, Vanderbilt formed separate (but unequal) councils by sex. In the 1920s, more women were on campus but their status was also more insecure. Victories had to be won over and over.

In 1923, two women were elected “sponsors” of the football team and sat on the team bench. Yet, women were still not allowed to play in marching band or lead cheers. Basic equity appeared unavailable except in the Nursing School and the Medical School. Still incremental progress continued.

In 1924, the Nursing School hired its first Asian faculty member, Dr. Li. 1924 was also the year of the Nursing School’s first male hires with Drs. Hollis, Paul Johnson, Goodrich, and Li. There were not enough nursing faculty to staff courses when the first Bachelor’s of Nursing program began in 1923, and so the School of Nursing hired MDs from the Vanderbilt hospital to staff its courses.

Women entered the School of Religion, the Dental School, and the Law School in 1916; the Medical School in 1926; and Engineering in 1929. In 1925, the University Woman’s Club offered to support a dean of women. Ada Bell Stapleton (also professor of English) was named the first dean of women on the Vanderbilt campus. In 1927, Kate Zerfoss made sure that Student Health, when it was established, was particularly accommodating to women. There were no women’s dormitories in 1927, but two houses took female boarders. In 1927, use of the YMCA gym enabled Vanderbilt University women to become eligible for Association of American University Women approval.

In 1925, Dr. Katherine Dodd became a pediatrics instructor. She eventually rose to the position of head of pediatrics in 1942. However, Dr. Dodd was replaced by a man the following year and resigned in 1945. The School of Nursing decided to become a true college in 1925-6 and attained its goal in 1930 although Nursing had trouble becoming a separate school while still servicing the medical school and hospital. Edith P. Brodie became director of the School of Nursing and nursing superintendent followed by Shirley Titus who became the Nursing School Dean in 1930. In 1928, Vanderbilt produced its first female PhDs since 1920 and its first female PhD ever in History. However, from 1931 onward, both the English and the History departments had at least one female PhD candidates each year.

By 1929, although women were about 25% of the student population they were winning a larger than their proportional share of MAs and serving as teaching fellows. Perhaps five or six women were instructors in the College. In 1943-1944 women students actually outnumbered men, but male students again became the majority in 1946.

White women were allowed to become students at Vanderbilt almost from the founding. That was not the case for Blacks, Asians, or other racial minorities. Until after World War II, the only Blacks employed at Vanderbilt worked in service positions. When Booker T. Washington was invited by Vanderbilt students to speak on campus in 1909, he was the first Black to come onto the campus in a non-servile role. By the end of the 1920s, race split Vanderbilt. A nucleus of the faculty was committed to equal rights with the School of Religion a center for racial reform. Edward Mims (chair of the English department from 1912 to 1942) and Chancellor James Kirkland (1893 to 1937) publicly opposed lynching. Yet, in 1926, Vanderbilt students protested an interracial forum organized by YMCA secretary William B. Jones and in 1948, when Vanderbilt played Yale in football, some alumni objected to having to play against a Black opposing player.

Indeed, Vanderbilt was not a leader when it came to challenging segregation at the university level. In 1938, the Supreme Court ruled that southern states had to offer equal opportunities for Blacks in higher education, mandating universities to admit Black students or provide them with viable alternatives. In 1942, President and Mrs. Roosevelt backed, and Mrs. Roosevelt attended, a conference of five hundred
people at the Nashville War Memorial Building that included equal Black participation (1/3 of the participants were Black) integrated seating, and entertainment from Paul Robeson's singing. The conference included participation from Vanderbilt's Student Christian Association headed by former YMCA secretary Henry Hart.

Hart and the Student Christian Association's faculty sponsor, Herman C. Nixon, supported equality for Blacks and advocated for a larger role for labor unions. The Student Christian Association speakers, such as Howard McClain, who defended Black equality, and Dean W. J. Faulkner of Fisk University who upset his Vanderbilt audience when he noted that there were about 8 million mixed race Americans, spoke out on race. Vanderbilt students' reactions to the Student Christian Association's programs on race were so intense that Board of Trust member James Stahlman pressured Chancellor Carmichael to shut down the program arguing that the Student Christian Association was using religion as a cover for confusing students over race, and Chancellor Carmichael received a petition asking him to have Hart removed from campus. (428) Chancellor Carmichael appointed a committee to look into the Student Christian Association. The committee report deplored the Student Christian Association's airing of race issues in a "time of great racial tension."(81) In 1945, Chancellor Carmichael ousted Hart, called for faculty oversight of all speakers' programs, and placed the Student Christian Association under supervision of the committee on student life and interest.

Jewish students and faculty were active participants in the Student Christian Association until 1958, when the Student Christian Association board sought to add "A fellowship of Christians," to its mission statement prompting a Jewish professor to resign and the Tennessean to remark on a growing rift between Christians and Jews. The conflict caused some on campus to question whether a non-denominational university like Vanderbilt should support sectarian religious organizations. After World War II, four religious organizations ministered to campus (but not through university funding): Wesley Foundation (Methodist); Canterbury House (Episcopal); Westminster House (Presbyterian); Newman Club (Catholic). The Jewish Student Organization also met on campus.

In 1947, Vanderbilt University opened the first Institute for Brazilian Studies in the United States. From 1950 to 1963, Vanderbilt expanded its international focus by adding the Latin American Studies program, and Russian and Chinese language instruction.

In the early 1950s, the State of Louisiana opened its public universities to Black students, and private universities recognized that they too must change. In 1952, the Divinity School faculty advocated for open admissions on moral and religious grounds, but the Board of Trust postponed a vote. From 1952 to 1962, Vanderbilt slowly removed racial restrictions from admission requirements. In 1950, the School of Nursing admitted its first Asian student, In-Ai Yang. In 1953, the Nursing School graduated its first Asian student, Amelia Mangay-Maglacas.

The School of Religion admitted its first Black student in 1953, prompting protests directed at Chancellor Branscomb and the Board. In 1955, the Rockefeller Foundation gave the School of Religion a $2.9 million infusion into endowment. An unspoken, but necessary, condition of the gift was the School's 1953 decision to admit Black students. The School of Religion's first Black student was Joseph A. Johnson, Jr. who later served as the second Black member of the Board. The Bishop Johnson Black Cultural Center bears his name.

The Law School admitted two Black students in 1956 to a barrage of off campus criticism. The two Black law students were asked not to eat in campus dining halls or play on intramural teams; indeed, they were advised not to use the campus gym at all although they were eventually allowed to sit in the student section at athletic events.

During 1950s, harassment of female students was part of Vanderbilt campus culture. Parody raids—some requiring police intervention—and male raids of female dormitories were common at a time when men outnumbered women 4 to 1 and opportunities for sexual intimacy were limited.

In 1958, the National Student Association (NSA) condemned racial segregation. Many Vanderbilt University students were offended by the NSA's declaration and the student body voted 775 to 362 to withdraw from NSA because of integration and other ideas they considered unacceptable to a "southern and conservative" point of view. Nevertheless, the Student Senate renewed its membership in NSA after heated debate. In 1960, the student senate again ignored its constituents' displeasure and renewed its NSA membership. In 1961, NSA endorsed sit-ins and civil disobedience to test the constitutionality of segregation laws.

In 1958, James Lawson applied to Vanderbilt in order to complete his B.D. Lawson was 31 years old and believed deeply in non-violent protest and pacifism. His beliefs led him to spend 11 months in federal prison as a conscientious objector before doing missionary work in India. Lawson was a new type of student for Vanderbilt University—older, experienced, Black, and not prepared to accept second class citizenship. When the Southern Christian Leadership Council decided to target Nashville lunch counters for sit-ins, Lawson instructed the student activists in non-violent protest techniques. Because of this training role, Nashville's Mayor West identified Lawson as a student leader and criminal.

Chancellor Branscomb considered the issue a matter of institutional survival. Chancellor Branscomb tried to get Lawson to back down, including invoking regulations for undergraduates designed to forestall parole raids. Lawson
understood the sit-ins as a matter of justice and Black self respect, and Lawson believed that Chancellor Branscomb was joining city authorities in blaming the victims of injustice. James Lawson also insisted his role was only to ensure that the protests remained non-violent. Dean Nelson tried to mediate, but he failed to take a clear position and wavered over Lawson’s prison record. Chancellor Branscomb gave Lawson the choice of withdrawal or expulsion. In 1960, James Lawson chose expulsion.

The Vanderbilt Student Senate backed Chancellor Branscomb’s decision to expel James Lawson, but many students protested in favor of James Lawson as well. When the faculty learned about the case mostly from the newspapers—a majority of the Divinity School faculty threatened to resign en masse. Eventually, 111 faculty members signed a petition supporting Lawson and 97 faculty members filed a counter petition supporting Chancellor Branscomb’s decision to expel. Recognizing that southern culture might be an issue, Chancellor Branscomb issued a new University rule urging faculty to exercise “discretion with respect to the admission of qualified Negro students outside the region.”

Also in 1960, Vanderbilt’s student body quality rose for the first time to the point that the University turned away highly qualified male applicants. In contrast, Vanderbilt turned away highly qualified female applicants from its founding. Even in the 1960s, Vanderbilt maintained a one third quota against women. Further, because the Engineering School was all male, and the Nursing School was small, in the 1960s only one fourth of all Vanderbilt students were female.

In 1961, Chancellor Branscomb asked the Board to approve open admissions for Blacks. By this time, other southern schools, including Peabody and Tulane, had already done so. The Hustler came out in favor of open admissions but the student senate opposed them. The faculty voted to remove all race restrictions and several pointed out the dangers of losing tax-exempt status and grant money if Vanderbilt continued to segregate. When it happened, the Board vote was not really in favor of full integration. The faculty asked that Blacks be admitted as equals; the Board was not willing to go that far. Instead, Chancellor Branscomb emphasized that only a very small number of Blacks would ever qualify for admission. The Board supported James Stahlman’s motion to allow the Chancellor to block admissions from Blacks who came from “outside the region.”

In 1963 four Black students applied for admission, but all four were rejected as unqualified. In 1964, as in 1875, the only Blacks on campus were employees doing menial tasks. In 1965, Vanderbilt started welcoming Black students in all schools; in 1966, it started actively recruiting Black students. Scholarships were earmarked for Black students and the Human Relations Council provided a vehicle for Blacks to express concerns to the administration. In 1967, basketball player Perry Wallace became the first Black athlete in the SEC. In 1967, the School of Nursing hired its first male Dean of Nursing, Luther Christian. In 1968, the School of Nursing admitted its first male student, Roy McRae who graduated in 1972. In 1970, Walter Murray became the first Black on the Vanderbilt University Board of Trust. Despite recruitment efforts, Black faculty remained extremely scarce. In 1968, there were only 4 Black faculty members on campus (one was a nutritionist; one held a joint appointment with Fisk).

In 1964, Chancellor Heard created an Impact Speakers’ series that brought a wide range of political views to campus from George Wallace (the segregationist presidential candidate and governor of Alabama) to Carl Braden (a prominent victim/opponent of House Un-American Activities Committee). In 1966, the Impact Speakers’ series hosted both Richard Nixon and Tom Hayden. In 1967, both Martin Luther King and Allen Ginsberg spoke.

The Impact Speakers’ series’ greatest challenge was Stokely Carmichael. Board of Trust member James Stahlman was especially distressed by Chancellor Heard’s invitation to Carmichael. The American Legion asked Chancellor Heard to withdraw the invitation; and the Tennessee State Senate denounced Carmichael as a racist. Although Carmichael’s speech was moderate, a scuffle near Fisk University turned into a riot. The local press blamed Vanderbilt University for the violence while Blacks on campus blamed the police.

The number of Black students, faculty, and administrators at Vanderbilt gradually increased. In 1966, the Vanderbilt University School of Medicine enrolled its first Black student, Levi Watkins, Jr. Watkins was one of approximately 100 students in his class. Currently, the Vanderbilt University School of Medicine enrolls between twenty and twenty-five percent under-represented minority students. The first Black student admitted to the Nursing School came in 1966 and graduated in 1970—Bobbi Jean Perdue.

By 1969-70, Vanderbilt had 18 Black undergraduates. In 1970-71, there were 35; in 1973-74 the number was up to 104. The College of Arts and Science approved the Afro-American Studies Program in 1969, although hiring and retaining Black faculty remained a problem. In 1971, Akbar Muhammad was appointed to chair Afro-American Studies, but he, and his two successors, soon left Vanderbilt for “more congenial jobs elsewhere.” The first Black professor in the Engineering School, William Mills, was placed in charge of minority recruitment where he enjoyed great success. In 1970, a local Black minister, Kelly Miller Smith, was hired by the Divinity School as an assistant dean. In 1968, Vanderbilt University entered a co-operative agreement with Meharry College of Medicine and Dentistry in biomedical engineering; in 1972, a DuPont grant allowed Fisk University students to
attend Vanderbilt University for a year. In 1981, there were still very few Black faculty and administrators (27 in 1982; 19 on faculty and some of them part-time).

Underrepresentation and discriminatory policies remained salient facts for women at Vanderbilt in the 1960s. Although the Board elected its first female trustee in 1964—Mary Jane Werthan—women lived under tight check-in rules with 11 pm curfew weekdays. In 1969, curfew was abolished for women over 21 and sophomores with parental permission. In 1970, mixed dorms allowed women the same privileges as men.

In 1968, the Vanderbilt Board of Trust approved a new class of recent graduate trustees. Three of the four new trustees were women, and, within 2 years, the Alumni voted in the first Black trustee. These positions had limited influence (they were brief terms of up to 4 years and they didn't serve on Board committees), but they did engage in policy debates and bring student voice to Board meetings.

In 1971, a team from the Department of Health Education and Welfare declared that Vanderbilt had a great deal of work to do after the passage of the Title IX because of its failure to commit to hiring and promoting women. According to HEW, Vanderbilt University had focused on recruiting Black students, while failing to hire and promote women.108 In 1972, at the urging of Professional Women at Vanderbilt, an ad hoc group of faculty and staff women who were concerned about the status of women at Vanderbilt University, Chancellor Alexander Heard commissioned a report on the status of women.109

The Commission on the Status of Women met from 1972 until its final report was issued in September 1976. The 200-page report, Women at Vanderbilt, detailed a litany of complaints by female students, faculty, and staff. Conkin writes that the commission's report resembled no other committee report at Vanderbilt:

It shocked many administrators...It raked the University over the coals on a number of issues: failure to provide complete or adequate data, failure to conform to the recent requirements of Title IX, and above all for the fact that women on this campus seldom receive equal treatment with men.107

The administration received the report in September, 1976 and reacted at first with stunted silence. Although the commission had requested that the report be widely disseminated on campus, it was not released for several months. The Hustler began reporting on the delay and wrote in an editorial on Dec. 10, 1976: "Apparentely, the Commission did its job all too well and in the process found some things that the University would rather they had not discovered."110

In the late 1960s, when the issue of women’s equity came to the forefront, there was little diversity at Vanderbilt, particularly on the faculty. Susan Wiltshire, a professor of classics who came to the University in the fall of 1971, recalled sitting in the back row at her first faculty meeting and looking out at a sea of bald white heads. Professor Wiltshire did not have a single female professor during her undergraduate studies at the University of Texas nor during her graduate studies at Columbia University. Thus, the fact that there were only 16 women on the 295-member Arts and Science faculty—and only four women with tenure—did not seem unusual. Yet one year later in 1972, the tide was began to turn. When Chancellor Heard agreed in April 1972 to appoint a commission to investigate the status of women, the Vanderbilt Hustler noted, “the discontent of women on campus is part of a movement which seems to be spreading across the nation.”109

In 1972, Martha Craig Daughtrey, who later became a federal appellate court judge, was the first woman on the Vanderbilt Law School faculty: "I can tell you it wasn't fun. A lot of us in those years were angry most of the time."110 Daughtrey was named to sit on the Commission on the Status of Women when it was first organized in 1972, and she went on to serve as one of its chairs before leaving the university in 1975 when she was appointed to the State Court of Criminal Appeals. Among the faculty women joining Daughtrey on the commission was Antonina Gove, who had come to Vanderbilt in 1969 as an assistant professor of Slavic languages. One of Gove's first experiences at the University was to serve on an Arts & Science committee that was revising college governance. Gove had very mixed feelings about her appointment to serve on the Commission on the Status of Women. One of those feelings was surprise. Soft-spoken, with no particular interest in the women's movement, Gove says she had never been an activist on any issue: “My appointment speaks volumes about what [kind of] women were on the faculty here. I didn’t have my consciousness raised until I was on the commission,” says Gove, who became a full professor and one of the few commission members still at Vanderbilt in the late 1990s.111 Gove served on the commission for the entire four years of its existence and served as co-chair with Jan Belcher, director of the News Bureau, in its final year, 1975-76. During its first years, the commission was a do-it-yourself effort, according to Daughtrey, with little staff support, an uncertain agenda and infrequent meetings. Realizing the huge task they faced, commission members pressured the administration to hire a staff person. Finally, in 1975, the administration hired a full-time staff assistant for the commission. Mary Lesser, who served as the commissions coordinator, was a sociologist who had recently moved to Nashville from Boston where she was active in the anti-war and civil rights protest movements. Dr. Lesser had strong beliefs about the women’s movement and about how to study the situation at Vanderbilt. Dr. Lesser, who later taught sociology at Quinnipiac College in Connecticut, recommended that the commission hold brown bag lunches with women all over the campus to gather information about their problems: "I was very aware of how the
little person often got left out and was eager to give staff people the opportunity to express their ideas,” Lesser recalled.

The commission mapped out a strategy to hold sessions in each work environment of the University, including the hospital. Some of the sessions were heated, especially those with hospital laundry workers, who raised many occupational safety and health issues. Some hospital administrators were disturbed enough to suggest that the commission be disallowed from holding further meetings. Nevertheless, the commission continued its work with a core of eight to 10 active members who were devoted to the cause.

Along with the female faculty, staff, and students, the commission included a handful of men, including Charles Federspiel and Lewis Lefkowitz, both members of the Medical School faculty who served on the commission during its important final year, 1975-76. Like Professor Gove, Professor Federspiel was surprised by his appointment because he was never vocal on women’s issues. Reflecting in the late 1990s on the events of 1975, Federspiel recalled that the administration chose many non-activists to serve on the commission. “They [the administration] may have been surprised before it was over by what those people accomplished,” according to Federspiel.

After collecting reams of data and many heartfelt personal accounts from women at Vanderbilt, the commission began the process of preparing a final report on its findings to submit to the Chancellor. Eventually the commission agreed on several recommendations, with its top priority being: “The establishment of a Women’s Center that would serve as a clearinghouse . . . for the receipt and expression of women’s concerns.”

Administrators were concerned about legal difficulties in publishing the report, due to ambiguities and purported misquotations contained within it. Gove and others took a tough negotiating stand, however, and in January 1977, the Chancellor’s office released the report. Although the commission had expired, and Dr. Lesser’s employment had ended, the struggle over the report had not. For more than a year after its release, a group of women kept up the pressure to see that the recommendations were implemented. This group, the Women’s Concerns Committee, was instrumental in funding of the commission during its important final year, 1975-76. Like Professor Gove, Professor Federspiel was surprised by his appointment because he was never vocal on women’s issues. Reflecting in the late 1990s on the events of 1975, Federspiel recalled that the administration chose many non-activists to serve on the commission. “They [the administration] may have been surprised before it was over by what those people accomplished,” according to Federspiel.

In many ways the 1976 Commission on the Status of Women’s report presages the 2016 report from the Chancellor’s Committee on Diversity, Inclusion, and Community. For example, the Commission found that the University:

- Used inadequate data collection methods
- Failed to engage in meaningful data analysis
- Needed:
  - extensive education of faculty and staff on female affirmative action (“attitudinal education”)
- structured child care
- an office reporting to the Chancellor on affirmative action issues for female faculty and staff
- explicit hiring targets for female faculty across the university
- curriculum reform around women’s issues and women’s scholarship
- female doctors for the student health service
- expanded psychological services

The 1976 report on the status of women initiated by Chancellor Heard revealed that there were so few women among the Vanderbilt faculty that discrimination could not be documented. At that time, women made up 15 of 263 members of the faculty, there were no female chairs, and only two full and four associate professors. The report also noted that Black women were almost entirely in the lowest, most menial positions on campus and that many, if not most graduate students never took a course with a female professor. Outside of the Nursing School, women made up only 5.5% of full status faculty. Outside of Medicine, only 11 women were tenured (and 4 of the tenured women were in Nursing).

The Commission on the Status of Women’s report was affirmative action based and the Equal Opportunity, Affirmative Action, and Disability Services Department’s (EAD) mission echoes this affirmative action and compliance oriented focus. The EAD mission is to:

- proactively assist the university with the interpretation, understanding, and application of federal and state laws regarding equal opportunity and affirmative action. The EAD carries out its mission by continuously developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising action-oriented programs aimed at promoting and valuing equity and diversity in the university’s faculty, staff, and student body. The EAD’s core values include equity, diversity, inclusiveness, accessibility and accommodation, all of which represent the spirit and purpose of the EAD.

The Commission on the Status of Women called for a Women’s Center. The Margaret Cuninggim Women’s Center is an affirming space for all members of the Vanderbilt community that acknowledges and actively resists sexism, racism, homophobia, and all forms of oppression while advocating for positive social change.

Core Values of the Margaret Cuninggim Women’s Center:
- Progress toward gender equality
- Celebration of the unique differences among all persons
- Work toward a diverse community
- Empowerment, voice, and opportunities to belong

The Margaret Cuninggim Women’s Center was the first
home of Project SAFE Center Vanderbilt. Project Safe Center’s mission is to provide information, support, referrals, and education about power-based personal violence (including sexual harassment, sexual assault, dating violence, domestic violence, and stalking), as well as consent, healthy relationships, and healthy sexuality to the Vanderbilt University community. The Project Safe Center is charged to assist members of the Vanderbilt community with navigating the University’s resources and support network (including the Psychological & Counseling Center, Student Health, the Equal Employment, Affirmative Action, and Disability Services Department, and the Vanderbilt University Police Department) as well as external support and law enforcement resources.

The Commission asked for a female doctor in the student health clinic and more psychological and health support for female students. Now the Psychological Counseling Center and Student Health offer special services for underrepresented groups.

When the University released the report from the Commission on the Status of Women in 1977 there was no maternity policy for female faculty or female staff. After several years of the Women’s Center advocating for maternity leave, Chancellor Gordon Gee instituted a maternity leave policy for female faculty. In 2001, the Vanderbilt female faculty organization gave Chancellor Gee a bow tie quilt to honor his maternity leave initiative. The quilt now hangs in the Vanderbilt Divinity School.

In 1968, Howard Harrod, who grew up in Oklahoma among the Native Americans of the Northern Plains began his career studying and writing about Native American religious practices and beliefs. Harrod authored five books and numerous articles dealing with Native American religions and traditions of the northern plains. Professor Harrod’s last publication was 2000’s The Animals Came Dancing: Native American Sacred Ecology and Animal Kinship. Laurel Schneider (in RLST) was Professor Harrod’s student. Dr. Schneider also works on Native American religious traditions, but focused on New England, where she grew up.

The 1970s saw gay activism come to the Vanderbilt campus. Given the social discrimination against sexual minorities that was also manifest on the Vanderbilt campus, Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, Trans*, Queer and Intersex students, staff and faculty were largely invisible at Vanderbilt for most of the University’s history. On December 9, 1972, the Young Socialist Alliance sponsored a campus dance for the “benefit of homosexuals” in the larger community. One hundred and fifty people showed up (estimates at the time speculated two-thirds of those who came considered themselves Gay, Lesbian, or Bisexual). A flood of mail—almost 100% opposed to any lenient policy toward homosexuals—ensued.

Chancellor Heard launched a staff study of the homosexual rights issue, and in 1973 and 1974, the Hustler printed a series of informative articles on homosexuality. In 1974, a small group of students tried to organize a gay student group, but it was March of 1977 before a gay student group held together long enough to apply for a charter from the Community Affairs Board.

In the 1970s, Vanderbilt University made several notable attempts to rectify its gender imbalance. In 1975, Sallie TeSelle was appointed Dean of the Divinity School, the first woman to hold that position at Vanderbilt outside of Nursing and the first female dean of a major theological school in the United States. (Ironically, Dean TeSelle was forced to step down after helping lead the campus resistance to Vanderbilt’s hosting of a Davis Cup match featuring the South African team, then still under the rule of apartheid.) By 1982, there was some improvement at the lower ranks, with 34 female associate professors (138 male) and 62 female assistant professors (82 male). Despite improvement, the numbers of female faculty were distorted by their preponderance on the Nursing faculty.

In response to the Commission on the Status of Women report (itself a response to the organizing efforts of female faculty and staff), the Women’s Center was established in 1977. In 1988, the Women’s Center was named after Margaret Cuninggim, the last Dean of Women who became the first woman appointed Dean of Student Services. In 1988, the Nursing School admitted its first Latina student—Susie Leming-Lee.

In addition to the Women’s Center, the College of Arts and Science began offering Women’s Studies courses in 1972, but it was not until 1988 that the Program received a faculty director. Women’s Studies appointed its first director, Professor Nancy Walker (English) in 1988. Under Professor Walker’s direction, the program developed a minor in Women’s Studies in 1990.

In 1980, Vanderbilt University signed a non-compliance agreement with the Department of Labor for failing to meet hiring targets for females. Also Vanderbilt University was forced to undertake modifications to make the campus accessible for the disabled.

In 1997, Professor Ronnie Steinberg (Sociology) began directing Women’s Studies, and the program added an undergraduate major. When Professor Steinberg retired as director of the Women’s Studies Program in 2003, Professor Carolyn Dever (English) served as Acting Director while a national search for a new director was conducted. The College hired Professor Monica Casper (Sociology) on the recommendation of the Women’s Studies Search Committee, and Professor Casper started her tenure as director in the fall of 2004. In 2008, Professor Casper left Vanderbilt, and Professor Charlotte Pierce-Baker (English/Women’s Studies) assumed the director’s position. In 2011, Katherine Crawford (History) became director. Laura Carpenter served as Interim Director in 2014-15.
Women's Studies became the Program in Women's and Gender Studies in 2004, and presently has a minor, a major, and a graduate certificate, but no permanent faculty.

In 1978, Peabody President John Dunworth started secret negotiations with Vanderbilt Chancellor Heard for Peabody to join Vanderbilt University. (712) The Peabody/Vanderbilt merger took place in April, 1979. (715) In 1981, Vanderbilt engaged in a second merger with Blair School of Music. (719) In 1981, Elizabeth Langland was denied tenure in Arts & Science bringing frustration to the small group of female faculty. Professor Langland filed an EEOC complaint against Vanderbilt University for a pattern of gender discrimination. (728) Professor Langland lost her Civil Rights suit when the judge decided that Vanderbilt University had grounds for her tenure denial. In 1981, Vanderbilt University empaneled a Committee on status of women and minorities, but the Committee did not have much influence. (734) The Committee made recommendations for more imaginative recruiting of women and Blacks, more administrative positions; Blacks on the BOT, more courses in Black Studies and Women's Studies, a recruiting fund, and highlighting sex and race as job qualifications.

Beginning in the 1980s, the Vanderbilt community profited from a small but distinguished Hispanic population, mainly visible in the Department of Spanish and Portuguese. 115 These eminent individuals include:

- Centennial Professor Enrique Pupo-Walker (from Cuba), who joined Vanderbilt’s senior faculty in 1980
- Professor Pupo-Walker who received an MA from Peabody in 1962, and who, along with his wife Betty Jean, was the second couple married in Benton chapel
- Centennial Professor Francisco Ruiz Ramón (from Spain) who served on the faculty from 1987-1992

The first Latino member of the faculty is William Luis, Gertrude Conaway Vanderbilt Professor of Spanish, who joined the faculty in 1991. He is also the Director of Latino and Latina Studies. Other Latino members of the faculty include Senior Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Science, and Stevenson Endowed Professor Keivan Guadalupe Stassun (Physics and Astronomy), Lorraine Lopez (English Department), Edward Wright-Rios (History), Candice Amich (English Department), and Efrén Pérez (Political Science). Prof. Luis is the only Afro-Latino on the Vanderbilt faculty.

In 1986, the School of Nursing hired its first Black staff member, Golda Franklin.

In the spring of 1987, the Dean of Residential and Judicial Affairs, K.C. Potter, invited three students to lunch because they had jointly authored an opinion column in the Hustler, taking issue with a short story in a student magazine (the now-extinct Versus) that advised students to leave Centennial Park at night before the “faggots” came out. 116 From this meeting grew Lambda which met for years in Dean Potter’s house on campus. That house is now the home for Project SAFE.

Andy Dailey is another pivotal figure in Vanderbilt's gay history. Just as the founding members of Lambda were graduating and the membership in the group was diminishing, Andy Dailey created a series of new programs including a whitewater rafting trip for Lambda and a convention for gay and lesbian groups in the SEC, hosted on Vanderbilt's campus, that invigorated the group. But the Hustler reported that Andy suffered for his activism when he was denied his teaching certification.

In response Andy Dailey not receiving a teaching certification, Lambda Association set its sights on revising the Vanderbilt's nondiscrimination policy. The Vanderbilt nondiscrimination clause prohibited discrimination on the basis of race, religion or sex and protected students and faculty from harassment. Lambda wanted to add “sexual orientation” to the list of protected classes—so that, for example, a professor could not be fired for being gay.

A Subcommittee on Sexual Orientation and Minority Harassment was appointed to investigate the adoption of a nondiscrimination clause. Throughout the next year, the subcommittee conducted an education campaign that was advertised through open meetings. Psychologists and psychiatrists came to speculate and present findings on the causes and nature of homosexuality. K.C. Potter researched similar nondiscrimination policies at peer schools. Religious leaders led the Board through what Deuteronomy and Leviticus had to offer on homosexuality, legal scholars presented their perspective. Homosexual activity was still illegal as a "crime against nature" in the state of Tennessee. ROTC would have to be exempt from the nondiscrimination clause because it was not legal for gay people to join the Army.

The open educational process gave the subcommittee's recommendation legitimacy and allowed the public to follow the sub-committee's decision-making. The Faculty Senate voted to adopt the amendment. Nevertheless, Chancellor Joe Wyatt did not move the Senate vote forward based on a recommendation from General Counsel Jeffrey Carr that the proposal raise legal questions. In 1991, after a series of student protests that included the Black Student Association, the Asian-American Student Association, and the Student Government Association (predecessor to VSG) the proposed amendment was adopted by the Board of Trust.

In 1992, the Nursing School hired its first openly gay faculty member.

There have been initiatives, however, in which Vanderbilt has been at the forefront. For example, the university was the Posse Foundation's first institutional partner, admitting the
first cohort of high-achieving public school students from underrepresented groups in New York City in 1989. For the university, the Posse Program represented an attempt to address the difficulties it faced in attracting students with distinct cultural and ethnic backgrounds beyond the south. Not surprisingly, some of these students struggled but thanks to support from the Posse Program and Vanderbilt, many earned their degrees and have gone on to successful careers. (As of 2009, 80% of 175 Posse students attending Vanderbilt have graduated.) The program has since expanded to additional cities and now also recruits from several other cities.

In 1995, thanks to the efforts primarily of several lesbian faculty members and alumnae, the Divinity School established the Carpenter Program in Religion, Gender and Sexuality, the first ever program or center of its kind at a major theological school. With the support of the E. Rhodes and Leona B. Carpenter Foundation, the School also established scholarships for students whose interest in these issues was central to their pursuit of theological education.

In 1995, the Nursing School hired its first Black faculty member—Rolanda Johnson. In 1997, the Nursing School hired its first Native American faculty member—Jana Lauderdale, Comanche.

In 1998, 14% of full professors were women at Vanderbilt. By 2008, it was 19%. And by 2015 it stood at 22%. An almost 50% increase over 17 years (14% to 22%). In 2015, 36% of associate professors were female, 44% of assistant professors were female, and 50% of the non-tenure track faculty were female. As promotions unfold, the full professor rank is expected to continue to rise. The numbers look different when minority faculty are considered. In the 21st century, no Black female has achieved tenure from the rank of Assistant Professor. In fact, it might be that no Black female has risen from Associate Professor to Full Professor while at Vanderbilt, nor has any Black Female ever received a chaired professorship based on promotion while at Vanderbilt University. In other words, the very strong tendency at Vanderbilt University has been for Black female faculty to remain in rank. It seems that no Black female professor has escaped this tendency in at least a generation, if ever.

In 1999, the Vanderbilt University School of Medicine started the Office for Minority Affairs. Over time, the Office for Minority Affairs morphed into the current Office for Diversity Affairs for Vanderbilt University School of medicine (VUSM). That office is now held by the Levi J. Watkins, Jr. chaired professor, Andre Churchwell.

The 21st century saw a number of firsts for Black women at Vanderbilt. The first Black Emerita Professor, Vera Stevens Chatman, who was also the first Black Ph.D. from the Peabody College, received her appointment in 2013. The first Black professor with tenure at the Peabody College, Professor Donna Ford, was also the first Black endowed chair at Peabody College. Professor Ford came to Vanderbilt University in 2004. In the 21st century, the Vanderbilt Law School hired its first (and only) black female professor as well as its first (and only) open lesbian and the Divinity School hired the first openly lesbian dean who is also the first Black dean in Vanderbilt’s history to oversee faculty.


In 2007 after having many years of success in the recruitment and matriculation of under-represented minority medical students, the Vanderbilt University School of Medicine turned its attention to enhancing the recruitment of under-represented minority house staff into our graduate medical education programs, e.g., departments of medicine, surgery, radiology, etc. This effort to expand the number of underrepresented minority house staff was supported by a diversity plan that was approved by the Vanderbilt University School of Medicine’s dean and its executive faculty council (made up of chairs, center leaders, and deans). The main focus of this plan was to create a partnership between the chairs and program directors of each clinical department in order to increase the applicant pool of under-represented minority house staff.

The Vanderbilt University School of Medicine’s index year was 2007 where ten under-represented minority students matched in our post-graduate year one (PGY-1-internship) spots. On average, the numbers before 2007 varied between 5 to 10. With the diversity plan in place, the Vanderbilt University School of Medicine has seen its PGY-1 match list to grow to between 25-30 URM trainees per year.

The AAMC is the governing body for all accredited medical schools in the United States. In 2011, the President of the AAMC, Dr. Darrel Kirsch, in his plenary address at the AAMC’s national convention, declared the Vanderbilt University School of Medicine an example for all majority schools to look to in their efforts to advance diversity.

After an attack on two gay men on campus in 2007, the Dean of Students established a committee to make recommendations for improving the campus atmosphere for lesbian and gay students. Chief among their recommendations was the establishment and staffing of what became the K.C. Potter Center for LGBTQI Life. Named after the much beloved Dean of Students who did much behind the scenes to support this constituency, the Center was dedicated in 2008. It coordinates activities and services for LGBTQI students across the campus. The Potter center is administered under the Office of the Dean of Students, and it has a director (who is staff, rather than fac-
ulty), a program coordinator, two part-time graduate student assistants, and a staff administrator. In addition to programming for undergraduates, the director of the Potter Center assists trans* students as they negotiate the university bureaucracy. While Vanderbilt has been accepting of LBGTQI faculty, there have been no discernible efforts to recruit such faculty, and Vanderbilt lags in terms of visibility at the faculty level.

The university has been tentative, though, in regards to new programs dedicated to interdisciplinary studies of some underrepresented groups. The University has lagged behind its peer institutions in supporting the study of religions other than Christianity. On the one hand, many of its area studies programs (Asian Studies, Latin American Studies, Islamic Studies and Jewish Studies, for example) include faculty with expertise in this area. And yet, only in the last few years has it been given the resources to grow substantially. After much resistance, the Latino and Latina Studies Program was officially approved for the Fall Semester of 2013 and launched its first course in Spring Semester of 2014. No office space was made available and administrative support came from the English Department. Currently it has a graduate student assistant and a small office in European Studies. In spite of the lack of support, the program, which offers a major, a minor, and a graduate certificate, graduated two majors in 2015 and awarded its first graduate certificate in 2016.

In summary, Vanderbilt’s historical approach to diversity and inclusion has been more or less what one might expect from an elite private university in the south that gradually made the transition from a primarily regional bastion of the white elite to a prestigious top-twenty research university with a growing national and international reputation. In truth, prestigious universities in the northeast did not do much better.

As outlined above, it is hardly surprising that Vanderbilt’s historical approach to diversity was sometimes conservative and often lagged behind national trends. On the other hand, although Vanderbilt took far too long before admitting Black students, the university was far ahead of the Ivy League in admitting women. Moreover, although ensuring a diverse faculty at Vanderbilt University still requires attention, there are signs in recent years that Vanderbilt is poised to chart a different more forward thinking history. We can see this new Vanderbilt in emerging initiatives, such as the IMSD and Fisk-Vanderbilt Bridge program that have made Vanderbilt a leading producer of underrepresented minority PhDs in the sciences, as well as the Provost’s new guidelines for faculty recruitment that were begun in 2015 and are continuing to take shape.

However, we must be diligent in order to ensure that any go-slow tendencies do not still linger on campus. These tendencies might appear, for example, in a halting approach to LGBTQI issues, a failure to track faculty so as to be able to recognize when, for example, no Black female faculty member has achieved a promotion at Vanderbilt for at least a generation, or in the university’s failure to provide adequate space to Latino/a Studies. Hopefully however, the university community’s zeal for diversity, inclusion, and excellence will firmly put this abiding tendency toward reticence to rest, so that Vanderbilt University may seize true national-level leadership in this arena. As always in history, time (and evidence) will tell.
VI. DETAILED RECOMMENDATIONS

In this section we present the full set of detailed recommendations emerging from the Committee’s work. The recommendations are organized into six broad areas of Culture and Climate, Faculty and Students, Staff, Teaching, Community and Research Centers, and Administration and Accountability.

Following the recommendations, in Section XX we connect the recommendations explicitly to the Academic Strategic Plan, present a suggested initial timeline for implementation, as well as a suggested prioritization, cost estimates, and markers of success.

A. Culture and Climate

The culture and climate of a university is highly complex and challenging to define, encompassing shared values, beliefs, knowledge, customs, and their many expressions throughout campus life. In diverse educational institutions that are continually changing, cultures are rarely monolithic or universal, but instead multiple and conflicting, with tenuous if powerful forms of community and belonging. It is the work of an inclusive campus culture to allow a diverse array of individuals and groups to find opportunities for belonging and growth, while providing a common life in which all may work to create an inspiring and caring community for learning. Fundamental to this is a respect for diverse views as a means of creating excellence in higher education. This challenge of negotiating unity and difference in the academy occurs in every school and department, every dorm and common space.

Therefore, what follows is a set of recommendations that have emerged from this committee’s many efforts to listen to the needs and aspirations of its many students, staff, and faculty, and its endeavor to shape a diverse and inclusive culture of which all of Vanderbilt can be proud. Whether in regards to the ways that we first welcome incoming freshmen to campus, the symbols across our campus that speak to our values, or the physical and informational accessibility of the campus, or the ways in which we prepare all members of the university community to engage with one another meaningfully and respectfully, Vanderbilt’s culture and climate convey who we are, who we aspire to be, and who is welcome here.

1. Recommendation: Establish Summer Bridge and VU Mentorship programs. Upon admission, all students, along with trained support staff in Admissions, would identify challenges each student may face in meeting their academic goals. Based on this assessment students would be offered the opportunity to participate in a month-long early Summer Bridge program, during which time students would live on campus. This program would include three different types of educational experiences. Primarily, it would involve classes to help hone necessary college-level skills, including but not limited to mathematics and writing. Second, the program would have courses designed to support skills necessary for student success, such as time management, budgetary and financial planning, and more. Third, the program would involve social events that support students in their acclimation to a diverse and inclusive Vanderbilt community. Because this program would be offered to all students, regardless of race, gender, class, or other differences, and based on individual, not group, interests and needs, it would not risk singling out some students, particularly those from underrepresented groups, to require remediation and thus trigger stereotypes, impostor syndromes, exclusionary messages, or other problematic ideas associated with targeted programs. In planning such a large program we recognize there would be many logistical challenges of arranging summer housing and dining, providing security for students (particularly the protection of minors), supplying extra residential advisors during the program, hiring new support staff in the Commons (current staff are at capacity during the summer), and mobilizing departmental and faculty support for the academic components. However, these challenges are not insurmountable with the appropriate innovations, planning, and resources.

Beginning in the fall of their freshman year, all students should be placed with well-trained student and faculty mentors who can help each student navigate social and academic life throughout their entire student careers. The goal would be to help students find the social and academic support necessary to find belonging in Vanderbilt’s increasingly diverse social life, and to plan their academic careers in an intentional way so that they may excel in any area of study they choose. This mentorship is very much like that student and faculty VUceptors provide in Visions, and indeed may be integrated with Visions programming, but would continue throughout freshman, sophomore, junior, and senior years. Preferably, these student and faculty mentors would serve as social and academic guides to help each student find the networks of support they need to have the best Vanderbilt experience. Mentors in this program also may include staff and alumni as well as graduate students, but all would be well trained to understand issues of difference and inequality, and mentor effectively students from all backgrounds. These
mentors should make use of, learn from, and support extant student-led mentoring and orientation initiatives in the Martha Rivers Ingram Commons, the Dean of Students offices, athletics, and academic schools, departments, and programs. Too often students, particularly those of underrepresented groups, do not receive the peer and faculty mentorship necessary to succeed academically, especially in STEM fields. Specifically in the sophomore year, as students move out of the Martha Rivers Ingram Commons and begin the process of declaring majors, academic mentorship is necessary for all.

While this is focused on undergraduate life, all of Vanderbilt's graduate and professional schools might consider similar programs for the orientation and mentorship of incoming graduate and professional students.

2. **Recommendation:** Make all majors accessible to students in each college/school. Provide prerequisite courses as needed so that students representing the normal range of incoming high school preparation can on-ramp to the major of their choice. Provide freshman research immersion experiences which have been demonstrated to enhance retention, especially in STEM for underrepresented groups. Make the range of undergraduate majors accessible by providing suitable on-ramps for meeting prerequisites and/or eliminate any existing outmoded pedagogical practices in the introductory level gatekeeper courses. Data suggest that there are not large disparities in intended majors among incoming freshmen across identity groups, but that by sophomore or junior year large disparities emerge in declared majors, with the STEM majors typically showing the largest attrition for all students and especially for students from underrepresented groups. Vanderbilt's incoming freshmen are exceptionally well qualified by all standard measures—indeed, incoming Vanderbilt students at the low end of the distribution today exceed the credentials of typical incoming Vanderbilt students admitted in decades past. A student deemed qualified for admission to one of Vanderbilt's colleges or schools should have real opportunity in practice to pursue and succeed in any major offered by that college or school.

3. **Recommendation:** Regularly revisit existing names, symbols, and images across campus to ensure consistency with Vanderbilt's values. Start by renaming Confederate Memorial Hall. As new naming opportunities arise, consider former Vanderbilt students, staff, and faculty across diverse groups that reflect the best of Vanderbilt's diverse campus culture and vision for the future. The symbols and names that are used across campus—whether the name of a building, road, scholarship, or the images placed on the walls of our classrooms—should reflect and represent the Vanderbilt that we are, that we aspire to be, and that we wish to be seen and known. Other universities, such as the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill, have renamed buildings out of just such a conviction to have the symbolism of the campus remain consistent with their values of diversity and inclusion. Finally, students, staff, and faculty should have access to spaces where inclusion-affirming symbols (e.g., the LGBTQI Pride Flag) may be displayed.

4. **Recommendation:** Update the registrar system to facilitate the use of chosen names and pronouns, allowing LGBTQI students to have the option to self-identify, if they choose. Update all centralized data systems to provide opportunities for self-reporting across all identity categories, thus enabling (de-identified) tracking of university performance with respect to all demographic categories. Whether for reasons of gender, culture, or other aspects of identity, all individuals have the right to have their chosen names and pronouns recognized and respected. Several universities are moving to systems that acknowledge and support pronoun usage beyond the gender binary, including Harvard University, the University of Vermont, and the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. More importantly, students, staff, and faculty across the campus have urged Vanderbilt to help gender non-conforming individuals be recognized in campus information systems. Vanderbilt also does not currently track the number of LGBTQI students, but doing so in a de-identified way would ensure that the university accurately recognizes and supports this population.

5. **Recommendation:** Throughout campus life religious diversity is elemental to a dynamic and inclusive culture, and therefore the needs of religious groups should be better supported. Students identifying as religious groups site the challenges they face finding suitable spaces and food compatible with their traditions. We therefore recommend creating expanded religious spaces and additional dining services so that they may remain faithful to their traditions. Though there are spaces for all religious groups on Vanderbilt's campus, we recommend the creation of a larger inter-faith center within which spaces would be readily accessible and compatible with myriad faith traditions. Alternatively, transportation should be provided to other religious spaces in Nashville. Regarding dietary needs, provide more vegetarian options for those who cannot eat meat, and ensure that meat is prepared in keeping with kosher/halal practices. This will require training and oversight by dining and catering staff.
6. **Recommendation:** Provide diversity education forums for all members of the Vanderbilt Community on issues of unconscious bias, inequality, social differences, intercultural communication, conflict resolution, team building, and other subjects essential to a diverse and inclusive campus citizenry. All of us—faculty, students, staff, and administrators—may have a tendency to make assumptions and preconceptions about those who are not like us, and we often have limited knowledge and skills in communicating effectively across differences. These challenges are very real to an inclusive community of diverse people, creating distrust, alienation, conflict, and marginalization, and thus harming a climate that is conducive to collaboration, free exchange of ideas, and excellence. Large numbers of students, faculty, and staff agree that this is a high priority in transforming Vanderbilt’s culture to make it more diverse, inclusive, and communal since it impacts every area of campus life. It is the responsibility of all of us to build a stronger and more diverse community. Therefore, the entire campus should have educational forums on these subjects, addressing the lives and practices of specific campus constituencies, on a regular, ongoing basis, and in ways that are targeted to specific constituencies and their needs. Such education currently exists in programming offered by units including but not limited to the Psychological and Counseling Center, the Commons, the KC Potter Center, the Cuninggim Women’s Center, the Bishop Johnson Black Cultural Center, the Center for Teaching, EAD (Equal Opportunity, Affirmative Action, and Disability Services), and International Student & Scholar Services. These offices should have all the support necessary to offer sufficient educational forums to more fully transform the campus community into a highly inclusive one. They also should collaborate in the form of a Diversity and Inclusion Education Council (also discussed below) that can coordinate their transformational efforts so as to best complement one another, share resources and responsibilities, and develop best practices. Indeed, significant research suggests that educational efforts at diversity often fail because of various common pitfalls that can best be avoided by collaborative efforts and honing best practices. Further, while students, both graduate and undergraduate, can be involved in these programs as peer mentors and educators, the primary work of developing campus educational curriculum and forums on diversity and inclusion should be done by professionally trained staff and faculty with the necessary legal, psychological, and sociological expertise to guide individuals and groups through challenging terrain.

7. **Recommendation:** Encourage institutional relationships with Vanderbilt which are consistent with our values of diversity, inclusion, and equity. This would require university administrators to do their due diligence by conducting background searches on any organizations potentially partnering with Vanderbilt to assess alignment with VU’s diversity and inclusion initiatives before entering into any agreements. To help in these endeavors, Vanderbilt should form an Ethics Review Committee consisting of students, staff, and faculty to assist in developing standards and metrics to efficiently assess relationships with institutional partners, such as those in procurement and investments. Models for such work exist at VUMC and at other institutions of higher education. Students have raised these concerns repeatedly, arguing that Vanderbilt should be consistent in its ethics lest much of the work the university does to support diversity, inclusion, equity, and community be undermined. Specifically with regards to VUMC: VUMC is now the non-VU entity with which VU personnel interact most; this warrants a special liaison/committee/group evaluating the impact of VUMC on diversity and inclusion for VU personnel who work, live, and learn in VUMC.

8. **Recommendation:** Vanderbilt should embrace principles of universal design across campus, make the campus easily navigable and usable, and use top design standards to create universally accessible spaces, events, communications, and information systems. Vanderbilt strives to achieve full compliance with the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), World Wide Web Consortium (W3C), and other federal and state and local regulations. Yet it has an opportunity to not only achieve but excel in the area of inclusion. In addition to meeting compliance standards, Vanderbilt should aim for excellence in creating an accessible campus which is a model for other universities. Vanderbilt needs to be accessible for a wide range of users. Thus, Universal Design in this case should indicate meaningful accessibility for all disabled people through a user-centered design process that guides all future campus design projects, as well as retrofits to existing buildings. User experts should be employed and compensated for their time in this process. In addition, Vanderbilt should become a leader in access to web technologies, including all internet platforms, if it is to facilitate full inclusion for all members of its community. Vanderbilt should also commit to building dedicated spaces and platforms for students, staff, and faculty with disabilities, where disability culture and community can be fostered outside of legal compliance offices (such as EAD) and medical and rehabilitative settings (including special education classrooms). The university’s Land Use
Planning process provides a timely opportunity to reach for excellence on this front, as well as to consider new religious/worship spaces on campus and additional space allocations for critical services such as mental health and wellness. We recommend further that this process be highly inclusive of students and faculty with expertise in accessibility. This proposal has wide support from students, staff, faculty, and administrators across campus. Further, Vanderbilt should commit to full accessibility for trans and gender non-conforming students, faculty, staff, and visitors by instituting a university-wide policy of making available all-gender restrooms and providing inclusive housing.

B. Students and Faculty

Graduate Students

DIVERSIFYING GRADUATE PROGRAMS:

1. **Recommendation**: Make Vanderbilt the leading producer of PhDs from diverse groups, thus enhancing Vanderbilt’s brand and reputation, and becoming a national resource for future faculty diversity across the nation.

2. Undergraduate admissions has achieved enormous gains in enrollment of Hispanic (900%) and African-American (400%) undergraduates. The School of Medicine has aligned its admissions procedures with the practices of the Office of Undergraduate Admission. Other Colleges and Schools should participate in this strong internal capacity for best practice as well.

**Recommendation**: Position graduate admissions in each of Vanderbilt’s colleges/schools to collaborate with and learn from the best practices of the Office of Undergraduate Admissions that has allowed Vanderbilt undergraduate body to achieve the levels of diversity that it has.

3. VU EDGE has successfully increased the number of underrepresented applicants to Vanderbilt graduate programs through relationship building with regional HBCUs, presence at national meetings of minority students, etc. We expect that expanding such programs would lead to further and broader successes in recruitment of diverse candidates. AccessStem and the KC Potter Center have provided mentorship and support networks for incoming students with disabilities and LGBTQIQ students, respectively.

**Recommendation**: Sustain and expand the Diversity Recruitment Office for Graduate Education (VU-EDGE), and increase collaboration with programs such as AccessStem (pairs students with disabilities with faculty mentors) and The KC Potter Center.

4. Vanderbilt is a recognized national leader in disciplines such as Medicine and the Biomedical Sciences; this role provides Vanderbilt with unique opportunities for mentorship that should be extended across the disciplines.

**Recommendation**: Institutionalize and scale up successful, bridge programs through which Vanderbilt is already a national leader, such as the Fisk-Vanderbilt Bridge Program, the Initiative for Maximizing Student Diversity (IMSD) program, and the Vanderbilt-Meharry Alliance.

5. **Recommendation**: Develop an endowed fund for graduate student fellowships, especially rewarding programs that make demonstrable progress on creating a diverse student body. For example, Create KC Potter Graduate Student Fellowships for graduate and professional students interested in LGBTQIQ issues and advocacy.

6. Summer research internships for undergraduates are an important way to enhance recruitment for our (and other) graduate programs. Currently these are funded either for Vanderbilt students (VUSRP, Little John) or for other students through external grants (e.g., NSF REU).

**Recommendation**: Create a summer research training program (scaled up VUSRP and with specific professional development geared to URMs and other URGs) as a “grow our own” strategy to recruiting diverse graduate students.

7. Vanderbilt’s own research as well as that from bodies such as the Council of Graduate Schools shows that overreliance on standardized tests can have a negative effect on diversity of graduate and professional programs. Meanwhile, alternative approaches for holistic evaluation have been developed that are efficacious at selecting highly capable students and yield strong diversity outcomes.

**Recommendation**: Provide best practice training on the appropriate use of GRE scores to reduce reliance on these measures, which can lead to a severe constriction on the pool of women and minority graduate students. Adopt best practice approaches in holistic admissions as recommended by the Council of Graduate Schools, including holistic admissions toolkits developed at Vanderbilt, enabling greater graduate diversity and greater measures of excellence in graduate education such as PhD completion rates. Lead the
national conversation in development of holistic admissions and evaluation processes.

8. Multiple leading universities acting in concert will be required to reduce the sway of rankings such as US News. 

Recommendation: Lead a national alliance of nationally leading universities in transcending the ratings and rankings reliance on standardized test scores as measures of institutional excellence.

RETAINING GRADUATE STUDENTS:

1. Graduate students need a community of scholars to develop their intellectual potential and sense of belonging on our campus beyond their home department. This has been well achieved at places like UC Berkeley, where interdisciplinary programs and areas studies are well supported and their scholarly agendas are valued. 

Recommendation: Provide graduate students with intellectual communities that transcend traditional departments.

2. Integration of programs and resources is essential to creating a climate of belonging at Vanderbilt. While group-specific centers can respond to needs of particular demographic subsections of the student body, diversity initiatives should also seek to create opportunities for inclusion within the larger Vanderbilt community. In addition, for graduate students to succeed in their role as academics, it is necessary to ensure that basic needs such as financial, mental and home life stability are met. 

Recommendation: Establish a center for student support (See Claremont Graduate School’s Student Success Center129), where information about graduate student programs and resources are easily accessible. Many of the below recommendations could be housed within a single Student Support Center, which would further create a physical space for bringing together the graduate student community.

Recommendation: Create a liaison between the Graduate School and the Vanderbilt Office of Equal Opportunity, Affirmative Action, and Disability Services. 

Recommendation: Create a liaison between the Graduate School and the KC Potter Center to improve support for LGBTQI graduate and professional students.

Recommendation: Enhance the Career Center support for graduate and professional school students.

Recommendation: Extend access to child care (including emergency child care) for graduate and professional school students.

Recommendation: Establish a travel fund for child and dependent care. Students with dependents may be financially limited in their ability to travel for conferences or other professional events. This in turn limits vital networking opportunities, inhibiting possibilities for collaboration that could lead to future employment.

Recommendation: Create an introductory or orientation session through PCC that is geared towards issues specific to graduate students, particularly self-care and stress management. Informing incoming graduate students that these are common issues can help to reduce stigma around the PCC and help students to recognize the resources available there.

Recommendation: Establish annual assessment of cost of living in Nashville, particularly within nearby commuting distance to Vanderbilt. Ensure that students are paid a living wage that can support the costs of living in an increasingly competitive rental market.

Recommendation: Initiate student-to-student mentoring programs to help integrate incoming students into academic environment during their first year and create ties to the academic community.

Recommendation: Provide graduate student education in diversity through workshops that include topics such as collaborating with diverse colleagues, engaging with a diverse university community, and broaching topics of diversity with students through the role of teaching assistant.

Recommendation: Improve support for international graduate and professional students (e.g., improved assistance in obtaining visas for them and their families; support groups/social networks for spouses and children of international scholars).

Undergraduate Students

1. Recommendation: Enhance the undergraduate experience to improve retention and to make the Vanderbilt experience more inclusive of students diverse groups.

2. National data for universities like Vanderbilt show clear trends of significant attrition of women and minorities out of STEM majors. We do not know, but suspect, that the situation at Vanderbilt is similar. Research shows that early immersion in meaningful research experiences can be a successful strategy for retention of women and minorities in STEM majors.

Recommendation: Conduct an analysis of retention-in-major of students from underrepresented groups in STEM majors at Vanderbilt, and implement an early research immersion program to enhance retention.

3. Research shows that disciplines that emphasize innate ability as the path to success (e.g., philosophy, physics) are the least diverse, whereas disciplines that emphasize effort
5. Students don’t feel listened to: Students have reported to the Committee that the student experience includes asking for the same things over and over again year after year with no sense that anything said actually makes a difference. The lack of response then leads to more aggressive and insistent behavior in the hope of being heard. Students come to Vanderbilt in order to be students, not activists. Students would rather not feel the need to police the university.

**Recommendation:** Provide evidence-based education in departments to reduce the likelihood of conscious or unconscious messaging to students that success in the disciplines is based on innate abilities as opposed to sustained effort and mastery.

6. Students, including in particular those who reside in the Confederate Memorial Hall, uniformly express dismay at the ongoing presence of a building so named on the Vanderbilt campus. Almost without exception, students stand behind the Hidden Dores demand to have the name removed. Students also agree with the idea that Vanderbilt should increase education about the history of slavery and the Confederacy, and about Vanderbilt’s and Nashville’s roles in that history.

**Recommendation:** Change the name of Confederate Memorial Hall.

7. **Recommendation:** Enhance existing successful pre-undergraduate recruitment and preparations programs and strengthen the pipeline from K-12 to Vanderbilt. For example, the VUMC Aspirant Program recruits qualified URMs and educationally/socioeconomically disadvantaged students from rural areas, magnet schools, Indian reservations, and Berea College. Applications are taken each spring from high school students for a summer research internship in the biomedical sciences here at VU. It is a live on site, 6-week program working in the lab with scientists and on research projects from an interdisciplinary perspective. They also get 1-1 academic counseling for their remaining high school coursework, have Nashville outings, have Vanderbilt speakers, a stipend at the end, and start considering schools that match their interests In order to build the program as a pipeline feeder to VU, additional funding is required, as the program is currently grant funded. Cost per student for 2016 will be approximately $6,000/student. The program tries to fund approximately 15-20 qualified student/year. However with additional funding this number could perhaps be doubled.

**Faculty**

Diversify the Vanderbilt faculty to serve Vanderbilt’s diverse undergraduate student body, increase the diversity of our graduate student body, and bring added expertise and expansion to Vanderbilt’s portfolio of teaching and research scholarship, thereby enhancing our capacity for innovation, creativity, and problem solving at Vanderbilt.

**DIVERSIFYING AND RECRUITING FACULTY:**

1. All constituencies with whom the Committee met on
campus agree that diversifying the faculty is a top priority, as ultimately it is the faculty who steward the institution and deliver on the institutional mission in scholarship, teaching, and mentoring. Research indicates that a diverse faculty leads to positive gains in educational outcomes, campus climate, and organizational excellence. Through Opportunity Vanderbilt, we can now boast strong diversity among the undergraduate student body in which African Americans and Hispanics/Latinos are nearly at parity with the US college-age population. Analysis of the PhD pipeline indicates that Vanderbilt will need to compete aggressively for the available PhD pool, grow the overall size of the faculty, and leverage retirements in the coming years. **Recommendation:** Create an open, flexible, target-of-opportunity faculty diversity hiring program to grow the diversity of tenure-track faculty from all underrepresented groups. Our analysis of the current Vanderbilt faculty finds that in order for the diversity of the faculty to mirror the undergraduate student body, the number of underrepresented non-clinical faculty at Vanderbilt by a total of about 150 over the next 15 years, a virtually insurmountable goal given the current realities of the PhD pool; it will be essential to be as aggressive as possible in recruiting a diverse pool of interested scholars, and to institutionalize best practices to enable steady progress over the long term. Maximize flexibility through year-round hiring and through “cluster hiring,” ensuring such hiring is happening across the ranks of Assistant, Associate and Full, perhaps connected with emerging major trans-institutional areas. Our analysis of the national PhD pool makes clear that Vanderbilt will need to be especially aggressive in its recruiting efforts in order to have a diverse pool of applicants by tapping its “share” of the national pool. Our analysis also shows that faculty will need to be hired from among those who earn PhDs across all institutions; the pool of PhDs emerging from only the very top-ranked schools is nowhere near sufficient to supply the aggressive faculty hiring needs of Vanderbilt and its peers.

2. Analysis of best practices reveals that these are important elements in successful faculty diversity hiring efforts. Moreover, U.S. Executive Order 11246 mandates all federal contractors to take affirmative action to ensure that equal opportunity is provided in all aspects of employment consistent with Vanderbilt’s Affirmative Action Plan. **Recommendation:** Improve the faculty search process with faculty diversity as a goal: Invigorate an aggressive recruitment and search process, including through

---

**Increasing Faculty Diversity**

As we consider ways to increase diversity, we want to keep in mind the existing structures that may subtly influence our thinking—so that we can work to make decisions and implement changes in the most effective ways. Consider this excerpt from a New York Times article by Virginia Postrel:

“DECIDING which shampoo or toothpaste to buy seems a long way from the emotionally charged debate over affirmative action. But an analytical tool developed by marketing scholars to analyze how consumers make brand choices can in fact illuminate that debate.

People have limited time, memory and attention. So when they make buying decisions, they simplify their choices.

“On the shelf you may have 30, 40 brands of shampoo, or 20, 30 brands of toothpaste,” explained Jagdish N. Sheth, a marketing professor at the Goizueta Business School of Emory University. But consumers don’t take the time to examine every possible choice.

Rather, they reduce their selection to a smaller set of options, based on experience and exposure. “Through learning over time, consumers are really efficient in terms of reducing their transaction costs,” Professor Sheth said.

In the 1960’s, he and John A. Howard, the Columbia University marketing scholar who died in 1999, developed the idea of the “evoked set” to describe this process of selection.

Shoppers start not with every single brand they are dimly aware of but with a group of options—the evoked set—uppermost in their minds.

“An evoked set consists of the brands in a product category that the consumer remembers at the time of decision making,” according to “Marketing: Best Practices,” a textbook edited by K. Douglas Hoffman. (An alternative term, “consideration set,” is sometimes used for the same concept and sometimes for the smaller set of choices that remain after consumers eliminate unacceptable options from the evoked set.)

Ask a grocery shopper to name toothpaste brands, for instance, and you’ll probably hear “Crest and Colgate.” Only when pressed to name others will the shopper come up with, say, Rembrandt and Mentadent. Crest and Colgate are the evoked set, the one from which most shoppers will choose to buy—especially if they aren’t looking at snappy product displays for other brands.
The downside of this process is that the results depend on exactly how we sort the possibilities into categories. The way this information is recorded in memory can influence consumers’ preference for brands, and whether the brand will be considered for purchase,” Barbara E. Kahn of the Wharton School at the University of Pennsylvania, and Professor McAlister of the University of Texas at Austin. As a result, “brand choices can be influenced without changing the actual preference for a brand per se, but merely by changing the content of the consideration set.”

What is true for yogurt and meat is true for Supreme Court appointments, award nominees, TV talking heads, corporate board members, conference speaker selections and many mundane hiring decisions. Decision makers start with an evoked set of possibilities—the people who immediately spring to mind. Who makes it into that evoked set depends in part on how people are categorized on the mind’s “grocery shelf.”

Last summer, for instance, The New York Times ran an article on Hollywood’s search for young action heroes. Old standbys like Arnold Schwarzenegger and Harrison Ford were getting a bit long in the tooth, leading studios to turn to newcomers like Matt Damon and Vin Diesel. The piece left the impression of a vast generation gap, with no heroes from the latter half of the baby boom.

But one huge action star was inconspicuously absent: Wesley Snipes, born in 1962. Another, Will Smith, born in 1968, was mentioned only in passing. The...
including HBCUs and faith-based schools, among others—for teaching- and research-based joint faculty appointments.

**Recommendation:** Deepen relationships with the HBCUs in Davidson County by providing transportation and parking services between Vanderbilt University, American Baptist College, Fisk, Meharry, and TSU.

4. According to the data shared with the Committee, HBCUs produce graduates that fare better than their peers who attend other institutions. A 2015 Gallup poll of 56,000 college graduates found that 55 percent of Black HBCU alums say their college prepared them well for life after graduation, as opposed to 29 percent of non-HBCU college graduates. Further, research reviewed by the Committee also finds that HBCU grads are much more likely to say they benefited from encouraging professors and mentors, are more fulfilled and involved at work, and are thriving financially (40 percent) than their non-HBCU peers (29 percent). Thus, we can look to our local HBCUs as a guide for building affirming college experiences for students of color.

**Recommendation:** Reinstate the type of robust student exchange that existed in past decades between Vanderbilt and the Nashville HBCUs, including the ability to take courses at other campuses and transportation to enable meaningful participation across campuses. Deploy educational technologies to link Vanderbilt with a broad network of HBCUs across the Southeastern United States to extend the reach of educational opportunities and to recruit future graduate and professional students for study at Vanderbilt.

5. Vanderbilt’s proximity to Nashville HBCUs is also an opportunity to enable top diverse scholars to move seamlessly between academic career stages within one intellectually rich and diverse scholarly community.

**Recommendation:** Create a robust PhD-to-postdoc-to-faculty pipeline program that links Vanderbilt with HBCUs in Nashville as a unique, signature “grow our own” approach to faculty diversity. Vanderbilt should consider being a doctoral feeder institution for historically marginalized students who intend to become faculty members. If Vanderbilt were to serve as a feeder institution, it would have the opportunity to significantly increase the diverse faculty applicant pool for universities around the country, and this would be a source of significant national leadership for Vanderbilt.

6. A postdoctoral future-faculty-development fellowship program is a best practice among our top peer institutions. In addition, postdoctoral training has become an increasingly necessary step in the preparation of future faculty in many disciplines. Research shows that many underrepresented groups, especially in STEM fields, are lost from the academic pipeline because they do not secure a postdoctoral fellowship as a stepping stone into the professoriate.

**Recommendation:** Create a top-flight postdoctoral future-faculty-development fellowship program to attract recent PhD graduates from diverse backgrounds to Vanderbilt and/or our HBCU partners in Nashville with the goal of preparing them for faculty appointments at one or more of the Nashville partner universities including Vanderbilt. This would provide an opportunity to introduce to Vanderbilt University’s academic community postdoctoral researchers who are considering faculty careers, while enhancing their opportunities for academic careers by preparing them for possible tenure-track appointments at Vanderbilt or other institutions. This would also enrich the academic environment of Vanderbilt University by providing opportunities for students and faculty to gain experience in multi-cultural, broadly diverse and inclusive work and research settings that build capacity in all their members.

7. Data collection and accountability on faculty hiring and retention is best practice among our top peer institutions, and moreover represents an aspirational goal that aims to “benchmark to the best” as opposed to “benchmark to the average.”

**Recommendation:** Improve data collection and accountability on faculty hiring and retention: Benchmark against research-intensive institutions that are considered the most diverse, regardless of similarities or differences to Vanderbilt; Track the demographics of the potential applicant pool for faculty positions. Properly equip diversity and inclusion committees for ongoing research and advocacy; Conduct exit interviews with all faculty who leave Vanderbilt to comprehensively address reasons for their departure.

8. **Recommendation:** As suggested by deans as a resource for their units across the university, develop a “diversity core resource” (perhaps in the Chief Diversity Officer’s office) through which expert staff are available to departments/programs that seek to develop best-practice based diversity programming/initiatives, especially for faculty hiring, in conjunction with or as part of EAD.

**RETYAINING FACULTY:**

1. Retention of existing faculty is the surest return on investment for creating and sustaining a diverse faculty long term, making advancements in ground-breaking scholarship on diversity and equity, delivering important
contributions to education and society.

**Recommendation:** Develop resources and strategies to retain faculty from underrepresented groups. Consider as a factor in faculty evaluation efforts to recruit additional faculty from diverse groups. Reward faculty for contributions to inclusive excellence at Vanderbilt.

2. The issue of under-valued “contingent faculty” is a growing one nationally. Contingent faculty often represent a particularly diverse pool of faculty with strong experience in teaching and mentoring that can be recruited into tenure stream positions.

**Recommendation:** Create a path for non-tenure-track faculty (e.g., lecturers, professors of practice) in colleges and schools to enter the tenure stream. Vanderbilt’s increase in non-tenure-track appointments could potentially impact the stability of the profession. Research concludes that the growth of non-tenure-track faculty erodes the size and influence of the tenured faculty and undermines the stability of the tenure system. Significant numbers of Vanderbilt’s practice faculty, who work without tenure, leave academic freedom more vulnerable to manipulation and suppression.

3. Spousal/partner accommodations are increasingly important for all faculty hiring, including recruitment and retention of faculty from underrepresented groups. Current spousal/partner accommodation policies vary greatly from school to school at Vanderbilt.

**Recommendation:** Develop a program and policies for spousal/partner accommodations in faculty hiring.

4. **Recommendation:** Establish an on-site center for faculty with families, including emergency child care center. (See the University of Michigan’s Work/Life Resource Center). This center would serve as the hub through which faculty could find services geared towards family work/life “balance”, and would attract potential job candidates who value family-friendly university policies that ensure a supportive work environment.

5. **Recommendation:** Provide funding to defray the costs associated with dependent and elder care during conferences or other required professional travel. This acknowledges the changing demographics of the faculty, in which dual-career and single-parent households are more common.

   a. Cornell University | Faculty Dependent Care Travel Fund | $1500 per year
   b. Northwestern University | Dependent Care Professional Travel Grant Program | $750 per year
   c. University of Michigan | Child Travel Expense Policy | $1000 per year
   d. Brown University | Dependent Care Travel Fund | $750 per year
   e. UC Berkeley | Dependent Care Travel Policy | Covers all costs + 70% more than actual costs to offset taxes that will be deducted

6. **Recommendation:** Ensure that resources for families include support for LGBTQI and other non-traditional families

7. **Recommendation:** Enhance support for the Career and Professional Development Program (CPD) for Assistant and Associate Professors. This program aids in providing faculty with better knowledge and skills to thrive in an academic environment and helps to create more equal mentoring, regardless of department/program and past graduate training.

### D. Teaching and Curriculum

1. **Intentionally reflect on the curriculum periodically**

   Teaching practices and curriculum are foundational for Vanderbilt’s identity as a leader in higher education. Excellence through diversity requires curriculum and teaching practices that foster a diverse, dynamic, and inclusive intellectual community. The curriculum should reflect the needs and interests of evolving disciplines and an increasingly diverse student body that faces many demands from a changing world, one in which issues of difference and inequality are central. The first step in a process of developing this curriculum is to critically reflect on courses offered.

   **Recommendation:** Establish a process of intentional reflection on the curriculum. All schools, departments, and programs should have a process of intentional reflection on the existing curriculum to ensure it represents the very best and most up-to-date scholarship, and to ensure it meets the needs of students and the world they serve. This should be done on a regular 5-year timeframe, with any results and recommended changes reported to the Dean. The metrics used in assessment may be specific to the discipline in question, but also may include those such as “diverse grounding” and “inclusive learning,” as discussed in Thomas F. Nelson Laird’s “Measuring the Diversity Inclusivity of College Courses.”
**Recommendation:** Each school should review its general education or core curriculum to determine whether they sufficiently support rigorous undergraduate and graduate education around difference, inequality, and justice.

2. Develop a curriculum that reflects values of diversity, inclusion, and community

Once there has been some critical reflection on the existing curriculum, departments, programs, and schools can identify opportunities for innovation and growth both within their curricular programs and across the institution. For this growth to occur, however, all departments, schools, and trans-institutional initiatives will require the appropriate supports to ensure that the curriculum reflects the values of diversity, inclusion, and community. Several recommendations will ensure that faculty have the support, and students have the incentives, to realize these goals.

**Recommendation:** The Provost’s and Deans’ Offices should ensure that faculty have the necessary time, resources, and professional development opportunities to innovate the curriculum as identified by departments and schools. Given the demands of research and service in faculty life, curricular innovation may not be realized quickly or fully without these opportunities. This should include expanding existing funds for course development around diversity and inclusion for all schools and trans-institutional teaching, and professional development programs at the Center for Teaching.

**Recommendation:** Each school should consider developing more expansive general education requirements for undergraduate and graduate curricula around issues of difference, inequality, and justice, as is appropriate to their fields. Students at all levels have requested these learning opportunities so that they may be more empowered citizens and more capable leaders in their professions. This may include creating required courses, course sequences, or one or more of several courses designated as part of a diversity curriculum. It also may include integration of diverse content into required courses in more thoroughgoing forms.

**Recommendation:** The University’s faculty should develop more optional school-based or trans-institutional curricula—for undergraduate and graduate students—that enhance understanding of issues related to difference and inequality, particularly ones that incorporate rigorous trans-disciplinary and immersive learning experiences. These curricula may vary by school and discipline, but may include two or more courses that focus students on trans-disciplinary issues related to difference and inequality, with opportunities for engagement in real-world communities in Nashville and beyond that enhance student capacities for intercultural expertise and leadership. These curricula would afford students and faculty opportunities for well-proven high-impact practices of experiential learning and community engagement. Connect these curricular offerings to career and workforce development—help students recognize the value to their future career prospects in developing core competencies related to diversity. This may include introductory, intermediate, advanced, or capstone offerings for either undergraduates or graduate students. Capstone curricula present an especially appropriate opportunity to encourage immersion and reflection, and therefore consolidate and extend learning on issues of difference. Models for this form of undergraduate engagement exist in two of the Vanderbilt proposals for the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools’ Quality Enhancement Plan.

**Recommendation:** In order to deepen the relationships between the Davidson County community and Vanderbilt University, provide incentives to help include community members in courses. For example, staff from Nashville Cares could lecture in classes that concern AIDS, or community organizing, or community health. Staff members from Thistle Farms/ Magdalene House could provide a course on Women’s health issues or on starting a small business.

**Recommendation:** The university should create more funding for each school and all transinstitutional programs to plan co-curricular events—speaker series, conferences, community-campus exchanges—related to issues of difference and inequality in the region, the US, and throughout the world. This co-curriculum should be tied to the Living Learning Communities of the Commons and College Halls, and to various disciplinary and interdisciplinary curricula, so that the learning gains of both the curriculum and co-curriculum are enhanced through integration. Coordinating and scheduling these events across schools and fields will be critical so that they are mutually supportive and not competing.

**Recommendation:** Develop new programs with minors and majors in fields of study that would serve student interest, expand Vanderbilt’s curriculum on difference, and represent inclusive excellence in higher education. Asian-American Studies, Disability Studies, Sexuality Studies, and Native American Studies currently do not have programs with minors and majors, yet they are represented in various courses across the Vanderbilt curriculum, are prominent areas of academic scholarship and teaching, and would serve student interests across campus. We therefore recommend that faculty groups related to each of these areas be supported in their efforts to develop these programs and curricula. For example, the Women’s
and Gender Studies intends to rename itself Gender and Sexuality Studies and ask for more resources to offer an LGBTQI curriculum that addresses important gender and sexuality issues throughout the disciplines. We recommend that Vanderbilt fully support this and similar efforts to build a more robust curriculum on issues of difference.

3. Support faculty development around inclusive teaching

For teaching to be excellent at fostering critical thinking, problem solving, and a host of other intellectual abilities, students must engage in exchanges that are challenging, provocative, and confounding. However, at no point should the classroom be a place where the human dignity of teachers and learners be forgotten or one where prejudices, biases, and inequities exist. These only serve to disrupt the learning process and limit the potential of both teachers and students from learning the most. Students, staff, and faculty therefore must create learning environments in which principles and practices of inclusive excellence are embraced fully. Indeed, all students bring unique abilities, challenges, experiences, and knowledge to the classroom, but all should be able to participate fully in the learning process regardless of their differences of race, gender, sexuality, religion, nationality, language, ability, mental health, learning preferences, or any other difference.

**Recommendation:** Vanderbilt should support additional programming and the necessary staff to ensure that all schools, departments, and co-curricular units engage in professional development around principles and practices of inclusive teaching. Each discipline or unit should have sufficient resources and program coordination to develop their inclusive teaching practices via external speakers and consultants, and internal consultants and programs offered through the Center for Teaching (CFT). To do this work well, the CFT should receive sufficient staff (2) and graduate assistants (2) to develop new programs in inclusive teaching for a growing number of faculty and graduate students, including regular inclusive course design institutes, learning communities on teaching and difference, faculty fellowships (similar to the CFT’s eight Junior Faculty Teaching Fellowships each year), as well as workshops and consultations on a variety of topics. These topics include: unconscious biases in teaching, high-impact collaborative teaching, critical and inclusive pedagogies, reducing stereotype threat and microaggressions, difference and power in graduate student mentoring, engaging in difficult dialogues effectively, discipline-specific teaching practices around difference, accommodating and supporting students with disabilities, supporting faculty from underrepresented groups, and teaching international students, to name just a few.

**Recommendation:** Provide educational technology solutions and training for connecting faculty and students at Vanderbilt with community partners and peers at regional HBCUs, making Vanderbilt a hub in a broad regional network of interaction for enhanced teaching, curricular, research, and service opportunities.

**Recommendation:** Create a Diversity and Inclusion Education Council to provide the necessary informal coordination between all offices engaged in diversity and inclusion education, workshops, and other forums. Currently, a variety of offices support students, staff, and faculty with educational opportunities on diversity and inclusion, including but not limited to the Psychological and Counseling Center, the Commons, the KC Potter Center, the Cuninggim Women’s Center, the Carpenter Program on Religion, Gender, and Sexuality, the Bishop Johnson Black Cultural Center, the Kelly Miller Smith Institute for Black Church Studies, the Center for Teaching, EAD (Equal Opportunity, Affirmative Action, and Disability Services), International Student & Scholar Services. To ensure these efforts meet the needs of institutional change will require them to have a clear division of responsibilities, open lines of communication, collaboration, mutual learning across specialty areas, and shared best practices in education. A council of this form would provide these functions and thereby enable all of its member units to achieve excellence and meet the many challenges of diversity and inclusion education.

**Recommendation:** The Provost’s and Deans’ Offices across Vanderbilt’s schools should ensure faculty are accountable to, and rewarded for, inclusive excellence in their teaching practices. Chairs and Deans should use student evaluations of faculty and annual teaching, research, and service reports to identify faculty with particular challenges and help them receive the proper assistance in developing their practices. Conversely, faculty who demonstrate inclusive excellence in their teaching should receive public recognition and prestigious awards so that they may become exemplars for the campus community. Further, ensure that every unit uses student evaluations of teaching, particularly their evaluation of instructor effectiveness in inclusive teaching, to assess and improve their teaching practices. Ensure that students are educated about unconscious biases that may affect their evaluations of faculty.

**Recommendation:** Recommendation: Support all instructors in the incorporation of universal design principles into their teaching by making teaching spaces, course websites, course management systems, and other instructional technologies fully accessible to all students.
E. Staff

Every day, thousands of individuals living in and around Davidson County come to the Vanderbilt campus for work, with responsibilities for everything from coordinating student programs to beautifying the grounds, from keeping the computers working to cooking the food—and innumerable other tasks. It is no exaggeration to say that the university could not function without the staff, and there would be no programs or services that deliver on the university mission, including its goals of diversity and inclusion, without staff involvement. Staff are the primary connection between Vanderbilt and Nashville’s diverse community, and Vanderbilt’s reputation in the community is driven in large part by the ways in which Vanderbilt values the staff. This in turn communicates Vanderbilt’s true values.

1. Fully engage staff in the educational mission of Vanderbilt and visibly recognize the integral role of staff in delivering that mission.

Staff members represent a largely untapped resource for advancing Vanderbilt’s educational mission. For many students, staff members offer some of the most supportive and meaningful relationships they have during their Vanderbilt experiences. Similarly, many staff members see this role as an enriching aspect of their work at Vanderbilt, one that should become an intentional part of their training, as well as more recognized and rewarded.

As the Joint Task Force on Student Learning has stated, “It takes a whole college to educate a whole student.”

Every staff member, from those in Dining Services to the Martha Ingram Commons, from Admissions to Alumni Relations, is part of the Vanderbilt student experience. By fully engaging staff members as part of the educational mission, students have greater chances of growth, socially and intellectually. For instance, because nearly all of the staff are residents of Nashville and the surrounding area, students learn from staff much about the region’s resources and culture, bringing greater meaning to the concept of community engagement.

Although staff members stand ready and eager to contribute to the educational mission, the University often develops programs that do not include staff as campus leaders, innovators, and educators. For example, the Provost’s initiative for Trans-Institutional Programs did not select a single proposal from highly qualified staff-led teams. The message staff receive is that they are not central to the University’s mission, and do not feel they are recognized for their innovative and meaningful contributions. Staff members are already contributing to the diversity mission on campus, but would like more recognition of their work as well as opportunities to expand that work. Furthermore, staff members often have a more holistic understanding of student life and learning. Staff members are often present in the “bridge” space where students are connecting classroom learning with their other lived experiences. Staff often spend more time with students than faculty and may be supportive of students during crises, but are not called on for this expertise when the university is planning student programs. Similarly, other staff across the university have disciplinary and administrative expertise that is not integrated into program development or strategic planning.

Recommendation: Create explicit opportunities, within as many staff job titles as possible, for staff to meaningfully contribute to the educational mission, and to develop professionally so they can do so even more effectively. This would include changing job descriptions and expectations to explicitly recognize this work.

Recommendation: Create more visible recognitions of staff for advancing diversity. Formerly, Vanderbilt recognized staff with an Affirmative Action and Diversity Award delivered by the Chancellor; something similar could be revived. Other awards for excellence in contributions to the educational mission could be established as well.

Recommendation: Create opportunities for more staff involvement in campus life and activities, programs and centers that provide connection and community for diverse groups, but which are often currently available only to students and faculty.

2. Pay all staff a living wage.

A diverse and inclusive campus is one that recognizes and respects the dignity of all students, staff, and faculty, especially those on whom the university depends for its maintenance and daily operations. The value we give to campus workers, workers who are overwhelmingly from underrepresented groups, sends a signal to students, faculty, and the surrounding community about Vanderbilt’s commitments to diversity and equity. Despite the essential services that they provide to the entire community, many Vanderbilt staff members are not paid a living wage. MIT Urban Planning scholar Amy Glasmeier has calculated a living wage in Nashville as approximately $11.50 an hour or $20,000 for 35 hours of work over 52 weeks of the year. Given the recent inflation in the Nashville economy, many members of the Vanderbilt community dispute that $20,000 annual figure and place the living wage closer to $15 an hour or approximately $27,000 a year. Too many Vanderbilt staff members who are paid under $15 an hour are forced to work multiple jobs while still giving their all to the Vanderbilt community.
**Recommendation:** Conduct a study of the true living wage required to live in Davidson County and establish a living wage at Vanderbilt of no less than $15/hour. Further, providing a living wage is a goal that the Committee urges not to be met by reducing the number of jobs or by subcontracting labor from third parties, since this would not be in keeping with the principles of inclusion and equity.

Vanderbilt policies currently effectively cut staff wages and benefits. Examples include requiring staff members to use one of their “off” days (paid time off days) when the campus is closed because of snow or ice, reducing the number of “off” days for staff members by seven days a year, and limiting staff members on paternal leave to short term disability which only pays 66% of salary up to a total of $24,000.

**Recommendation:** Align policies and benefits to support a true living wage, keep benefits equitable, and do not reduce days off when conditions demand campus closures. Many Vanderbilt staff, particularly those in Dining Services, are employed on nine-month contracts with layoffs every summer, and thus must find alternative employment during those months. This work can be less stable and financially rewarding for workers, and thus their abilities to feel commitment and lasting opportunity at Vanderbilt. Recently, Dining Services, Plant Operations, and Human Resources have cooperated to develop a pipeline for some nine-month employees to find summer work in Plant Ops.

**Recommendation:** Expand this pilot program or develop new creative programs to find summer work at Vanderbilt for all nine-month employees with summer layoffs. The decision to outsource some custodial and other service positions to third-party contractors, despite being logistically convenient, is a way to avoid living wages and fair benefits.

**Recommendation:** Reconsider the decision to outsource some custodial and other service positions to third-party contractors.

3. **Enhance staff training and professional development opportunities.**

At a university that values diversity, equity, and inclusion, there must be clear and equitable paths for staff advancement and caring professional mentorship that empowers staff to do their best and grow in their capacities. Without transparent paths in place, staff may not feel valued, limiting their inclusion and community, and one might suppose it would affect their productivity and length of employment. Further, without the support necessary to achieve professional advancement, many staff members, especially those from underrepresented groups, do not advance—and thus do not diversify campus staff leadership. Currently at Vanderbilt, staff members often reach the top of their career paths and find that there is no information on how they might transfer to another job track or gain more responsibility and compensation within their units. The Vanderbilt University Police Department has a successful model of staff development that was favorably studied by Peabody College. The clear paths to promotion within VUPD have increased retention and employee satisfaction. The VUPD program’s model is a Vanderbilt University best practice.

**Recommendation:** Create multiple pathways to personal and professional development. Consider the VU Police Department’s system for staff advancement as an exemplar for other staff positions.

A truly diverse and inclusive university should care about staff development in the same way that it cares about faculty and student development. Vanderbilt University does not live up to that standard. In fact, the one topic that the staff advisory council returned to in each of our meetings was the desire for training, leadership opportunities, and advancement. Staff report that training opportunities are not provided on an equitable basis to all staff. In addition, staff at Vanderbilt are not provided the same educational opportunities as are staff at neighboring universities who are able to earn a bachelor’s degree at no cost, Vanderbilt staff are limited to a small number of courses per year with partial tuition remission, limiting the utility of this benefit in practice for many staff.

**Recommendation:** Create opportunities for training and leadership, including: training for advancement and leadership development within one’s job, and normalization of ongoing “diversity” education forums for all faculty/staff positions. In addition, Vanderbilt should provide staff members with access to free coursework in sufficient quantity to allow a staff member to obtain a degree in no more than eight (8) years, and the University should adopt a leave policy that permits staff members to take courses during traditional work hours and make up their time at less traditional times so as to be able to attend classes.

**Recommendation:** Equalize the provision of benefits between faculty members and staff members so that professional staff members in residence in campus housing as part of their employment may live in campus housing with their same sex partners to the same extent as faculty in residence in faculty housing. In addition, allow staff members to apply for leadership positions as VUceptors and other programs where their skills and interests are appropriate.

**Recommendation:** Have HR review staff and faculty benefits and equalize those benefits where there are
significant differences. We recognize that it can be hard for one mentor—whether self-selected out of a personal act or formally assigned—to offer the kind of collective wisdom that a community can offer. Just as we have doctoral committees that offer our graduate students different perspectives on their work and different types of support, in order to effectively support faculty members on the tenure track, we need to harness sufficient mentoring from the department, the school, and across the university.

**Recommendation:** Explore ways to build small communities of mentors upon which all of our people can draw. These small communities might provide tremendous leverage especially for our most sought after mentors who could discuss challenges with protégés in small group settings so as to add value to the mentoring process through listening to, and sharing, experiences and challenges.

4. **Increase the recruitment of underrepresented groups to Vanderbilt staff positions.**

If Vanderbilt is to fully support a diverse student body and faculty, its staff must be an example of the principles of diversity and inclusion. Therefore, Vanderbilt needs to do more to recruit and retain staff from underrepresented groups.

**Recommendation:** Enable stronger relationships between hiring units and Human Resources recruiters. To ensure the pool of applicants is as diverse as possible, units should embrace best practices of recruiting, including but not limited to the circulation of job advertisements in publications and professional societies that have high numbers of members from underrepresented groups. To ensure that the entire diverse pool of applicants is considered for a position, HR should review the diversity of the pool before moving forward in the process.

**Recommendation:** Vanderbilt should adopt best practices of retention by providing all employees with sufficient wages, benefits, career advancement opportunities, and a climate of support and care to ensure a diverse and capable staff finds Vanderbilt a preferred employer in the local labor market.

5. **Enhance shared governance and accountability for all Vanderbilt employees, including staff and faculty.**

Creating a university that models diversity, inclusion, and community is the responsibility of every student, faculty, staff, and administrator, not merely those who have special expertise or leadership positions around issues of diversity or those at the top of the organizational chart. Staff and faculty at all levels contribute to diversity and inclusion through their day-to-day labor across campus, and through this work they gain organizational expertise in how to realize these goals. Therefore, the decision-making and planning processes that realize diversity and inclusion goals are ones to which all staff should have the ability to contribute meaningfully, and ones to which all should be held responsible. Indeed, if Vanderbilt University is to function as a true community with shared vision and work, particularly in the area of diversity and inclusion, all members of the community must have opportunities for their voices to be heard and respected by decision-makers. This will not only create the trust necessary for a more communal and inclusive campus climate, but it will create loyalty, buy-in, and knowledge sharing crucial to successful implementation of the mission. Staff, along with faculty and students, must know that they are valued through the practices of the university, not merely its words.

**Recommendation:** Open as many opportunities as possible for more shared governance by establishing committees with staff, faculty, and student representation, particularly in the implementation of diversity and inclusion policies and programs. Further, establish communication practices that enable truly shared governance, including involving staff members in the creation of diversity goals; increasing practices/mechanisms for staff to give feedback to supervisors, departments, or Vanderbilt as a whole (e.g. climate and satisfaction surveys, etc.); treating all staff members with respect when they are raising concerns about problematic language or practices, or share alternatives; and supporting staff creativity and innovation in which change is sought rather than avoided.

**Recommendation:** To ensure shared accountability for staff and faculty, adopt concrete goals that are evaluated each year; rewards for increasing and maintaining diversity and inclusion; specific diversity-related evaluations, followed by an analysis of what is needed for improvement; leaders’ and supervisors’ engagement in enhancing staff members’ development; and opportunities for feedback both up and down the organization chart.

6. **Hire staff to support the policies and programs necessary to meet the goals of diversity and inclusion**

**Recommendation:** Hire significant numbers of new staff to support the goals of diversity and inclusion. To accomplish the work of diversity and inclusion, Vanderbilt must embark on a myriad of tasks associated with the policies and programs recommended here, many of which are new to the university. The work required from staff members in order to make these programs a success is beyond significant; it is transformative in its scope and depth. There must be data gathering and assessment, new orientation and mentorship programs, support for student mental health and education, new diversity education for all members of the campus community, assistance
for new centers, support for faculty development, administration of new programs for international and other diverse student groups, and more. Every member of the Vanderbilt community should be involved in this work; existing staff and faculty cannot do it alone. Yet because much of the work is challenging and complex, requiring professional expertise and experience, it also cannot be done merely by training undergraduate and graduate assistants. Rather, part of accountability is committing to provide the additional staff support required to make each program a success. We already know that many key programs are understaffed compared to their most generous past funding. Yet now these programs are forced to service more students with less staff and smaller budgets. If Vanderbilt University is to take the leadership role in diversity that we can and should embrace, then we cannot place more and more responsibility on the same or even a smaller numbers of staff members. Some of specific recommendations regarding staff may be found in subsequent recommendations regarding support for existing centers below.

7. Ensure a professionally respectful climate at Vanderbilt for all.

A fundamental element of a diverse and inclusive community is a universal and mutual respect for the human dignity of all its members. This is particularly necessary for staff given the vulnerability they have to being disrespected and poorly treated by students, faculty, and administrators.

Recommendation: Vanderbilt must affirm respect for the humanity and work of its staff, in addition to students and faculty. We emphasize “respect” because of concern over the sometimes negative use of “civility” (e.g., dismissing legitimate anger over mistreatment as uncivil).

---

F. Community Engagement and Research Centers

As reported in the Best Practices section, there is considerable research showing the importance of developing diversity and inclusion competencies as a resource for creativity in research, problem solving, and innovation. \(^{126}\) Research also shows that fostering diversity and inclusion is hard work. It requires persistent engagement, openness to discomfort, and willingness to invest time and emotional energy. It requires community building as well as scholarship and teaching.

Vanderbilt has established Programs and Centers that contribute directly to the goals of diversification and inclusion.

- Some do so primarily by promoting and supporting scholarship and teaching (hereafter Academic Centers).
- Others do so primarily by providing co-curricular programming that supports specific groups within the Vanderbilt community, educates others about those groups, and fosters community across various dividing lines (hereafter Community Centers).
- Some combine academic and community engagement.

Financial and staffing support for these Programs and Centers varies widely and ebbs and flows. We contacted each program/center director and asked them for current and historic staffing levels and current staffing needs. Listed below are specific recommendations that resulted from those exchanges, with the understanding that specific resource levels must ultimately be determined by the appropriate unit/school/college heads/deans.

In some cases, it may be valuable to reconsider the positioning of existing centers or programs within the organizational chart. For example, Religious Life is currently positioned within the purview of the Dean of Students, which may limit the ability of the center to serve staff and faculty and the broader community or to develop programming that effectively links these various aspects of the community.

Encourage and enable innovation in programming from campus support centers to be inclusive of the broader community, and consider opportunities for engagement of “staff interns”—experts from the broader community.

1. Increase Support for Existing Academic Programs/ Centers

- **African American Diaspora Studies Program/ Callie House Center:**

  Recommendation: Make African American and Diaspora Studies a full department with hiring and tenure lines, recognizing that there have been a number of faculty losses and impending retirements. Also provide six (6) tenured/tenure-stream lines over six-year hiring period. These hires will replace:
  - two faculty retention losses
  - departure of the Mellon Assistant Professor (2017)
  - three pending retirements

  The grad assistants and pre-doc/post doc fellows will be housed in House Center. The grad assistants though will help with teaching and research of faculty in AADS as well as activities in Center.

- **Asian Studies Program and Asian Cultural Center:**

  Recommendation: Support the Asian Studies Program’s plans to hire the following:
• Senior Lecturer in Hindi-Urdu Applying for a Korea Foundation Grant to hire a tenure-track Assistant Professor in Korean Studies (Fall 2017)

• Senior Lecturer in Korean language (Fall 2017)

The Committee heard from the Asian community that a Cultural Center along the lines of the Bishop Johnson Center is needed on the campus. Though we must recognize and accept the differences among Asians on campus, such a center would give Asians the opportunity to meet other Asians in an informal cultural space, where they can organize and plan activities. The center, for example, can have TV channels that can receive programs from Asian countries and a kitchen for students to prepare meals. This center could hire a director who can serve as a counselor and be familiar with Asian cultures and the needs of Asian students. Linguistic, cultural, and religious barriers, student and resident visas are some concerns that could be addressed. The director could also establish liaison between the Vanderbilt center and the Nashville Asian communities.

Recommendation: Create an Asian Cultural Center, as a space to enrich the cultural life and celebrate the vast diversity of the Asian community in the Vanderbilt campus.

▶ Women’s and Gender Studies Program:

This program has been seriously under-supported by the University. It should grow toward departmental status, with care and thought.

Recommendation: Provide two lectureships to support expanding offerings in LGBTQI studies and two tenure track lines—perhaps joint appointments with other departments—be added in the next two years, with two more to come later.127

▶ Center for Latin American Studies:

Recommendation: Endorse its hiring plans to fill the currently vacant Associate Director position.

▶ Latino and Latina Studies:

Recommendation: Support Director’s requests as follows:

• Add three tenure-track lines to be shared with other programs and departments where Latino and Latina courses and scholarship is desirable.

• Hire and support a full-time Administrative Assistant who could also teach a course.

• Provide suitable space to house the Director, the Administrative Assistant, and future hires.

• Provide library support for annual acquisitions and one-time purchases for databases.

• Cosponsor Latino Literary Prize with Latino and Latina Studies at the University of Notre Dame and the University of Arizona Press.

Recommendation: Support an international conference on Afro-Hispanic and Afro-Latino Studies.

▶ Center for Medicine, Health, and Society:

Recommendation: Provide one additional staff person (the Director is self-funding a half-time person for next year to handle the workload).

2. Increase Support for Existing Community Programs/ Centers, As Follows:

All three of these Centers have lost a Program Coordinator position in recent years, which has reduced their ability to provide programming, much less expand it. We recommend that their prior staffing levels be restored. In two cases, we are recommending expansion of staff.

▶ Margaret Cuninggim Women’s Center:

Recommendation: Restore second program coordinator position.

▶ K.C. Potter Center:

Since late 2015, the KC Potter Center has lost one program coordinators. The KC Potter Center did 52 trainings and presentations in academic year 2015/2016 for an average of two trainings a week. Each presentation is adapted to the audience so that a presentation to a health setting is different than a presentation to a Women’s and Gender studies course. There is pent up demand for more trainings. The KC Potter Center has been forced to decline many training and presentation requests on campus and in the greater Nashville area this year. In addition, the Safe Zone materials have not been updated in 4 years because of so much staff time devoted to trainings.

When the KC Potter Center had two program coordinators, its program included a student leadership specialist (who focused on programming and outreach to our graduate student groups) and a training and education specialist.

The committee has asked the KC Potter Center to be more intentional about reaching out to graduate students, and to do so we need additional help. However, the Center has stopped doing monthly meetings with graduate student groups and monthly faculty/staff socials with our new staffing model.

Recommendation: Restore second program coordinator position.

In 2015, a counselor with a specialty in transgender identities (and other LGBQI identities) left the PCC, and the KC Potter Center has not yet found a suitable replacement. According to the quality of life survey 1.5% of students identify as trans/genderqueer and 14% identify as non-heterosexual in some way. This is a high-need population with very specific and wide-ranging needs.
Although Vanderbilt has a 93% graduation rate, the KC Potter Center is aware of several students on medical and mental health leaves of absence, as well as many more who fail courses and/or take longer than four years to graduate. An LGBTQI specialist—a position split between the PCC and the KC Potter Center, in the PCC completely—would be able to serve this population.

**Recommendation:** Appoint an LGBTQI specialist in the Counseling Center.

The KC Potter Center once shared an administrative assistant with Project Safe. However, when that administrative assistant left last semester, Project Safe received a full-time Administrative Assistant, and KC Potter now shares its assistant with the Dean of Students’ main operation.

**Recommendation:** Appoint an Administrative Assistant.

▶ **Bishop Joseph Johnson Black Cultural Center:**

Presently, the Bishop Johnson Black Cultural Center operates on a model of three staff members: a director, an associate director, and an administrative assistant.

The Black Cultural Center is currently in the process of hiring an assistant director, who will report directly to the associate director and assist with the student support and development functions of the Center, including the BCC Ambassa'Dores program. The center handles a range of student issues. Black Cultural Center staff advise several student groups and is on-call for walk-in students with issues of well-being and/or crisis.

**Recommendation:** Support the Center’s desire to expand its graduate student staff, to include:

- Three graduate student workers (from either Divinity or Peabody), to assist with both the BCC Ambassa'Dores mentoring program, as well as to assist with cultural programming and program management.
- One graduate student worker to serve as a PR assistant, working with the Associate Director, to help manage the BCC’s social media presence.
- The BCC has experienced operational issues and needs to expand its usable space, as the Center is utilized by numerous University offices, departments and student organizations. Thus, there is the need for there to be a redesign of the current spaces within the Center so as to better serve students, faculty and staff needs.

**Recommendation:** Enhance the Center’s spaces as follows:

- Redesign the Black Student Alliance space to provide both office facilities and a space for storage.
- Redesign the basement area space (right side) to create an additional area for the Black Student Association office and other student functions, including a student study space. This space is now needed, because of the Legacy Lounge, which is really the only dedicated space students have within the Center for studying and relaxing. This would also help to enhance the sense of the BCC as a safe and welcoming space.
- Redesign the basement area (left side) to facilitate safe and secure storage of art and other equipment. This redesign would require either building storage racks or purchasing a similar product to install.
- Purchase additional furniture and technology for a Legacy Lounge exhibit.
- Purchase additional art for future standing BCC exhibits. This would include an augmentation to the Center’s budget to allow for more funds for art exhibits and art acquisitions.

The BCC also experiences issues with regard to community outreach and service. These issues have to do with the Center’s function as a liaison to Nashville black community, including local HBCU’s, as well as community groups and agencies and local schools. Additionally, the Center serves pre-collegians from across the nation who visit VU and wish to understand the minority student experience.

**Recommendation:** Enhance the Center’s community outreach ability as follows:

- Redesign the BCC brochure, to better reflect the University’s current "diversity and inclusion" efforts.
- Create additional brochures for pre-college students and a community brochure/marketing items.
- Expand the BCC budget, to include funds for “diversity and inclusion” outreach around BCC and other University programming which targets the Black community. This would include funds for PR, such as radio and print ads, as well as for related matters.

▶ **Office of Religious Life Multi-Faith Center:**

Reflecting its growing global diversity, Vanderbilt is already home to faculty, staff and students who practice a variety of religious traditions. Though Vanderbilt has come some distance in providing support for religious diversity, we are not yet there.

**Recommendation:** Create a Multi-Faith Center that would provide worship and gathering space for religious groups who currently lack sufficient such space on campus. It would provide programming for multi-faith work and for informing the entire campus—faculty, staff and students—about how to support religious diversity on campus. (Dining staff, e.g., would learn more about accommodating religious dietary needs.) It would also help the University build stronger connections to the full range of faith communities in the Nashville area.
3. Create a new Institute for the Study of Civil and Human Rights

The work of supporting diversity and inclusion will continue to expand. Infrastructure is a critical need to support the smaller, younger Academic and Community Programs already in existence (for example, Latino and Latina Studies) and those that are likely to form in the future. A pan-institutional center would allow some “economy of scale” in making currently “boutique” activities across campus more connected to one another and to the entire campus through the TIPs initiative currently underway at Vanderbilt. Including the professional and clinically oriented schools represents a particularly rich opportunity for trans-institutional and community-centered engagement (e.g., the Nursing School’s emphasis on serving marginalized communities in Nashville, the Owen School’s programs for social ventures emphasizing business approaches to social uplift, the Divinity School’s programs for social justice, etc.).

Recommendation: We recommend that Vanderbilt create a new Center as follows:

Vanderbilt Institute for the Advanced Study of Human Rights and Civil Rights

A Preliminary Proposal
Chancellor’s Committee on Diversity, Inclusion, and Community
July 2016

In his August 2015 address to the Vanderbilt faculty, Chancellor Nicholas Zeppos announced the formation of a committee on diversity, inclusion, and community. The committee was charged to bring recommendations from the Vanderbilt community to the Chancellor that might make Vanderbilt University a leader in higher education as exemplified by a diverse and inclusive campus. The Chancellor’s Committee on Diversity, Inclusion, and Community’s Report includes a wide range of recommendations collected from Vanderbilt faculty, staff, and students. This report sets out a vision for an Institute for the Advanced Study of Human Rights and Civil Rights.

Purpose of the Vanderbilt Institute for the Advanced Study of Human Rights and Civil Rights

RECONCILIATION

As the History section of the Committee Report demonstrates, Vanderbilt University has a long and not always friendly history surrounding human rights and civil rights on campus. We need go no further than our own living alumni to discover many “firsts.” With as complicated a history towards race, sex, identity, and inclusion, as any United States research I university, Committee members see our history as an opportunity for truth and reconciliation. Just as Vanderbilt practiced exclusion, Vanderbilt is now uniquely situated to study the effects of exclusion, oppression, race, sex, identity, and redemption, on higher education.

PROVIDING AN INCUBATOR

Vanderbilt already houses many small programs, institutes, and centers, that each contribute mightily to diversity and inclusion on campus. As the Committee Report makes clear, these programs must expand to meet growing need.

In addition to more staff and funding, the smaller, younger Academic and Community Programs already in existence (e.g., Latino/a Studies and those that are likely to form in the future) need infrastructure and could benefit from close relations to other programs and centers such as African American and Diaspora Studies, Black Cultural Center, and Women’s Center. The Vanderbilt Institute for the Advanced Study of Human and Civil Rights would serve as an incubator and initial home for the development of new programs (for example in Native American Studies or Disability Studies) and the growth of young programs (for example, Latino/a Studies). The Institute would provide the staff support needed for these programs to grow while also generating research that goes beyond the mission of any one of the smaller programs. Though studies programs are geared to enriching the teaching experience, the focus of the Institute is research with a secondary practical teaching component.

Proposed programs housed in the Institute

To that end, we recommend that Vanderbilt create a new Center that would house three initiatives:

- Diversity Studies Program
- Multi-cultural community program
► **Community engagement program**

The three initiatives, working in concert, are meant to accomplish five (5) goals:

1. **First**, to secure Vanderbilt’s national and international reputation as an exciting, innovative, and interdisciplinary center for research, scholarship, and intellectual advance.
2. **Second**, to persuade the world’s most talented, ambitious, and creative scholars, researchers, and intellectuals that Vanderbilt’s dynamic intellectual community is something that they must experience for themselves, either by becoming regular members of the faculty or by joining the community as semester- or year-long Institute fellows.
3. **Third**, to significantly accelerate the pace, volume, and innovation of interdisciplinary research and conversation on the Vanderbilt campus by focusing on building trans-institutional intellectual bridges that many scholars and researchers desire but need help to construct.
4. **Fourth**, to ensure that faculty become deeply involved in the interdisciplinary and trans-institutional focus at the heart of the Vanderbilt strategic plan.
5. **Fifth**, to bring coherence and integration to the University’s diversity related centers, programs, and institutes.

**Features of the Institute**

**HUMANITIES-SOCIAL SCIENCE CORE, WITH LINKS TO THE SCIENCES:**

The humanities and social sciences should form the core of Vanderbilt Institute for the Advanced Study of Human Rights and Civil Rights. At Vanderbilt and beyond, humanities and social sciences have less access to research funds than do the sciences; nor have the social sciences and humanities developed as strong a core of interdisciplinary and trans-institutional inquiry as in the physical and biological sciences and engineering.

The Vanderbilt Institute for the Advanced Study of Human Rights and Civil Rights must define the humanities and social sciences broadly to include all those at the university who think of themselves in those terms, and not just those whose appointments are located in the School of Arts and Science. Thus the Vanderbilt Institute for the Advanced Study of Human Rights and Civil Rights must become a center that draws in humanities and social science scholars from Divinity, Education, Law, Music, Medicine, Nursing, and other schools.

The Vanderbilt Institute for the Advanced Study of Human Rights and Civil Rights must also be a center that looks beyond its core to cultivate innovative links with hard scientists.

**CRITICAL MASS OF FELLOWS:**

On one level, critical mass means having enough individuals to generate and sustain exciting intellectual conversations; on another level, it means bringing together people from a broad cross section of the disciplines; on a third level, it means a healthy mix of visiting fellows and Vanderbilt faculty. Achieving sufficient numbers on each of these fronts increases the minimum at which critical mass is achieved. A combination of twenty Vanderbilt faculty/visiting fellows per year is the absolute minimum; a number somewhere between thirty/per year to forty/year would be ideal. The institute may wish to start small (twenty-five) and grow to forty or forty-five over the course of a five years.

**DEDICATED SPACE:**

Successful institutes almost invariably depend for their success on their ability to create space in which rich informal conversations go on all the time. For that reason, Vanderbilt Institute for the Advanced Study of Human Rights and Civil Rights must have its own building, with office and common space for the fellows.

The critical physical requirements are administrative offices for the Institute’s staff, an office for each fellow, and some form of common space, with the best kind being a seminar room that doubles as a dining room. There must also be incubator space for new and young programs and full facilities for any departments or programs housed within the Institute.

**TARGETED INTERDISCIPLINARY PROJECTS AND SEMINARS:**

Every year the Institute should reserve a significant number of its fellowships for those scholars/researchers working on two or three particular themes targeted in advance by the Institute’s governing board.

Selecting topics and organizing fellowship clusters around those topics would allow Vanderbilt to play a major role in identifying the most important research and intellectual issues of the day and bringing to campus those individuals who have done the best thinking, research, and writing on the topics. These themes must be big and capacious interdisciplinary topics; some may carry with them public policy implications (e.g., America’s health care crisis), others will be purely intellectual. Ordinarily a theme would influence the Institute’s intellectual agenda for a year, sometimes for two, and never more than three.

Each interdisciplinary or trans-institutional project should sponsor a weekly seminar to serve as the project’s intellectual motor. It is in these seminars that the fellows from the various disciplines and schools will develop common language, common methods, and common knowledge for solving the intellectual, scientific, and public policy issues with which they are engaged.
GRADUATE STUDENT TRAINING, PARTICIPATION, AND FELLOWSHIPS:

If interdisciplinary work is to succeed, it must penetrate and begin to alter graduate education, an area where disciplinary walls remain high. Thus, the Vanderbilt Institute for the Advanced Study of Civil Rights and Human Rights should take steps to encourage graduate student participation in seminars and programs.

The Institute should also fund a certain number of advanced dissertation fellowships every year and make the recipients of those fellowships regular members of the Institute for that year. The Warren Center has had good success with that kind of graduate program, and that experience should be studied and adapted to the Vanderbilt Institute for the Advanced Study of Human Rights and Civil Rights.

UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULAR CONNECTIONS:

Parallel efforts should be made to connect the intellectual work going on at the Institute with what faculty are doing in their classrooms. The Institute might want to make internal fellows eligible for small curricular grants the year of (or the year after) their fellowship on the condition that they use such grants to develop new undergraduate and graduate courses that build on the intellectual work that they will have done during their Institute year. That would be an exciting way of directing intellectual energy from Institute into undergraduate and graduate classrooms.

DIVERSITY STUDIES PROGRAM

This Program would promote new scholarship, course and curriculum development, through a number of initiatives. Thus, for example, the program would support curriculum reform across campus as urged in the Committee report. Because of concerns over IRB approvals for research that Vanderbilt needs in order to truly understand, and thus honestly serve, its own population, a part of the Institute's funding each year will support a study of the Vanderbilt population's diversity. In fact, the need for this information, and the need for the information to be collected in this way, makes funding the institute a key component of any success with the rest of the diversity initiatives outlined in the rest of this report.

Annual Members of the Diversity Studies Program would include Research fellowships for faculty (Vanderbilt and elsewhere) and post docs (for newly minted PhDs from Vanderbilt and elsewhere).

Yearlong seminars on Diversity & Inclusion issues based on the Callie House Program and the Robert Penn Warren Humanities Center models.

MULTI-CULTURAL COMMUNITY PROGRAM

This Center would provide meeting and gathering space for student groups (DAP, graduate student organizations, etc.). Housing groups together would encourage cross fertilization and cooperation. It would also be staffed by experts in cultivating cross-cultural conversation and cooperation.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT PROGRAM

As the Committee explored the relationship of the University to Nashville, we heard again and again that the University must be better connected to our neighbors and our neighborhood. Supporting research that contributes to building up Nashville’s on-going efforts to become a community that embraces diversity as a strength could model how a great university can contribute to the creation of a great city.

We know that there are any number of connections (occasional and more robust) between different University entities and Nashville community organizations. By developing more collaborative and effective campus-community partnerships, the Center will enhance the capabilities of faculty in their research and teaching, students in their learning and leadership development, staff in their public service, and community members in their search for the common good.

One recent example of community engagement is the $11.6 million NIH grant to Vanderbilt, the University of Miami, and Meharry Medical College, to help launch a new center that uses precision medicine to eradicate health disparities among African-Americans and Latinos. [http://news.vanderbilt.edu/2016/05/nih-awards-11-6-million-grant-to-vanderbilt-miami-and-meharry-for-new-center-to-study-precision-medicine-and-health-disparities/?utm_source=research_email&utm_medium=research_email&utm_campaign=research_email_2016-05-27](http://news.vanderbilt.edu/2016/05/nih-awards-11-6-million-grant-to-vanderbilt-miami-and-meharry-for-new-center-to-study-precision-medicine-and-health-disparities/?utm_source=research_email&utm_medium=research_email&utm_campaign=research_email_2016-05-27)
G. Administration, Governance, and Accountability

This section presents the means to obtain diversity and inclusion by emphasizing the importance of accountability.128

Justifications

The justifications for most of the recommendations and observations here come from the success of practices in the School of Medicine, examples from the AAMC Strategic Plan Report (2014), and other peer universities. It is our belief that practices that have shown measurable results in one part of Vanderbilt are more likely to produce results in other parts of the university. Therefore, we point out that other universities use these techniques but emphasize the success that Vanderbilt has already achieved with these methods.129

Research and Record Keeping

The recommendations are meant to enhance the lives of every faculty member, staff member, and student while improving the University’s national and international standing. The main thrust of every recommendation is enhancement of the university through investigation. Therefore, a great deal of emphasis is put on collecting and analyzing information about the University and how it treats different members of the community as a basis for rewards and obligations.

Ultimate Responsibility for Diversity and Inclusion

We suggest that the recommendations for administration and governance address each layer of the university bureaucracy in turn so that every part of the university has separate and related responsibilities for diversity, inclusion, retention, and community. In this report, the senior Administration is viewed as the Board of Trust, the Chancellor, the Provost, the Chief Diversity Officer (CDO), and the other Vice Chancellors. This group is most responsible for the success or failure of each diversity plan. Though the Board of Trust will have no day to day role in carrying out Diversity and Inclusion plans, it is imperative that time is allotted at every Board of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADMINISTRATION, GOVERNANCE, ACCOUNTABILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHANCELLOR</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Set the “tone at the top”</em> by demonstrating the importance of diversity throughout the organization through words and actions*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROVOST</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Provost and other vice chancellors implement new accountability and data collection systems, support the deans and other major unit heads, and hold them accountable for diversity goals. CDO works alongside the provost and other vice chancellors, convening a diversity roundtable of senior university leadership to regularly discuss diversity and across the org chart.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEANS &amp; Major Unit Heads</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Work with unit-level Diversity Officer (e.g., Associate Dean for Diversity within Schools, Diversity Liaison within major units) to develop “tool kits” for chairs and other unit heads</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHAIRS &amp; Other Unit Heads</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Annual report on moving faculty/staff up through ranks, and progress on diversity of faculty/staff through recruitment efforts</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FACULTY STAFF STUDENTS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Create granular, unit-level diversity and inclusion plans through processes that are appropriate for each unit and that are representative of staff, students, and faculty, as appropriate for that unit</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DIVERSITY PLANS MADE PUBLIC AS APPROPRIATE
Trust meeting for a Diversity and Inclusion update from the Chancellor and CDO.

The Chief Diversity Officer must continue to report directly to the Chancellor so that the entire university community understands the value that University leadership places in the CDO office.

Deans and department chairs report up to the Provost, who reports to the Chancellor. They are important implementers of the administration’s diversity plans. Every Dean must construct a strategic five-year diversity and inclusion plan based on individual college metrics. Plans will be evaluated and assisted in implementation by the Provost. The plans will consist of timelines, milestones, metrics, and outcomes. Each Dean should also select a Faculty Liaison or Associate Dean for Diversity and Inclusion, who will become part of the CDO’s Advisory Committee and will assist in creating and implementing the college’s diversity and inclusion plan.

In the spirit of inclusiveness, it is imperative that our citizens—faculty, staff, and students—are intimately involved in the creation, assessment, and accountability structure of the strategic plan. Therefore, the Faculty Liaison or Assistant Dean for Diversity will also work in concert with the school-specific Diversity Committee composed of selected faculty, staff, and students in the entire process of school and dean accountability, from planning to implementation.

**Chancellor Responsibilities:**

There are parts of the university culture that cross all boundaries. Throughout Vanderbilt, information is not shared concerning rewards, mentoring, and retention disaggregated by race, physical abilities, sexual orientation, gender identity, and sex. Another persistent problem is the grouping of categories so that a unit may claim diversity by reporting different groups together, masking that some groups are increasing while others are standing still or decreasing. In order to reveal and address these disparities the Chancellor should require:

1. To the extent allowed by law, an annual review of salaries across race and sex in all job categories in order to identify disparities. The analysis should be broken down by category so that specific communities are not ignored and also broken down across categories in order to reveal, for example, whether females are more likely to be housed in non-tenured positions. Make clear with each solicitation that all information regarding sexual orientation or disability is voluntary.

2. An annual climate survey of all students, staff, and faculty, with the option to reveal sexual orientation and gender identity, structured to have a high response rate and to include class, gender identity, and attitudes toward diversity, in addition to race, physical abilities, and sexual orientation. (clarify per blue highlighted note above)

3. Collection of demographic information on all students, faculty, and staff to assist in developing Strategic Diversity Plans across campus.

In collecting information about the Vanderbilt community, the surveys should pay particular attention to the wide diversity cross race, physical abilities, sexual orientation, gender identity, and sex. It is important to account for the differences in sub-groups contained within larger groups. For example, the bi-sexual community on campus reports feeling invisible when folded into the LGBTQI community and the concerns of transgender people are not always the same as the concerns of gay, lesbian, and bisexual people.

**Provost Responsibilities:**

As the head of the faculty, the Provost is particularly responsible for ensuring that faculty members receive proper support and guidance as they work through the tenure track from assistant professor to associate professor to full professor without regard to race, physical abilities, sexual orientation, gender identity, or sex. The Provost is responsible for monitoring the Deans and Department Chairs so that faculty members have opportunities for success and inclusion without regard to race, physical abilities, sexual orientation, gender identity, and sex.

1. Monitor the Deans for their retention and mentoring of faculty members by race and sex.

2. An annual review of faculty members by race and sex, showing how many years each group is kept in rank, including the rank of chaired professor. This information to be used to encourage Deans to make appropriate plans for moving faculty members through the ranks.

3. Monitor and ensure that faculty members are not over-represented in university service that does not translate into leadership positions.

4. In that incentives to achieve diversity goals and their need will likely be school-specific, how they will be used by each school will be decided by the Provost and each dean.

5. Prepare a plan for each faculty member showing what the Dean has done in order to support and promote that faculty member’s success.

6. Evaluate the Strategic Diversity Plan for each school and perform a yearly review with each Dean.

7. Develop metrics to structure compensation to reward for taking actionable, specific steps to increase diversity. Measure by using metrics and proven strategies. Increase funding for Deans and Department Chairs if these metrics are met.

The Provost should appoint a Vice Provost for Faculty Diversity and Development, whose role is to interface directly with all aspects of faculty recruitment, hiring, and promotion. The
vice provost will coordinate with the CDO, but as a direct report to the Provost operates fundamentally within the context of academic affairs. The vice provost should be intimately engaged in all matters materially pertaining to faculty—searches, hiring, promotion, tenure, retention. For example, Harvard University has a Senior Vice Provost for Faculty Development and Diversity; among other duties, this officer produces an annual report on faculty diversity (including granular data down to single digits) as well as a Best Practices for Faculty Searches guide that could be utilized as a model for VU.130

The Provost should appoint an individual, perhaps within the area of the Dean of Students, whose role is to interface directly with all aspects of student life in the context of diversity and inclusion. This individual would coordinate with the CDO as well, but reporting up to the provost.

Chief Diversity Officer Responsibilities:
The Chief Diversity Officer’s role is to serve as eyes and ears for the Board of Trust, Chancellor, and Provost, as well as spokesperson for underrepresented groups within the Vanderbilt community. In these roles, the CDO opens lines of communication so that every member of the community can contribute to the Vanderbilt mission at the highest level.

The CDO also serves as a resource to the Provost—including especially in coordination with a Vice Provost for Faculty Diversity—and the Deans on ways to diversify with excellence across the campus and how to reach out to alumni and other groups that Vanderbilt has failed to engage in the past to its detriment. In this role the CDO is responsible for presenting current data about Vanderbilt through surveys, statistical analysis, and outreach.

The successor to the current Diversity, Inclusion, and Community committee is a key component of the CDO structure. Its new role needs to be discerned—for example: as a group to serve as the sounding board for new ideas brought by senior leadership, part of monitoring diversity, raising responses to concerns from staff, faculty, and students.

The CDO will require a Working Group to assist with the engineering and implementation of the recommendations of this report, including careful attention to installing the system of recommendations in a manner that respects the leadership structure of the university. In particular, it is essential that the CDO have appropriate counterparts throughout the org chart—including especially a Vice Provost for Faculty Diversity and Development, Associate Deans for Diversity within the schools, etc.—while preserving the ability of individual vice chancellors and deans to exert appropriate leadership for their units.

To the extent that the CDO is to serve as a key engineer for embedding diversity across the university, we recommend that the office be renamed as Vice Chancellor for Equity and Diversity Inclusion, that is, the overarching purview is the inclusion of diversity into and across the university. Since the CDO will coordinate with other individuals who operate within the respective areas of other vice chancellors (i.e., faculty, students, and staff; see below), the CDO’s purpose can be seen as being principally in service of the university culture and climate, and working with the other vice chancellors on developing systems for talent management. Indeed, it is important that the CDO coordinate with areas across the university that pertain to career development (for faculty, staff, students) because competence in diversity is emerging as a core competency expected of our students entering the workforce, of staff for professional advancement, and of faculty for effectively teaching and mentoring students.

The CDO should be added as a non-voting member of the university’s promotion and tenure committee. This enables the CDO to serve as a resource to the committee—to help the committee execute its functions with fairness and with cognizance of possible unconscious bias—without appearing to interfere with the committee’s essential responsibility over promotion and tenure as a fundamental academic function.

The CDO must also coordinate closely with the vice chancellor for public affairs to enable the university to respond rapidly and proactively when situations arise that warrant a public statement from the university.

Finally, succession planning for the CDO role should be viewed as an opportunity for developing the future top leadership for the university.

Other Vice Chancellor Responsibilities:
The description of the Provost is meant as a model for the other Vice Chancellors. They too will be asked to work with their middle management (the equivalent of the deans) to create and implement diversity plans that reflect input from all parts of the staff within their units. Also as with the deans, the CDO will convene middle managers from other Vice Chancellor areas in order to help investigate and shape the best diversity plans for each area within the University.

In particular, the Vice Chancellor for Administration should appoint an assistant vice chancellor whose role is to interface directly with all aspects of diversity and inclusion issues among staff. This individual would coordinate with the CDO as well, but reporting up to the vice chancellor for administration.

Dean Responsibilities:
Need to monitor their various departments in order to ensure that each unit has a diversity plan that meets the college’s requirements. Deans should develop an accurate view of their colleges that does not hide the realities of diversity within the colleges by, for example, lumping all under represented faculty
together in order to hide that some groups are increasing while others remain stagnant.

1. The Chief Diversity Officer should be available to work with the Assistant Deans for Diversity and Inclusion at the College level, EAD, and Human Resources in order to assist in the development of “tool kits” for deans and department chairs to aid in reaching diversity objectives, if requested.

2. Deans should report to the Provost each year on the length of time that each faculty member (whether tenure or non-tenure track) stays in rank. That report should be prepared for every faculty member and should track data by race and sex, and reviewed annually.

3. Deans or department chairs should provide a plan for the development of each faculty member.

4. Deans should obtain an assessment from internal and external panels (either other Schools within Vanderbilt, or outside Vanderbilt University) that evaluate departments with respect to diversity goals as a part of the existing evaluation processes. These assessments should attend to race and sex.

**Department Chair Responsibilities:**

1. Prepare an annual report on the department’s plan for moving each faculty member through the process from assistant professor to associate professor to full professor to chaired professor.

2. Prepare an annual assessment performed by internal and external panels that evaluate departments with respect to diversity goals as a part of the existing evaluation processes.

3. Assist in development of the school’s yearly assessment of the school-specific Diversity Plan.

**Gaining the Respect and Cooperation of the Community**

The Chancellor's committee on Diversity, Inclusion, and Community has interviewed a broad cross section of the Vanderbilt University community including: staff, undergraduate students, graduate students, and faculty. These interviews have all emphasized the need to include the community in the diversity process. Therefore we recommend that:

- The entire university community, starting with granular units across the university org chart (e.g., individual academic departments, specific functional units and offices, etc), develop diversity goals appropriate to their unit, factoring in current challenges and needs specific to their unit. These goals, along with suggested metrics appropriate to tracking those goals, are communicated up the chain, and ultimately aggregated into overarching diversity plans by the vice chancellors for each of their vertical areas. The vice chancellors then direct resources down through their vertical areas to support the diversity goals of their units, and in turn hold their units accountable to those goals.

- The CDO coordinates with key individuals placed throughout the org chart to support the inclusion of diversity throughout the university, with appropriate focused attention to faculty, staff, and students. The CDO also serves to connect the vice chancellors horizontally in the org chart, by regularly bringing the vice chancellors together as a diversity roundtable to discuss, brainstorm, troubleshoot, and otherwise collectively strive for maximum organizational excellence with regard to diversity and inclusion.

- Diversity Plans are made available within Vanderbilt as appropriate so that the community can respond to them and follow the university’s progress in achieving them.

**Recognizing Problems of Intersectionality**

The Chancellor’s committee on Diversity, Inclusion, and Community notes that there are opportunities to consider multiple, intersecting factors of diversity in the University’s diversity efforts that appear to be based on intersectional discrimination. For example, the retention of Black male faculty members needs to be increased, but the rate of retention for Black female professors is even less.

**New Infrastructure for Diversity and Inclusion**

The following chart identifies key new elements in the university leadership and org chart to enable the vision of diversity inclusion and accountability outlined here. To be clear, this is not intended to be a complete depiction of the entire org chart; indeed, we omit most of the vice chancellor lines for simplicity. New essential elements are indicated in yellow. Key coordination relationships with the CDO are represented as dashed lines; we emphasize that these are points of coordination, these positions do not report to the CDO.
New Capabilities for Diversity Accountability across Vanderbilt

*Arrows represent consultative, not reporting relationships*
VII. THE WAY FORWARD

In this Section, we connect the recommendations explicitly to the Academic Strategic Plan, present a suggested initial time-line for implementation, as well as a suggested prioritization, cost estimates, and markers of success.

A. Recommendations in Context of Academic Strategic Plan

The recommendations in this report should not be viewed in isolation but rather as an integrated whole that connect with and extend from the university’s broader mission and strategic vision. Indeed, in 2014 Vanderbilt released a new Academic Strategic Plan (ASP) that sets a strategic vision for the university, with multiple facets connected to and undergirded by a commitment to diversity:

“Vanderbilt University aspires to shape the future of higher education and to foster the creation of knowledge that together improve the human condition. Vanderbilt embraces this vision by focusing on the following goals:

1. Offering students a rich and diverse intellectual community that educates the whole person and cultivates lifelong learning

   Our graduates must be able to solve problems. Toward that end, a Vanderbilt education will instill in our students an ability to engage, to question, and to forge positive change.

   Strategic Initiatives

   • Fully endow Opportunity Vanderbilt to ensure accessibility and affordability and fully launch an Experience Vanderbilt that extends accessibility and affordability for students to engage in a fully immersive Vanderbilt experience.
   • Enrich the educational experience by completing and extending the residential college system and developing new infrastructure—including a new trans-institutional center for meaningful scholarly engagement in issues of diversity and inclusion—to foster further interconnections between discovery and learning
   • Establish Immersion Vanderbilt to ensure that every undergraduate engages in a creative and independent project, including opportunity for experiences with Nashville's diverse and dynamic communities
   • Launch new curriculum to enable foundational skills for lifelong learning, including those in the languages, the arts, and new technology, as well as key analytical skills to enable engagement with issues of difference, power, and marginalization
   • Establish a Cross-College Teaching Initiative that allows all faculty to work together to educate our undergraduate, graduate and professional students in inclusive ways that make the full array of Vanderbilt undergraduate majors accessible to all and that make Vanderbilt a leader in diversifying the professions and the academy

2. Investing in multi- and inter-disciplinary programs to lead in defining and addressing important problems facing society, while pursuing new and exciting opportunities

Vanderbilt is poised to excel in discovery and learning by leveraging the tremendous expertise from across One Vanderbilt while further strengthening our training of
future leaders and scholars. Trans-institutional programs will focus on issues of wide-ranging significance, create and/or extend collaborations across multiple fields, and include both research and teaching components, positioning Vanderbilt to be a world leader.

**Strategic Initiatives**
- Establish a university-wide council to oversee Trans-institutional Programs (TIPs), developing and applying criteria for guiding investments in new and existing TIPs that fully engage staff as well as faculty and students in the educational mission of the university
- Provide seed money for creative ideas with clear benchmarks for ongoing support, including measures of impact with regard to diversity, and establish sustainable platforms and environments for incubating innovative ventures for discovery and learning.
- Invest in graduate education to make dramatic improvements that advance recruiting and special training, and strengthen our intellectually rich culture across the entire campus, by more fully leveraging the Graduate School for trans-institutional, diverse faculty development and strategic partnerships with local and regional Historically Black Colleges and Universities to make Vanderbilt a national leader in the production of PhDs to underrepresented groups.

3. **Building distinctive and distinguished programs that develop and offer effective solutions to pressing health and healthcare problems**

Vanderbilt must harness its widely recognized strengths in healthcare and considerable disciplinary breadth across our compact campus.

We recommend support for efforts to develop and implement innovative, aggressive and multidisciplinary solutions that... **advance the quality, equity, and accountability of healthcare services**... and **train future leaders and scholars in healthcare**.

**Strategic Initiatives**
- Create sustainable platforms to support fundamental research and engage diverse researchers and learners yielding discoveries about the molecular basis of disease
- Launch efforts to infuse health and biomedical science initiatives with university strengths in the humanities and social sciences, and provide forums for understanding the cultural, economic, legal, political, social and attributes that affect health and disease prevention across the diverse demographic groups—and their intersections—that comprise our community, country, and world
- Develop specialized curriculum that will train future leaders to address complex health and healthcare issues from innovative interdisciplinary perspectives as well as through the lens of human diversity, including expanding dual degree programs in ways that ensure the training of diverse future scholars and leaders
- Make Vanderbilt a national “hub” for identifying solutions in healthcare delivery and policy, including in particular with regard to marginalized communities

4. **Transforming education models through technology and research**

Vanderbilt must build on its international reputation and conduct cutting-edge research that will assess effectiveness of new education technologies, which, in turn, will allow us to be a leader in best practices. We must embrace those new education technologies that foster innovation in learning, teaching, and discovery.

**Strategic Initiatives**
- Create new infrastructure that supports emerging education technologies and enables personalized and connected learning for all Vanderbilt students—current, past, and future—including opportunities to engage Vanderbilt’s diverse and global community of alumni in training and mentoring current Vanderbilt students
- Build partnerships between the new Vanderbilt Institute for Digital Learning, the Center for Teaching, libraries, and all campus programs to efficiently and effectively advance new technologies incorporating ideas of universal design for broad accessibility for persons with disabilities
- Employ new education technologies to forge partnerships, collaborations, and global outreach, extending local exemplar partnerships regionally, nationally, and globally for enhanced recruitment of diverse faculty and training of diverse students

Finally, the ASP emphasizes the importance of ongoing assessment and review of progress with respect to benchmarks as a form of stewardship for the future, and we reaffirm these commitments as central to building a fully diverse and inclusive Vanderbilt community. Here we quote from the ASP and indicate in blue this report’s amplifications and extensions:

- Vanderbilt will assess outcomes and be accountable for the efficient use of resources, including its precious human resources
- Vanderbilt will assess the achievements and satisfaction of students and faculty, going beyond mere compliance with required data collection and with full attention paid to underrepresented and intersectional groups
• Vanderbilt will assess the impact of research and the effectiveness of learning, including with respect to diversity and inclusion goals
• Vanderbilt will periodically review its activities in these thematic areas, eliminating or improving underperforming areas, including with respect to diversity and inclusion goals, and setting priorities so the University can be truly distinctive

B. Implementation, Prioritization, and Timeline

Both as a matter of the Committee’s formal charge and as a matter of principle, the Committee approached its work with a focus on articulating a vision and the high-level recommendations needed to achieve that vision; we did not in general attempt to flesh out all of the details or to engineer the implementation. These are things best left to those who will be ultimately responsible and accountable for implementation. At the same time, the Committee’s work did result in some thinking that may help inform and guide the implementation, and we offer these considerations as helpful suggestions.

What does success look like?

One important way of assessing progress toward our goals is to envision what Vanderbilt will look like when the goals are achieved. In other words, what does success look like?

Here we consider each of the high-level summary recommendations in this regard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>What does success look like?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Culture and Climate</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherd students throughout their experience with mentoring and coaching</td>
<td>All incoming undergraduate, graduate, and professional students have opportunity for appropriate on-ramps to Vanderbilt, including bridge programs. Students are prepared to hit the ground running in their program academically, financially, and personally, and they know how to access all available resources to support their success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make all majors accessible to students in each college or school.</td>
<td>All incoming students have opportunity for meaningful assessment intended to place them on realistic paths to success in their chosen majors. Recognizing the superb qualifications and abilities of admitted students, the faculty eschew a “weed out” mindset. The curriculum enables paths to success in every major for the full range of academic preparation found among admitted Vanderbilt students, and pedagogical practices support positive learning outcomes for all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employ sensitivity in creating symbols and environments.</td>
<td>All members of the Vanderbilt community feel belonging and find exemplars of their identity, culture, or heritage among the various images, symbols, or names on campus. Confederate Memorial Hall has been renamed. Vanderbilt involves the full community in regularly revisiting symbols and in finding new ways to celebrate the rich diversity of the Vanderbilt community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make it easy for people to be called by their preferred names.</td>
<td>Recognizing that a person’s name is integral to their sense of self, all Vanderbilt information systems enable and respect the use of preferred names and pronouns. Faculty receive course rosters that reflect students’ preferred names and pronouns. All members of the Vanderbilt community understand these conventions and know how to use and respect them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collect data needed to serve the LGBTQI community.</strong></td>
<td>All members of the Vanderbilt community know how to identify their gender and sexual orientation, if they choose, in all Vanderbilt information systems. Administrators know how Vanderbilt is doing with respect to equitable treatment, climate, advancement, and outcomes for self-identified LGBTQI individuals across the Vanderbilt community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provide support for international students and scholars.</strong></td>
<td>Vanderbilt’s international services, including visa services and others, are such that international students and scholars find it easy to get to Vanderbilt. All new international students feel welcomed upon arrival, feel supported and integrated on campus, and know how to access appropriate resources for culinary and/or religious requirements. Vanderbilt students, staff, and faculty are competent in customs and mores of cultures other than their own.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enhance education in understanding and mitigating unconscious bias to all members of the Vanderbilt community to existing programs on nondiscrimination and equal opportunity.</strong></td>
<td>All Vanderbilt students, staff, faculty, and administrators are given education on and are knowledgeable about unconscious bias, regularly have opportunities to learn about their own biases, and are equipped with tools to effectively mitigate the effects of biases on others. Bias is widely seen not as a problem but as a natural tendency that can be managed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Create an Ombudsman office.</strong></td>
<td>All Vanderbilt students, staff, and faculty are aware of the service and know how to utilize this office as a supportive resource anytime they experience marginalization or exclusion related to issues of difference. The Ombudsman is widely seen as a neutral, independent, impartial, caring, and safe resource who provides useful information on policies, practices, options, and referrals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improve information and communications to make the Vanderbilt campus more accessible to all.</strong></td>
<td>All individuals are able—with supports if needed—to get to any part of campus that they need to access. Individuals needing accommodations are able to easily request and use them. All information and communications from Vanderbilt are in accessible formats following best practice and top standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty and Students</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retain faculty from underrepresented groups.</strong></td>
<td>All faculty experience Vanderbilt to be a place that best supports and celebrates their scholarly potential and accomplishments. All faculty have equal opportunity to advance through the ranks, see a fruitful and rewarding future at Vanderbilt, have their scholarly contributions recognized, and choose to remain at Vanderbilt when offered positions elsewhere. The likelihood of failure to advance to tenure or to full or to endowed professor cannot be correlated to any diverse characteristics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Install best practices in faculty recruitment, searches, and hiring procedures to support diversity in the faculty over the long term.</strong></td>
<td>Faculty search committees conduct searches and make good faith efforts—as required by law—to ensure the diversity of the candidates for a faculty position (the faculty application pool). Opportunities to recruit scholars who bring diversity are recognized, sought and seized upon. Contributions to diversity are valued and regarded as necessary to achieve a truly excellent, world-class faculty. “No good applicants” is not an excuse for not obtaining a diverse applicant pool.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create stronger connections between Vanderbilt and HBCUs in Nashville and beyond through strategic partnerships.</td>
<td>Nashville is seen around the world as a unique hub of cutting-edge, community engaged scholarship and immersive, solution oriented learning. Students and faculty at Vanderbilt, Fisk, TSU, and ABC enjoy robust, meaningful exchange and interchange, including opportunities for seamless cross-registration, access to facilities, and creative trans-institutional programs that link the complementary strengths of each institution. Vanderbilt is seen as a nexus for training and access for students and scholars from HBCUs across the region. Diverse students and scholars are able to progress through their academic careers within this network of diverse institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Become a national source of diverse PhD scholars to diversify the faculty at Vanderbilt and beyond.</td>
<td>Vanderbilt is recognized across the country as the leading innovator in creative programs, linked with neighboring HBCUs, to create robust streams of diverse students earning PhDs from Vanderbilt. Vanderbilt is the nation's top source of diverse PhDs who go on to join the faculties of colleges and universities across the nation. Vanderbilt is known for best practices and tools that are emulated across the country for holistic admissions, mentoring, professional development, and career support, and has institutionalized support of its own exemplar bridge programs. The Graduate School is a prominent leader in the national agenda and conversation on inclusive excellence in graduate education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launch Experience Vanderbilt in order to enable full participation in student life.</td>
<td>All students, including those with financial need, are able to participate in a rich array of experiences at Vanderbilt. Vanderbilt is recognized around the world for enabling full access as well as full participation in an engaging and immersive educational experience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Teaching and Curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The curriculum should reflect the needs and interests of an increasingly diverse student body, evolving disciplines, and the demands of a changing world in which issues of difference and inequality are central.</th>
<th>Every five years, the faculty of each unit, with input from students and other identified stakeholders, undertake a process of intentional, careful reflection on their existing curriculum to determine what innovations and changes are necessary to meet complex and multiple needs. Students report that the curriculum adequately prepares them to understand, operate within, solve problems for, and lead a global, multi-cultural, society and world.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Innovate the curriculum.</td>
<td>Faculty have the time, resources, and professional development necessary to innovate courses and curriculum. Each school regularly reviews its general education requirements and core curriculum to determine whether they sufficiently support rigorous undergraduate and graduate education around difference and inequality. Schools routinely develop optional curricular offerings that enhance understanding of issues related to difference and inequality, particularly ones that incorporate rigorous trans-disciplinary and immersive learning experiences and enhance student capacities for public scholarship, intercultural expertise, and leadership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make teaching more inclusive.</td>
<td>Vanderbilt instructors have access to a wide variety of professional development opportunities, including an expanded set of programs and fellowships dedicated to pedagogies of inclusion at the Center for Teaching. Departments and programs have resources to develop inclusive teaching forums tailored to their specific teaching needs. Instructors are rewarded for demonstrating how they have contributed to the university's diversity and inclusion mission.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Create explicit opportunities for staff of all types of jobs to meaningfully contribute to the educational mission.</th>
<th>Staff are recognized and remunerated for the contributions they make to Vanderbilt’s educational mission, including staff whose duties do not explicitly involve student support. Staff have ample training and development opportunities for more involvement in the educational mission and to advance in their careers.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide more opportunities for training and education.</td>
<td>Staff at all salary tiers are able to make use of the tuition benefit and obtain a degree from Vanderbilt at reasonable cost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Define more clear pathways for advancement up the job ladder.</td>
<td>Staff in all job categories and ranks are aware of the paths and mechanisms through which to advance to a higher job classification and salary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay a living wage.</td>
<td>No staff member earns a salary that is below the recognized living wage for Nashville. Vanderbilt is recognized nationally for its commitment to fair wages as a form of social justice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance staff representation and involvement in governance.</td>
<td>Staff are included in communications about campus events, programs, and news, including especially news about students. Staff report that they are meaningfully involved in decision making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commit to diverse hiring among staff.</td>
<td>The demographics of the Vanderbilt undergraduate student body are reflected in the professional, administrative and academic staff through continued good faith efforts to create a diversity applicant pool.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Community Engagement and Research Centers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Build up existing programs.</th>
<th>Deans and other heads of major units have the resources required to fully support academic and community programs and centers with a record of fostering diversity, inclusion, and community. Student led programs are supported as well and institutionalized as innovation evolves into recognized best practice.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop a center on community engagement and diversity.</td>
<td>At least one major new research program, center, or institute has been established that engages Vanderbilt staff, students, faculty, and visitors in issues of diversity and inclusion. Vanderbilt is recognized as a global leader and world class center of exploration and discovery for grand intellectual and social challenges that center on difference, power, and marginalization.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Administration, Governance, and Accountability

| Install a system of shared governance and accountability throughout the organization. | Students, staff, and faculty within every granular unit across the university feel empowered to help articulate goals and metrics for diversity and inclusion most relevant to their unit. Department chairs, unit heads, deans, and other major unit heads collaborate in articulating these goals and metrics. The provost and other vice chancellors provide adequate support for achieving these goals, and hold all those within their purview accountable to these goals. |
Collect the data needed to monitor progress on diversity and inclusion.
The university at all levels conduct comprehensive data collection inclusive of all identity categories, academic and non-academic titles and job descriptions. Analysis of progress over time is carried out and reported, including publicly where appropriate.

Position the Chief Diversity Officer as a convener of the university’s top leadership.
The Chief Diversity Officer is meaningfully connected to the other vice chancellors. There is open communication and learning and sharing of best practice among the university’s top leadership, who regularly come together to brainstorm, troubleshoot, plan, strategize, and discuss diversity and inclusion across Vanderbilt. The Chief Diversity Officer has created a standing Diversity Council and Working Group of representative students, faculty, staff, and administrators who help to fully engineer, and advise on the implementation of, the recommendations of this report.

Enable faculty, staff, and students with appropriate venues such as Councils or Roundtables.
All members of the Vanderbilt community regularly participate in venues to discuss and share successes, best practices, challenges, needs with respect to diversity and inclusion, and are provided opportunities for communication with university leadership.

Deans should lead their units in developing statements of commitments and principles.
Every college and school regularly conducts a review of its statement of commitments and principles, which articulate high-level goals for creating a diverse and inclusive community within their unit and that link diversity and inclusion to the broader mission of the unit. These principles and commitments are invoked in major actions, such as efforts to attract diverse faculty and curriculum design.

Prioritization of Recommendations
To the extent that it may not be realistic for all recommendations to be implemented, or for some recommendations to be fully realized immediately, the Committee provides here a prioritization of its high-level recommendations on the basis of (1) absolute importance and (2) rapid implementation.

The prioritization by absolute importance in essence asks the question, “How do we know if Vanderbilt has been successful in implementing these recommendations?” We suggest that Vanderbilt should be judged as having failed if the top-most recommendations are not realized within the next 15 years, and should be judged to have achieved greater degrees of success as more of the prioritized recommendations are accomplished. The priorities are grouped into three priority bands according to the committee’s assessment of their absolute priority, with the Priority 1 band representing the recommendations that are most vital.

The prioritization by rapid implementation asks the question, “What can we get done immediately?” While not all of the rapid implementation recommendations are also prioritized as the most important, we suggest that these are opportunities for quick gains and a means to building up a positive momentum that will be needed to sustain the overall implementation of this report’s recommendations over the next 15 years.

Note that the recommendation to initiate comprehensive data collection and to implement an accountability plan is both a top priority by importance and by rapid implementation. The other Priority 1 recommendation—faculty diversity—will require more time to fully achieve, but some progress can also be started immediately and thus is also a rapid implementation recommendation.
# Prioritization of Recommendations

**Categorization legend:**

- Faculty and Students
- Accountability and Governance
- Research and Community Engagement
- Teaching and Curriculum
- Culture and Climate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty and Student Recruitment/Retention</td>
<td>Diversify faculty by retaining existing faculty and growing diverse faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability and Governance</td>
<td>Implement recommended accountability plan and data collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Community Engagement</td>
<td>Increase support for existing academic and community programs/centers with a record of fostering diversity, inclusion, and community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture and Climate</td>
<td>Diversity education for all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty and Student Recruitment/Retention</td>
<td>Make Vanderbilt the leading educator of PhDs from underrepresented groups and make Vanderbilt a leader in a national effort to transcend the &quot;standardized testing regime&quot; in graduate education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Community Engagement</td>
<td>Explore the creation of one or more major new academic and community programs/centers that would further the goals of fostering Vanderbilt’s leadership and visibility in diversity, inclusion &amp; community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Commit to providing all staff a living wage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and Curriculum</td>
<td>Encourage curriculum reflection and innovation discussions at school/unit level to diversify the curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and Curriculum</td>
<td>Provide opportunities for faculty to develop courses or course content on diversity, difference, and power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and Curriculum</td>
<td>Support professional development around inclusive teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture and Climate</td>
<td>Early orientation and mentorship program for incoming students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture and Climate</td>
<td>Embrace principles of universal design across campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Enhance training, education, and clear pathways for professional and leadership development of staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Create explicit opportunities for staff to meaningfully contribute to the educational mission, and recognize those contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff</strong></td>
<td><strong>Increase diversity of staff through good faith efforts to recruit diverse candidates</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty and Student Recruitment/Retention</strong></td>
<td>Provide an Experience Vanderbilt, enabling full participation in student life, and engaging all students in issues of difference and marginalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Culture and Climate</strong></td>
<td>Provide resources for International Students to integrate into the larger community while maintaining cultural values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff</strong></td>
<td>Enhance shared governance for staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Culture and Climate</strong></td>
<td>Update the registrar system to facilitate the use of preferred names and pronouns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Culture and Climate</strong></td>
<td>Create a process for regularly reviewing names and symbols on campus to ensure consistency with Vanderbilt’s values</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RECOMMENDATIONS FOR RAPID IMPLEMENTATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Broad recommendation</strong></th>
<th><strong>Granular recommendation for rapid implementation</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implement accountability plan recommended. Initiate data collection and analysis on salaries, climate, identity category demographics and rank</td>
<td>Implement the accountability plan recommended in this report. Initiate full data collection on staff and faculty identity categories - including especially sexual orientation and gender identity; also exit interviews of people who have left to assess climate issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversify faculty by retaining existing faculty, growing the diversity of the faculty</td>
<td>Focus on full-time tenure stream faculty: Enable opportunistic hires and implement best practices in regular searches in the coming year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate the use of preferred names and pronouns</td>
<td>Update the registrar system and other central systems to facilitate the use of preferred names and pronouns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly review building names and other symbols for consistency with Vanderbilt’s values</td>
<td>Rename Confederate Memorial Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase support for existing academic and community programs/centers with a record of fostering diversity, inclusion, and community</td>
<td>See Section VII.E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early orientation and mentorship program for incoming students</td>
<td>Focus on incoming students, e.g. summer pre-orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity education for all</td>
<td>Diversity and unconscious bias education specifically for faculty search processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commit to providing all staff a living wage</td>
<td>Immediately begin review of job classifications and current staffing to ensure alignment with goal of living wage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embrace principles of universal design across campus</td>
<td>Start with signage, more gender-neutral bathrooms—use the accessibility map-a-thon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TIMETABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION

The following is a suggested timeline for implementation of this report’s recommendations. Note that this timeline does not attempt to capture all of the individual recommendations. Rather, we focus on the actions required to have the necessary structures in place to achieve the recommendations over the next 15 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Who responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deliver this report to Chancellor.</td>
<td>July 1, 2016</td>
<td>DI&amp;C Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Trust receive and endorse this report.</td>
<td>Aug 1, 2016</td>
<td>Chancellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appoint Working Group to assist CDO in engineering a plan for implemen-</td>
<td>Aug 15, 2016</td>
<td>Chancellor and Chief Diversity Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tation of recommendations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Announce Working Group at Fall Faculty Assembly, release public versi-</td>
<td>Aug 26, 2016</td>
<td>Chancellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on of this report to all community stakeholders, and launch public web-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>site showing progress on recommendations as appropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiate regular meetings of Vice Chancellors Round-table on diversity</td>
<td>Sept 1, 2016</td>
<td>Chief Diversity Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and inclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appoint Vice Provost for Faculty Diversity and Development. Create fa-</td>
<td>Sept 15, 2016</td>
<td>Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>culty opportunity hire mechanisms, and begin search committee education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in preparation for fall searches.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiate baseline comprehensive data collection related to diversity,</td>
<td>Oct 1, 2016</td>
<td>EAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and update administrative dashboards to track diversity categories.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiate installation of accountability plan.</td>
<td>Oct 15, 2016</td>
<td>Vice Chancellors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleges and Schools release statements of commitment and principles.</td>
<td>Dec 31, 2016</td>
<td>Deans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major units develop bottom-up diversity plans and accountability metri-</td>
<td>April 1, 2017</td>
<td>Vice Chancellors, Deans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cs and timelines.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appoint standing committee on diversity, inclusion, and community.</td>
<td>June 1, 2017</td>
<td>Chancellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliver first annual report on progress toward implementation of diver-</td>
<td>July 1, 2017</td>
<td>Chief Diversity Officer to Chancellor and to Standing Com-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sity and inclusion goals and recommendations.</td>
<td></td>
<td>mite Committee on Diversity, Inclusion, and Community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Cost Estimates and Cost Considerations

Cost Estimates for Selected Recommendations and Analysis of Possible Revenue Sources

The committee conferred with several individuals in Vanderbilt’s upper administration—including David Williams, Eric Kopstain, Doug Christiansen, and Brett Sweet—to obtain realistic cost estimates for a number of the key recommendations in the report. In addition, the committee asked for guidelines on the primary sources of possible revenue for funding these initiatives. Here we briefly summarize these cost estimates and revenue analyses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Estimated annual cost</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accountability data collection</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Marginal cost of incorporating more data categories and detail into existing Institutional Research, Human Resources, Registrar, and other centralized systems. Possible modest cost for additional research staff for data analysis and reporting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Bridge Program student lines</td>
<td>$75k per fellowship</td>
<td>Based on Fisk-Vanderbilt Bridge Program model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature postdoc-to-faculty bridge fellowship program</td>
<td>$100k per fellowship</td>
<td>Based on UNC-Chapel Hill model (salary, benefits, research funds).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment of faculty to vice provost and associate deans for diversity roles</td>
<td>$100k</td>
<td>Approximate cost of course buyouts for partial FTE reassignment of faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New faculty hiring lines</td>
<td>$150k per faculty line</td>
<td>Plus additional one-time cost of startup package for each new faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Center or Institute</td>
<td>$1M</td>
<td>Assumes Robert Penn Warren Center as model, with additional support for faculty and student fellows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer early orientation bridge program</td>
<td>$1.8M</td>
<td>Based on Athletics Department summer bridge program, assuming $300k of programmatic cost and $5k per student marginal cost for 300 students with demonstrated need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience Vanderbilt</td>
<td>$3M</td>
<td>Assumes $10k stipend for 300 students with demonstrated need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty retention</td>
<td>$5M</td>
<td>Based on current experience plus expected increases in retention needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff living wage</td>
<td>$20-24M</td>
<td>Assumes $15/hr minimum and appropriate raises for staff currently at or near that minimum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
POSSIBLE REVENUE SOURCES

To the extent that implementation of these and other initiatives recommended in our report will require new funding streams, there are essentially three possible sources: (1) increased tuition, (2) increased endowment drawdown, (3) new gifts/endowments. Here we summarize the committee’s understanding of these three options based on discussion with university leadership.

1. Tuition. At first blush, it may seem that increased tuition would produce increased revenue on a roughly dollar-for-dollar basis. However, because of Vanderbilt’s commitment to Opportunity Vanderbilt—through which every student’s demonstrated need is met without loans—the situation is in fact complex. Currently, roughly half of all incoming Vanderbilt undergraduates have at least some demonstrated need; increased tuition only increases these students’ need and generates no net revenue. Further, increased tuition increases the number of incoming students who newly qualify for some amount of demonstrated need; to generate additional revenues, tuition increases must be larger than the compound annual growth rate (CAGR) of total cost of attendance (of which tuition is one part). In sum, total tuition revenues are a function of the rate of increase of the consumer price index, average household income of admitted students, average financial need of admitted students, and percentage of admitted students qualifying for aid. As an approximate benchmark, a 1% increase in tuition above the CAGR generates approximately $1.5M in new revenues for the university. Note that, for the reasons discussed above, tuition increases are effectively cost neutral only for families in the lowest and highest levels of household income; increased tuition is effectively borne primarily by families with mid-level household income.

2. Endowment. The first point to clarify is that there is not one Vanderbilt Endowment. Rather, Vanderbilt’s current total endowment assets of roughly $4.3B comprise a very large number of smaller endowments, many of which are restricted to specific purposes. In total, nearly half of all endowment assets are restricted for student aid, and another roughly 40% is restricted for various other specific purposes. Approximately 7% of endowment holdings ($300M) are effectively unrestricted. Vanderbilt has currently authorized a 5% drawdown on unrestricted endowment, or about $15M per year in unrestricted revenue. Increasing the drawdown rate by an additional full 0.5% would generate roughly $1.5M per year in new revenue, comparable to a 1% increase in tuition.

3. Development of new gifts/endowment. A number of the recommended initiatives would appear ripe for development activities for donors who seek to advance Vanderbilt’s leadership and commitment to excellence and to creating a leading, inclusive community of scholars, teachers, and learners. Indeed, a number of our recommendations should find natural synergy with Vanderbilt’s emerging strategic investments in trans-institutional scholarship, graduate education, and a truly immersive student experience.
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