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IDC Charge

The Institutional Diversity Committee serves as the primary advisory committee to the University Council on all matters related to diversity, equity, inclusion and intercultural relations at Whitworth. The committee’s work is directed at enabling Whitworth to establish a sustainable course which will ensure the achievement of its current and future objectives related to our goals. The IDC is a representative body of faculty, staff, and students that complements and supports strategic diversity-related initiatives throughout the campus community.
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Elise Forman, Human Resources Representative
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Hanna Kim, Cultural Diversity Advocate Representative/RA (student)
Suzanne Sherman, Facilities and Staff Representative
Corliss Slack, Faculty Exec. Representative
Jason Tobeck, Athletic Department Representative
Timothy Wilkinson, Academic Deans Representative
Jason Wollschleger, Faculty Assembly Representative

¹ Composition of the IDC is a combination of position holders and constituency representatives.
Executive Summary

Introduction

In the fall semester of 2011, Whitworth University launched an ambitious and visionary strategic plan called Whitworth 2021: Courage at the Crossroads. Like any effective and credible strategic plan associated with Whitworth University, each goal and objective embedded in Vision 2021 is aligned with and driven by Whitworth’s Christ-centered mission of which the central purpose is to “…provide its diverse student body an education of mind and heart, equipping its graduates to honor God, follow Christ, and serve humanity.” This mission provides the foundation upon which four core values are built and find meaning. They are:

- Provide an education of mind and heart that equips our diverse student body to honor God, follow Christ and serve humanity;
- Prepare undergraduate and graduate students with an interdisciplinary education firmly rooted in the liberal arts and sciences;
- Develop students' understanding of personal responsibility, justice, and love of neighbor in a global and inclusive university community, working for reconciliation and healing in a broken world; and
- Build a community of Christian scholars characterized by shared commitments to Christ, academic excellence, freedom of inquiry, and respect for difference.

In January 2012, Whitworth University, under the leadership of the newly-formed Institutional Diversity Committee (IDC), embarked upon a comprehensive assessment of the university’s diversity-related efforts and survey of its social climate. The assessment of initiatives and learning outcomes and survey of climate fulfilled KPIs 1, 2 and 3 under Objective 4.2 of the Vision 2021 Strategic Plan which reads as follows:

**ASSESS CURRENT EFFORTS TO ASSIST STUDENTS, FACULTY AND STAFF IN DEVELOPING INTERCULTURAL COMPETENCIES, AND MEASURE THEIR EFFECTS ON THE RELATIONAL QUALITY OF THE CAMPUS ENVIRONMENT REGARDING THE LIVING, LEARNING, AND WORKING EXPERIENCES OF ALL MEMBERS OF THE WHITWORTH COMMUNITY.**

**KPI 4.2.1:** COMPLETE A CAMPUS-WIDE AUDIT OF DIVERSITY-RELATED INITIATIVES AND REPORT TO THE CAMPUS COMMUNITY BY FALL OF 2013.

**KPI 4.2.2:** ASSESS THE SUCCESS OF THE CURRENT GENERAL EDUCATION, AMERICAN DIVERSITY, AND GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES REQUIREMENTS IN STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT OF LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSOCIATED WITH EACH CATEGORY AND REPORT, WITH RECOMMENDATIONS AS APPROPRIATE, TO THE CAMPUS COMMUNITY BY FALL OF 2013.

**KPI 4.2.3:** COMPLETE A COMPREHENSIVE ASSESSMENT OF WHITWORTH’S LEARNING, WORKING, AND LIVING CLIMATE AND REPORT TO THE CAMPUS COMMUNITY BY FALL OF 2014.
The IDC screened external consultants and ultimately secured the services of Halualani & Associates to assist the university in this process of assessment and evaluation. This process was comprehensive in both scope and depth and consisted of the following timeline and steps:

Feb.-June 2013  Campus-wide data collection process of all diversity efforts and diversity-related courses at Whitworth over the past five years

June 2013  Consultant report and presentation of preliminary findings and recommendations to campus leadership

Summer 2013  IDC development of comprehensive campus climate survey instruments for faculty, staff, and students

September 2013  Consultant report and presentation of final findings and recommendations resulting from the diversity efforts mapping process and assessment of the American Diversity and Global Perspectives General Education requirements

February 2014  Consultant report on findings from Campus Experience (climate) Survey

March 2014  IDC identifies five (5) strategic priorities informed by the consultant’s findings, recommendations and previously established university strategic goals and objectives

April 2014  IDC launches “campus outreach process” to present its strategic priorities and to invite responses, questions, suggestions and concerns from stakeholders across the campus community

The Past and the Present

As Whitworth celebrates its 125th anniversary, we can say with thanksgiving, humility and confidence that the university has made significant strides in enhancing its delivery of a high quality education of the mind and heart. A significant element of this growth is Whitworth’s recognition that diversity, equity, inclusion, and intercultural relations are inextricably tied to excellence. Perhaps even more important is Whitworth’s acknowledgement that, when understood properly, these core values are in fact aligned with Whitworth’s Christ-centered mission.

Despite the aforementioned examples of Whitworth’s attention to diversity, the assessment, whose findings form the evidential basis of this report, suggests that structurally-embedded marginalization and exclusion at Whitworth University persists for members belonging to historically underserved and underrepresented communities.² Failure to acknowledge Whitworth’s historical legacy of exclusion of underrepresented and underserved groups would diminish the significance of the university’s journey and growth in its response to God’s call as reflected in its mission. It would further inhibit the institution’s efforts to achieve an accurate assessment of both strengths and persistent challenges in its current situation.

A brief overview of diversity-related developments at Whitworth since 1960 (see Appendix C) gives us cause to both celebrate with thanksgiving and pause in mindfulness of the persistent challenges which necessitate continuous resolve and attention to advancing our Christ-centered mission and making excellence inclusive.

² see Appendices H-J for more on the consultant’s findings and recommendations
Moving Forward

Remembering the shortcomings in Whitworth’s past, celebrating growth in response to God’s call to date, and recognizing the challenges that persist, the IDC submits the following recommendations to the University Council for consideration and action. It is our collective belief that consideration of these recommendations is crucial for Whitworth’s achievement of sustainable and strategic diversity-related goals and objectives that advance its Christ-centered mission.

IDC’s Strategic Priorities, Recommendations and Rationale

Based on the Vision 2021 Strategic Plan, our examination of assessment, mapping and survey data, the consultant's findings and recommendations, and our lived experiences at Whitworth, the IDC has identified five strategic priorities which we believe to be informed by and aligned with Whitworth’s Christ-centered mission. The following priorities are recommended for development and implementation by appointed institutional bodies, with support from the IDC as appropriate.

1. Campus-Wide Diversity Master Plan for a pan-institutional effort to address the following interrelated priorities:

2. Permanent Organizational Infrastructure to advance, assess and sustain high-impact institutional goals and objectives related to diversity, equity, inclusion and intercultural relations

3. Professional Development and Training in intercultural competency and inclusive excellence for faculty and staff to promote a safe, affirming and welcoming campus climate

4. Recruitment and Retention of students, faculty and staff from underrepresented racial/ethnic populations and historically marginalized and/or underserved groups

5. Curricular and Co-Curricular strategies to advance student learning outcomes in the area of intercultural competency development

Conclusion

With this report the Institutional Diversity Committee sends forth a clarion call and sense of urgency for Whitworth University to move expeditiously to take necessary and decisive steps to deliver on the promises – implicit and explicit – embedded in its enduring mission and core values. We believe that it is not an overstatement to say that Whitworth’s future – its very existence – will depend, in part, on the manner in which we respond to the opportunities, challenges and recommendations contained in this report.

Based on the evidence of God’s presence in Whitworth’s 125-year journey thus far, we are confident that God’s grace, and the commitment of Whitworth’s faculty, staff, trustees and students, will move us forward in a way that more fully honors God, follows Christ and serves humanity.
Introduction

Report Context

In the fall semester of 2011, Whitworth University launched an ambitious and visionary strategic plan called *Whitworth 2021: Courage at the Crossroads*. Like any effective and credible strategic plan associated with Whitworth University, each goal and objective embedded in *Vision 2021* is aligned with and driven by Whitworth’s Christ-centered mission of which the central purpose is to “…provide its diverse student body an education of mind and heart, equipping its graduates to honor God, follow Christ, and serve humanity.” This mission provides the foundation upon which four core values are built and find meaning. They are:

- Provide an education of mind and heart that equips our diverse student body to honor God, follow Christ and serve humanity;
- Prepare undergraduate and graduate students with an interdisciplinary education firmly rooted in the liberal arts and sciences;
- Develop students’ understanding of personal responsibility, justice, and love of neighbor in a global and inclusive university community, working for reconciliation and healing in a broken world; and
- Build a community of Christian scholars characterized by shared commitments to Christ, academic excellence, freedom of inquiry, and respect for difference.

*Goal 4 of Whitworth 2021* is to “demonstrate courageous leadership for an increasingly diverse world” and the Institutional Diversity Committee is charged with addressing objectives and fulfilling key performance indicators (KPIs) outlined in the plan.\(^3\) In January 2012, Whitworth University, under the leadership of the newly-formed Institutional Diversity Committee (IDC), embarked upon a comprehensive assessment of the university’s diversity-related efforts and survey of its social climate. The assessment of initiatives and learning outcomes and survey of climate fulfilled KPIs 1, 2 and 3 under Objective 4.2 of the *Vision 2021 Strategic Plan* which reads as follows:

**Assess current efforts to assist students, faculty and staff in developing intercultural competencies, and measure their effects on the relational quality of the campus environment regarding the living, learning, and working experiences of all members of the Whitworth community.**

- **KPI 4.2.1:** Complete a campus-wide audit of diversity-related initiatives and report to the campus community by fall of 2013.
- **KPI 4.2.2:** Assess the success of the current general education, American diversity, and global perspectives requirements in student achievement of learning outcomes associated with each category and report, with recommendations as appropriate, to the campus community by fall of 2013.
- **KPI 4.2.3:** Complete a comprehensive assessment of Whitworth’s learning, working, and living climate and report to the campus community by fall of 2014.

---

\(^3\) see Appendix B for the full text of *Vision 2021: Goal 4*
The IDC screened external consultants and ultimately secured the services of Halualani & Associates\(^4\) to assist the university in this process of assessment and evaluation. This process was comprehensive in both scope and depth and consisted of the following timeline and steps:

Feb.-June 2013  Campus-wide data collection process of all diversity efforts and diversity-related courses at Whitworth over the past five years

June 2013  Consultant report and presentation of preliminary findings and recommendations to campus leadership

Summer 2013  IDC development of comprehensive campus climate survey instruments for faculty, staff, and students

September 2013  Consultant report and presentation of final findings and recommendations resulting from the diversity efforts mapping process and assessment of the American Diversity and Global Perspectives General Education requirements

February 2014  Consultant report on findings from Campus Experience (climate) Survey

March 2014  IDC identifies five (5) strategic priorities informed by the consultant’s findings, recommendations and previously established university strategic goals and objectives

April 2014  IDC launches campus outreach process to present its strategic priorities and to invite responses, questions, suggestions and concerns from stakeholders across the campus community

This report stands as part of a rich legacy of efforts by members of Whitworth to more fully live out its mission. Our goal is to provide data-driven and evidence-based recommendations aimed at advancing Whitworth’s capacity to live out its mission to “honor God, follow Christ, and serve humanity.” A brief overview of diversity-related developments since 1960 (see Appendix C) provides concrete evidence of Whitworth’s evolving understanding of diversity, equity, inclusion and intercultural relations. We understand these facets of our institutional experience as vital to advancing a Christ-centered education of mind and heart.

In a real sense this report represents a milestone in the history of Whitworth University’s commitment to diversity. The recommendations provided herein are informed by extensive data collection and analysis, as well as campus outreach to faculty, staff and students. Our recommendations also draw from historical developments and contemporary conditions which have far-reaching implications for Whitworth University’s ability to respond faithfully to God’s call to advance its Christ-centered mission.

The historical timeline demonstrates Whitworth’s emerging commitment to and recognition of the value of human diversity. However, some within Christian higher education and the Whitworth community have questioned whether substantive attention to diversity and inclusion may steer the institution away from an enduring commitment to a Christ-centered mission. To be sure, the most influential theoretical paradigms that have informed diversity and inclusion-related work over the past two decades emerge from sources that are largely secular. These paradigms, however, are built upon core values of equity, justice, and the affirmation and celebration of the diverse reality of God’s creation. At Whitworth we have identified compatible elements of two theoretical paradigms – *Inclusive Excellence and Intercultural Relations/Communication* – and contextualized them to reinforce our Biblically-grounded and Christ-centered mission.

\(^4\) Dr. Rona Halualani, principal and founder http://www.halualani.com/
Primary Theoretical Frameworks

Informed Whitworth’s Attention to Diversity

*Inclusive Excellence* is a planning process intended to help Whitworth University to establish a comprehensive and well-coordinated set of systemic actions that focus specifically on fostering greater diversity, equity, inclusion, and accountability at every level of university life. The central premise of *Inclusive Excellence* holds that Whitworth needs to intentionally integrate its diversity efforts into the core aspects of the institution—such as academic priorities, leadership, quality improvement initiatives, decision-making, day-to-day operations, and organizational cultures—in order to maximize success. Additionally, *Inclusive Excellence* is characterized by:

1. A focus on student intellectual and social development. Academically, it means offering the best possible course of study for the context in which the education is offered.
2. A purposeful development and utilization of organizational resources to enhance student learning.
3. Attention to the cultural differences learners bring to the educational experience and that enhance the enterprise for all persons within the learning environment.
4. A welcoming community that engages all of its diversity in the service of student and organizational learning.

*Intercultural Relations:* The value Whitworth places on intercultural relations is informed by occurrence of communication that takes place when individuals, influenced by different cultural communities, negotiate shared meanings in interaction (Ting-Toomey, 1999). Whitworth recognizes that an effective delivery of an education of the mind and heart depends in part on building the capacity of all members of the campus community in the areas of intercultural competency which involve “the knowledge, motivation and skills to interact effectively and appropriately with members of different cultures, either in the United States or elsewhere”.

---

5 Glossary of Terms, Whitworth 2021 Strategic Plan
Theological Foundation

Informing Whitworth’s Commitment to Diversity, Equity, Inclusion and Intercultural Relations

Whitworth’s attention to diversity, equity, inclusion and intercultural relations by no means represents a new phenomenon in higher education nor is it trendy. The past two and a half decades have witnessed significant growth in both scholarly and practical understanding of the complexity and institutional pervasiveness of inclusive excellence throughout the academy, particularly in regards to the reframing and achievement of academic excellence. As a result higher education leaders have increasingly become better-positioned to identify and deconstruct structurally-embedded policies and practices that have and continue to exclude and/or marginalize historically underrepresented (UREP) and underserved groups. The resulting outcomes are graduating students who are better prepared to ethically and effectively compete in an increasingly diverse global market economy (Milem, Chang, & Antonio, 2005).

The most innovative organizational application of the insights generated by research in these areas has largely occurred within secular contexts of the academy. Understanding the need to demonstrate a clear alignment of these values to our Christ-centered mission, Whitworth has articulated a theological and Biblical foundational statement that responds to any claim or assertion that its commitment to diversity, equity, inclusion and intercultural relations is incongruent with its mission. This statement reads in part:

The Christian mission of Whitworth University is grounded in our twin theological commitments: to the centrality of Christ and to the authority of scripture, as both are understood within the context of historical Christian orthodoxy. As a Christian educational institution we seek to live out these commitments as we “honor God, follow Christ and serve humanity.” Due to the expanding global context in which we live and work, we believe that we will be able to live out our mission only by developing intercultural competency; that is, the skills needed for effective and Christ-like engagement in a diverse community, with its variety of worldviews, life histories, learning styles, customs, communication patterns and methods of problem-solving. These skills are necessary due to the presence and participation of in the human community of people and groups who differ from one another in a variety of ways. The Whitworth community must first engage these issues of intercultural relations and diversity from the perspective of its commitments to the authority of the scriptures and the centrality of Christ. In other words, we strive to develop intercultural competencies that are biblically and theologically grounded. A biblical approach to diversity rightly begins with the promise of unity in Christ, in whom God’s purpose was “to bring all things together under one head” (Eph. 1.10; Col. 1.17-20). Therefore, we seek to root both the theory and practice of inclusive community in the saving work of Christ and in the unity of the Triune God: Father, Son and Holy Spirit. We claim Christ’s resurrection power over sin as the only means by which we may attempt unity in Christ. With the promise of unity in Christ firmly in mind, we turn to the Bible to help us understand the role that diversity plays in the story of creation, fall and redemption.

---

6 UREP (underrepresented racial/ethnic population) as defined in Vision 2021 is frequently combined herein with the term “underserved”. For the purpose of this report IDC considers additional facets of diversity including gender, religion, sexual orientation, disabilities and others as “underserved” populations.

7 A Theological Foundation for Diversity & Intercultural Relations at Whitworth University
Perhaps Whitworth’s enduring commitment to diversity, equity, inclusion, and intercultural relations, and the manner in which these values align with the university’s Christ-centered mission, are best expressed by our current president Beck Taylor when he writes:

Whitworth University is committed to seeking academic excellence while striving continuously to be a welcoming, inclusive and diverse campus. Our community aspires to providing an education that embraces difference and fosters respect that extends beyond the classroom to all university spaces and to local and global communities. Our intent is to support a learning environment in which students, faculty and staff understand the challenges, accomplishments and perspectives of various groups of people, thus gaining a more complete understanding of ourselves as well as how to engage in conversation spanning differences and commonalities. Achieving this vision is a fundamental commitment critical to Whitworth University’s mission as a Christian institution of higher learning.

Whitworth’s commitment to diversity stems from a Christ-centered heritage that compels us to love justice and to treat every individual equally with respect and compassion. It is through the inclusion and experiences of others from diverse points of view that we often begin to see dimensions of life previously unseen.

http://www.whitworth.edu/GeneralInformation/DiversityInterculturalRelations/TheologicalFoundation.htm

8 President’s Message on Diversity, 2012
Looking Back and Assessing the Present

As Whitworth celebrates its 125th anniversary, it can say with humble confidence and thanksgiving that it has come a long way in understanding the roles diversity, equity, and inclusion play in advancing its Christ-centered mission. However, it would be a mistake not to acknowledge Whitworth’s historical legacy of exclusion of underrepresented and underserved groups; to do so would diminish the significance of the university’s journey and growth in its response to God’s call as reflected in its mission. Failure to acknowledge this history would also diminish the institution’s ability to assess its current situation. It is also important to celebrate and affirm a demonstrated commitment to diversity, as well as provide an accurate assessment of persistent challenges. The following section, drawn from Whitworth University data as well as the Halualani Report findings, serves as an overview of our institutional strengths. Our goal is to provide a glimpse back at our history and a look forward to frame our institutional efforts around diversity, equity and inclusion.

Evidence of Whitworth’s Commitment to Inclusive Excellence

- Creation of cabinet-level position to lead strategic diversity-related efforts – Asst. Vice President for Diversity and Intercultural Relations.
- Issues of diversity, equity, inclusion, and intercultural competencies are addressed throughout the Whitworth 2021 Strategic Plan with the most explicit attention stated in Goal 4.
- As of June 2013, every major division at the university is involved in some diversity effort and there is some solid momentum (with 238 diversity efforts and 432 diversity-related courses) in diversity and inclusion work.
- The President’s Cabinet is in its fourth year of “Courageous Conversations at the Senior Level,” a process of reading, reflection, and discussion on complex issues related to diversity-related topics, power, privilege and persistent socioeconomic inequities in the church, academy and the broader society.
- Development of infrastructure to support diversity-efforts by creating the Institutional Diversity Committee.
- The President Beck Taylor led a public forum and a panel discussion during the spring Board of Trustees meeting which gave space for diverse perspectives relating to LGBTQ issues and concerns.
- In the past 4 years, the percentage of full-time matriculating undergraduate day students from underrepresented racial/ethnic populations grew from 13.7% to 19.2% as of fall 2014.
- In fall 2010, first to second-year retention for students from UREPs was 78.9%. In fall 2013, first to second year retention of students from UREPs improved to 89.9%.
- Established the Inclusive University Classroom Lecture and Consultation, now in its fourth year
- Designed and launched a new webpage “Diversity and Intercultural Relations at Whitworth University” to more effectively communicate the university’s demonstrated commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion.
- Inclusive Excellence Grant support numerous faculty, staff, and students to attend conferences for professional development and training.
- Diversity efforts are featured across several different themes.
• Development of resource manual for search committees “Best and Promising Practices for Recruitment and Retention for faculty and Staff from Underrepresented Racial/Ethnic Populations and Women”.

• With an outside consultant, completed a comprehensive assessment of for the university’s American Diversity and Global Perspectives general education requirements, diversity efforts across the institution for the past five (5) years, and a survey of the campus social climate.

• Divisions and offices are working in alignment with one another on larger university-wide directions in diversity.

• Whitworth University is clearly in a diversity action stage (as opposed to being in just a diversity declaration).

• “Whitworth University’s diversity efforts are primarily targeted toward all campus members (47%), followed by all students (17%) and faculty (16%). Indeed, there is a more generalized, inclusive approach to diversity efforts.”

• “Whitworth University features an exciting, robust curricular structure around diversity that can be maximized further.”

• Overall, faculty, staff, and student respondents also reported that Whitworth University demonstrates value for diversity through its actions.

• Faculty and staff respondents largely agreed that the workplace climate at Whitworth University is more welcoming than not for faculty and staff based on their various identities and backgrounds. However, faculty reported lower mean values (2.83 - 3.93) on this item than staff respondents (3.13 - 4.08).

• The majority of faculty respondents (62%) reported that they taught diversity courses and wanted to teach more of these types of courses (62%). 57% of faculty respondents felt that all faculty should be required to participate in diversity training.

• 26% of staff respondents felt that people at WU are NOT treated fairly in terms of their sexual orientation.

• The majority (69%) of student respondents reported that they have been exposed to courses that feature the history, culture, and social classes of diverse groups.

Evidence of Persistent Challenges

Despite the aforementioned examples of Whitworth’s attention to diversity, the assessment, whose findings form the evidential basis of this report, suggests that structurally-embedded marginalization and exclusion at Whitworth University persist for members belonging to historically underserved and underrepresented communities. It is to a number of these persistent challenges and recommendations for effectively addressing them that we now turn our attention.

9 Halualani, “Diversity Mapping Project” p. 19
10 Halualani, “Diversity Mapping Recommendations & Insights” p. 5
11 Halualani, “Campus Experience Survey Executive Summary” p. 7
12 Ibid., p. 10
13 Ibid., p. 19
14 Ibid., p. 21
15 Ibid., p. 22
16 see Appendices H-L for more on the consultant’s findings and recommendations
IDC’s Strategic Priorities Moving Forward

It’s important to note here that this report also comes at a time when many within the community, particularly those who identify with historically underrepresented and underserved communities and their allies, question how seriously the recommendations made in this report will be taken by university administration and faculty. Such questioning is informed by the oft-cited failure of campus leaders — from the perspectives of many within the campus community — to take action on the recommendations made in previous studies and reports, some of which are listed in the aforementioned historical overview of diversity-related developments (see Appendix C). The IDC, however, has and continues to express a high level of confidence and expectation that the university’s administration and faculty will make appropriate decisions regarding effective use of assets and as informed by the strategic objectives, as well as the evidence and data-driven recommendations provided in this report.

Based on the Vision 2021 Strategic Plan, our examination of assessment, mapping and survey data, the consultant’s findings and recommendations, and our lived experiences at Whitworth, the IDC has identified five strategic priorities which we believe to be informed by and aligned with Whitworth’s Christ-centered mission. The following priorities are recommended for development and implementation by appointed institutional bodies, with support from the IDC as appropriate.

1. **Campus-Wide Diversity Master Plan** for a pan-institutional effort to address the following interrelated priorities:

2. **Permanent Organizational Infrastructure** to advance, assess and sustain high-impact institutional goals and objectives related to diversity, equity, inclusion and intercultural relations

3. **Professional Development and Training** in intercultural competency and inclusive excellence for faculty and staff to promote a safe, affirming and welcoming campus climate

4. **Recruitment and Retention** of students, faculty and staff from underrepresented racial/ethnic populations and historically marginalized and/or underserved groups

5. **Curricular and Co-Curricular strategies** to advance student learning outcomes in the area of intercultural competency development
Strategic Priority 1

**Campus-Wide Diversity Master Plan for a Pan-Institutional Effort to Address Interrelated Strategic Priorities 2-5**

Key Findings in the Halualani Reports related to the Development of an Intentional Diversity

The formation of a diversity strategy or master plan which builds off of the diversity-related goals in *Vision 2021* (this strategy or master plan would identify specific action steps, needed processes and resources, outcome measures and metrics, and an assessment schedule)¹⁷ and one that closely connects to your mission (this may create a complex and multidimensional and introspective diversity vision in terms of honoring God, following Christ, and serving humanity in a larger context of forces and power differences).

Recommendation and Rationale

*Goal 4 of Vision 2021* provides specific diversity-related objectives along with key performance indicators. This goal and related objectives are helpful in casting a vision with specific benchmarks for advancing the university’s diversity-related interests. A *Diversity Master Plan* will provide recommended actions, rationales, assignments of responsibility across the university; timelines, accountability protocols, clearly defined methods and criteria for measuring progress, and a budget (see Appendix D for more detailed framework). Achieving such a plan will require the implementation of an inclusive campus-wide master-planning process to foster broad and decentralized responsibility, and alignment with Whitworth’s Christ-centered mission. The Assistant Vice President for Diversity and Intercultural Relations, in cooperation with the IDC, will have primary administrative responsibility for overseeing development and implementation of a campus-wide master planning process.

---

¹⁷ Halualani, “Diversity Mapping Recommendations & Insights” p. 2
Strategic Priority 2

Permanent Organizational Infrastructure to Advance, Assess and Sustain High-Impact Institutional Goals and Objectives Related to Diversity, Equity, Inclusion and Intercultural Relations

Key Findings in the Halualani Reports related to Organizational Infrastructure

- While every major division at the university is involved in some diversity effort and there is some solid momentum (with 238 diversity efforts and 432 diversity-related courses) in diversity and inclusion work at Whitworth University, there is no evidence of a concerted or intentional, organizational approach/strategy to diversity and inclusion on campus. Such an approach or strategy is needed to make major strides and sustain targeted momentum in diversity achievement on all levels. Higher educational institutions can no longer rest on the “laurels” of past diversity efforts or commitments; efforts and commitments in this vein must be continually re-articulated and planned out to actualize true inclusive excellence and dedication to serve humanity. In this regard, Halualani & Associates recommends two major components related to a diversity organizational change approach/strategy at Whitworth University:

- A key diversity organizational structure that is conducive to facilitating transformative change around diversity and inclusion. By “key diversity organizational structure,” we refer to a comprehensive, multilayered division or office led by your diversity leader (Assistant Vice President of Diversity and Intercultural Relations) that incorporates the following functions:
  - visioning (“charting the path”) function: the proactive strategizing and planning for the future needs of making Whitworth University a highly engaged, inclusive, and productive climate around diversity and inclusion; and
  - support and engagement function for faculty, staff, leadership, and students (“building up the campus community with skills and perspectives”): the strategic delineation, planning, and provider of professional development training and support for the following campus constituencies.

Recommendations and Rationale

In an effort to increase and optimize effectiveness of Whitworth’s efforts to achieve inclusive excellence, the Institutional Diversity Committee is making the following recommendations to modify the current use and structure of existing resources and organizations. IDC recommends the following organizational and administrative realignment:

- create an Office of Diversity, Inclusion and Equity all programs and staff associated with the Intercultural Student Development office will be in the Office of Diversity, Inclusion and Intercultural Relations
- the Assistant Dean of Intercultural Student Development will report to the Assistant Vice President of Diversity and Intercultural Relations and maintain a “dotted line” report to the Vice President of Student Life/Dean of Students
- the Assistant Vice President of Diversity and Intercultural Relations will work collaboratively with the Vice President of Student Life/Dean of Student to ensure the center’s contribution to

---

18 Ibid., p. 5
institutional efforts to develop and align student socialization, learning experiences and support services that result in an inclusive living and learning environment and the success of all students

- the Assistant Vice President of Diversity and Intercultural Relations will report directly to the president of the university

The IDC believes this realignment is necessary to realize sustainable achievement of the goals and objectives related to diversity, equity, inclusion, and intercultural relations embedded in the Whitworth Vision 2021 Strategic Plan. This move will not only facilitate consistency in our directional objectives, but provide support for the staff working in these areas. In addition, creation of this office would send a strong message to both internal and external constituencies about Whitworth’s commitment to diversity, equity, inclusion, and intercultural relations. Reporting directly to the president reflects the pan-institutional scope of diversity-related strategic goals and objectives, as well as the university’s commitment to inclusive excellence and the level of importance these efforts have for the entirety of institutional function, efficiency and excellence.

See Appendix E for a detailed proposal entitled “The Creation of an Office of Diversity, Inclusion and Intercultural Relations at Whitworth University: A Recommendation for Consideration.” See also Appendix F for an organizational chart reflecting these recommendations.
Strategic Priority 3

Professional Development and Training in Intercultural Competency and Inclusive Excellence for Faculty and Staff to Promote a Safe, Affirming and Welcoming Campus Climate

Key Findings in the Halualani Reports related to Training and Professional Development

- Trainings and workshops are listed as an “untapped area of diversity efforts” at Whitworth.\(^{19}\) Reinforcing this observation were the findings of the climate survey in which 57% of faculty responded that they should be required to participate in diversity training.\(^{20}\) Similarly, the IDC noted in its campus outreach meeting with student leaders in GE 330 in April 2014 a strong concern that faculty and staff need additional training on topics of diversity and inclusion.

- Training for faculty and staff must note only equip these employees in intercultural competency but also help them to identify their role in meeting student learning outcomes for the university related to diversity and inclusion.\(^{21}\)

- Training and professional development opportunities should be facilitated by a “key diversity organizational structure” which at Whitworth should fall under the Office of Diversity, Inclusion and Intercultural Affairs. Among other things, this office should be responsible for “the strategic delineation, planning and provider [sic] of professional development, training and support” to faculty, staff, administration, student employees and all students.\(^{22}\) While providing leadership and inspiration, this office must be able to rely on collaborations and linkages across campus units, so that the university’s commitment to diversity not become the work of a single unit.\(^{23}\)

- There is a need for rigorous diversity assessment protocols to be adopted university-wide to provide a means for all campus constituents “to engage in diversity, culture and power differences in various contexts” and for that participation to be measured.\(^{24}\)

- The Halualani Report identified Faculty Development and HR programming related to diversity as operating at the 1\(^{st}\) and 2\(^{nd}\) order levels of the Delta Taxonomy (see Appendix G). These efforts need amplification to include a developmental training model or a “life-staged plan for diversity learning and engagement” to provide training to employees at all levels of the Delta taxonomy, or its eventual equivalent. Such a developmental model would meet the needs of “all campus constituencies in terms of their diversity needs.”\(^{25}\)

- Professional development and training must address multiple dimensions of diversity to moderate Whitworth’s predominant focus on issues of class, culture and race.\(^{26}\) There are specific opportunities to address these multiple dimensions through Halualani recommendations that promote mentoring for women faculty or for staff from UREP backgrounds, and alternatively training focused on graduate students.\(^{27}\)

\(^{19}\) Ibid., p. 5
\(^{20}\) Halualani, “Campus Experience Survey Executive Summary” p. 19
\(^{21}\) Halualani, “Summary of Recommendations” #13
\(^{22}\) Halualani, “Diversity Mapping Recommendations & Insights” p. 2
\(^{23}\) Halualani, “Summary of Recommendations” #3
\(^{24}\) Ibid., #6
\(^{25}\) Halualani, “Diversity Mapping Recommendations & Insights” p. 4
\(^{26}\) Halualani, “Diversity Mapping Project” p. 26
\(^{27}\) Halualani, “Summary of Recommendations” #4 & #30
Recommendations and Rationale

KPI 4.3.1 Informed by Assessment in Objective 4.2, coordinate and implement professional development and training to assist all members of the campus community to develop and apply intercultural competency.

The Institutional Diversity Committee sees professional development and training as a critical area of development for Whitworth. With a tiered system of developmental training programs offered across all areas of the institution, Whitworth can cultivate a workforce committed to advancing its mission of inclusively honoring God, following Christ and serving humanity.

The IDC recommends the following steps be taken in support of a robust professional development program:

- Diversity and inclusion training should be institutionally mandated and address the following constituencies: staff, faculty, students, student employees, administrative leadership and trustees. Meaningful participation in training should be a factor in performance reviews and a condition of employment for all employees. This will ensure that Whitworth provides a faculty and staff responsive to the needs of a growing campus community which includes students and employees increasingly drawn from U-Rep populations (Goal 4, retention). Training and development programs in the area of diversity awareness will demonstrate investment in employees’ personal and professional development as well as supporting the university’s goal of equipping employees to pursue excellence in their vocations, continuous improvement of the university, and the integration of their Christian faith into all facets of their life and work (Goal 7). Finally, the universal training requirement will create an environment of inclusion among employees that supports Whitworth’s position as one of the best Christian workplaces.
  - The Delta taxonomy used by Halualani & Associates provides a useful model of developmental levels of learning around issues of diversity and inclusion and may help to guide training efforts.

- The proposed Office of Diversity, Inclusion and Equity should facilitate the design of training programs for different constituencies. To do so, the office requires a standing commitment from the university that extends beyond the advisory work of the Institutional Diversity Committee.
  - Institution-wide training initiatives developed by the proposed Office of Diversity, Inclusion and Equity should build strategic relationships with other campus units such as Academic Affairs, Human Resources, Student Life, Enrollment and Financial Aid and Finance and Administration whenever possible. These relationships will assure the maximum impact of programming. In order to accomplish this, divisions across the university would identify positions and allocate staff time to support goals related to diversity and inclusion training.
  - The proposed Office of Diversity, Inclusion and Equity should brand its training program to create awareness not only of the professional development opportunities but of the importance of participation across all campus constituencies.

- Professional development in diversity and inclusion should utilize existing resources where possible and identify new systems of support as needed.
  - In order to enforce a training requirement, we recommend that Whitworth identify and invest in a Talent Management System to facilitate accurate tracking of participation in this training as well as completion of other campus requirements. Such a system has
long been sought for use by departments including IT, HR, Safety and Facilities Services, and efficient management of the various programmatic needs is necessary if another new obligation is to be met. *Current systems such as Datatel cannot support the needs of tracking diversity training among staff. The proposed Office of Diversity, Inclusion and Equity can, therefore, provide leadership in seeking a long-needed system of managing personnel data more effectively at Whitworth.*

- To support delivery of diversity training modules, Whitworth can make use of existing learning platform Blackboard to deliver diversity training in adaptive release formats, allowing faculty and staff to complete trainings identified for their level of need in small blocks of content at regular intervals. The School of Continuing Studies has successfully modeled this approach to professional development in the Blackboard site used for training its adjunct faculty. It is important to note that a learning platform, such as Blackboard, in no way substitutes for a comprehensive Talent Management System that will develop and track staff training and performance.

- Professional development and training should include mentorship programs targeted at female, as well as UREP, faculty and staff. To ensure the success of such mentoring programs, the proposed Office of Diversity, Inclusion and Equity should provide leadership to ensure meaningful training for mentors and the availability of time from mentors by working with supervisors to ensure staff time is available.

- Whitworth should assess whether or not its current staffing structure is sufficient to effectively develop and deliver a comprehensive and sustainable developmental diversity and inclusion professional development and training process.
Strategic Priority 4

RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION OF STUDENTS, FACULTY AND STAFF FROM UNDERREPRESENTED RACIAL/ETHNIC POPULATIONS AND HISTORICALLY MARGINALIZED AND/OR UNDERSERVED GROUPS

The objectives addressed below are: A) recruitment and retention of faculty and staff from under-represented populations, and B) achieving gender parity and equity.

Key Findings in the Halualani Reports related to Recruitment and Retention

- In categorizing Whitworth diversity efforts by theme, the Halualani & Associates Diversity Mapping Project noted that faculty recruitment reflected only 3% of campus efforts, while staff recruitment represented 0%.28
- The target population for diversity-related efforts at Whitworth listed faculty, staff and administrators among constituencies with 16% of diversity efforts targeted at faculty, but only 9% at staff and 0% at administration.29
- The prospective reach of diversity efforts on campus was estimated at the lowest percentage for faculty to impact students at only 21% of campus efforts.30
- Additionally, the Diversity Mapping Project identified as “demarcated empty zones” in diversity efforts the following: a university-wide approach to faculty recruitment and professional development on diversity for leadership and staff members.31
- With regard to the framing of diversity issues around gender, there exists a gap of ten percentage points between institutional efforts focused on issues of socioeconomic class (21%), cultural competency, race and ethnicity vs. gender at 11% of campus-wide efforts, suggesting that gender remains an underrepresented issue of diversity at Whitworth University.32

Recommendations and Rationale

KPI 4.4.1 ESTABLISH BY THE FALL OF 2012 AN ONGOING TRAINING PROGRAM FOR HIRING MANAGERS THAT ADDRESSES BEST PRACTICES RELATED TO THIS OBJECTIVE

IDC recommends that Human Resources (HR) work at various stages of the hiring process and with various internal constituents to develop partnered programming in order to articulate the importance of inclusive excellence in hiring. Specifically we recommend that the university should consider the following:

- **Produce and post a short video by the university president** on the HR website about the institution’s commitment to inclusive excellence to frame our hiring practices clearly for all potential applicants.
  - Share this video also with student employment for posting on its website linked to all student jobs.
  - The video may also be of use to external constituents in developing understanding of the university’s position regarding inclusive excellence.

28 Halualani, “Diversity Mapping Project” p. 15
29 Ibid., p. 20
30 Ibid., p. 25
31 Ibid., p. 28
32 Ibid., p. 24
• Adopt a requirement of a 300 word written statement from all finalists in faculty and staff positions, explaining how their previous work experience, personal experience or education has informed their views of inclusive excellence.
  
  o To lessen the burden on potential applicants, we recommend this requirement be used only at the time of on-campus interviews, once finalists in the search have been identified. The statement will help to shed light on the applicants’ experience with diverse workforces and commitment to supporting an inclusive workplace. It is meant to open up conversations that might not otherwise occur at a final round of interviewing.
  
  o This will require a short document be developed to explain what we expect of the written statement. It may be posted to the HR website, as is the current “Faculty Faith Essay” link; alternatively, the explanation may be provided to finalists in writing as they prepare for interviews and campus visits.

• Develop a training module for all faculty, staff and students serving on search committees, both for regular and for student employment, to explain the principles of inclusive excellence in hiring.
  
  o Post the training in a video format or voiceover presentation so that others may view it.
  
  o Develop a short quiz, similar to the FERPA quiz, which all members of hiring committees must complete in order to access resumes or post to WhitJobs.
  
  o Establish and distribute a hiring checklist that is updated with inclusion practices. For faculty searches, this may include bringing in certain staff to meet with potential hires from underrepresented groups. For student employment, this may include additional recommended questions for job interviews.

• Revise the format of Whitworth job descriptions both for students and for faculty and staff to move from the current statement of adherence to anti-discriminatory policy at the end of the document to a more prominent avowal of commitment to inclusive excellence at the top of the document.
  
  o The change of language may occur in the opening paragraph that provides general background on Whitworth.
  
  o A short statement of the educational and theological commitment to inclusive excellence should appear at the top of all student job descriptions.

KPI 4.4.2: Monitor, achieve and sustain gender parity (+/- 5 percent) in hiring, tenure and promotion of faculty and in hiring and retention for academic and administrative leaders

IDC further recommends that several internal constituents should work together to advance the institution toward achievement of this KPI, including HR, the faculty promotion and tenure review committee, and the faculty assembly. Specifically we recommend that Whitworth should:

• Initiate a review of the promotion and tenure review process to assess the language in the evaluation instrument. Specifically, the review should make adjustments to the document as needed to identify the extent to which candidates for promotion and/or tenure have incorporated diversity-related issues into their scholarship, course content, pedagogy through the use of non-traditional, student-centered learning and/or their on campus or off campus service.
This emphasis on inclusion at a critical juncture in the faculty promotion process will again affirm Whitworth’s institutional commitment to diversity and support women especially who include experiential learning in their classroom pedagogy at a higher rate than men (across institutions of higher ed. nationally, and at Whitworth), but who may fear introducing a new pedagogy given the potential risk of negative student evaluations.

The adjustments in language would make space for a variety of faculty responses on diversity beyond the conventional measures of scholarship and teaching as defined by content.

KPI 4.4.3 Achieve steady progress toward reflecting the racial/ethnic diversity of the U.S. population in Whitworth’s faculty and staff

Our committee recognizes that Whitworth University currently draws from a predominantly local pool of applicants in most searches, and therefore the institution is limited to a population whose demographics do not mirror national trends on race and ethnicity. In light of this limitation, we recommend that Whitworth:

- Complete a study of hiring practices at neighboring institutions, both public and private, to assess how HR departments frame their hiring and approach the local workforce with an eye to enhancing diversity.
- Revise procedures to allow hiring committees in staff hires to review where applicants learned about job openings. This will allow hiring committees to make recommendations to HR about adapting or expanding recruitment practices.
- Convene focus groups through the proposed Office of Diversity, Inclusion and Equity to gather current faculty and staff as well as those who have turned over to assess the strengths and weaknesses in university retention of women and underrepresented groups.
- Devote resources to soft-skills training for faculty, staff and students on a regular basis to provide diversity workplace training. These training modules may be borrowed from local agencies at low to no cost (World Relief, Arc of Spokane).
- Make the Assistant Vice President of Diversity and Intercultural Relations a de facto member of every faculty and administrative search committee.

KPI 4.4.4 Monitor turnover rates for women and underrepresented racial/ethnic populations and seek to achieve rates that are comparable to all employees in similar classifications

IDC recommends that HR work with internal constituents to develop a monitoring process of turnover ratios; suggestions below:

- Develop a plan for dissemination of information regarding turnover ratios that is transparent to campus constituents by providing annual data on the Diversity and Intercultural Relations (current name) webpage and by linking this data to the relevant KPI in the strategic plan.
- Complete a study of peer institutions that have targeted turnover ratios for women and underrepresented groups to examine their best practices.
Recruitment and retention of students, faculty and staff from underrepresented racial/ethnic populations and historically marginalized and/or underserved groups

The objectives addressed below are C) retaining students from under-represented populations (in response to increased enrollment), and D) attention to social/campus climate concerns.

Key Findings

Findings from the campus climate student survey point to a couple of trends that are worth addressing. The first is that students recognize a need for the university to be committed to diversity and inclusion: over 90% of student respondents agree that it is important to have a campus environment that is supportive of diversity and over 65% indicate that there is a lack of understanding of the problems that people from other racial and ethnic groups face. Additionally, students are finding themselves interacting with people from a different background than themselves, demonstrating an immediate need for intercultural competency. Only 10% of students reported NOT having an intercultural interaction within the past 2 weeks. That means 90% of our students are engaged in intercultural interactions, 71% of these interactions happened with people the respondent considers friends, 27% with a stranger, and 100% of them happened on campus.

Not surprisingly, given the majority/minority context of Whitworth, there is a down side to these interactions: about 17% of students believe there is racial tension on campus; 33% believe that people are treated unfairly on the basis of their sexual orientation; 15% have been singled out in class because of their race/ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation or religious affiliation; 25% feel they have to work harder than their peers to be perceived as a good student; 24% have heard faculty express stereotypes based on race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, or religious affiliation; and, 16% don’t feel comfortable contributing to class discussions.

This negative climate is reflected in responses given to the question as to whether or not the respondent would recommend Whitworth to prospective students by racial category. Of the student respondents 47% said they would recommend Whitworth to white prospective students, but only 7% would recommend it to African American and Hispanic/Latino prospective students, 8% would recommend Whitworth to Asian/Pacific Islander students, and less than 3% would recommend Whitworth to Native American prospective students.

Recommendations and Rationale

A number of the other recommendations and strategic priorities, if implemented, will go a long way in addressing campus climate issues and therefore retaining students from underrepresented racial and ethnic populations (UREP). Successful hiring and retaining of faculty and staff from UREPs, changes in the curriculum and professional development training on diversity, inclusion and intercultural competency for faculty and staff will all greatly impact the experience of all students both in and outside the classroom. As will the creation of a centralized, institutional structure that is focused on diversity and inclusions. This will send a message to students, as well as faculty and staff, that diversity is not a haphazard and fragmented aspect of our campus life and culture but rather it is a central commitment that is connected to our mission and central to our task as a Christian university.

These recommendations, however, are interventions that will impact the campus climate over the long term. It is not possible, nor desirable, to implement these immediately. This leaves the university with a crisis. We have successfully recruited diverse cohorts of incoming students, and this change in demographics has led to noticeable increases in tension, which left unaddressed will lead to a decreased ability to retain and recruit students from UREPs. In addition to long-term solutions we need
short-term interventions that can positively improve the campus climate, thus the following two recommendations:

- While an existing mechanism is in place, there needs to be a **well-publicized, accessible, easy to find and easy to use mechanism for reporting negative incidents** around diversity fault-lines: race/ethnicity, gender, religion, national origin, disabilities and sexual orientation. This reporting mechanism should be monitored by a task-force — referred to on many campuses as the “bias/harassment response team” — of staff from resident life, student affairs, and faculty affairs. This task force should be equipped to investigate and make recommendations for disciplinary actions and interventions. It should also track, assess, evaluate, and report incidents to the proposed Office of Diversity, Inclusion and Equity.

- The university should implement a **mandatory, campus wide program for intercultural communication and competence to take place during the first year of study at Whitworth**. This could be done via a change in goals and expectations for GE125 freshman seminar, an additional credit (GE126), or through resident/student life co-curricular programming.
**Strategic Priority 5**

**CURRICULAR AND CO-CURRICULAR STRATEGIES TO ADVANCE STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES IN THE AREA OF INTERCULTURAL COMPETENCY DEVELOPMENT**

Key Findings in the Halualani Reports related to Curricular and Co-Curricular Strategies:

- Infuse a focus on “intersectionalities” across diversity efforts and courses.
- Integrate diversity concepts, perspectives, and pedagogies throughout the curriculum (and in core subject matter writing, theory, and inquiry) and not just in diversity content courses.
- Develop a life-staged plan for diversity learning and engagement for each student level/year (1st – 4th and graduate).
- Create a curricular strategy to have every student reach and be immersed in DELTA Level 5: Evaluation-Critique of Power Differences every year of their education.
- Rigorously assess the study abroad/cultural exchange programs to identify the diversity impacts and learning created through those outlets.
- Institute a major assessment system for the general education diversity program/requirements.
- Re-tool the American Diversity and Global Perspective student learning objectives.
- Re-construct the application process for general education diversity status and make it more rigorous.
- Establish rules for how courses should fulfill general education diversity requirements and place information on syllabi.
- Examine the kinds of diversity included in the American Diversity courses – are there aspects of diversity that are missing? Actively seek out the missing perspectives.
- Engage the DELTA Taxonomy and target the higher DELTA levels (Evaluation-Critique of Power Differences, Privilege; Social Agency and Action; Innovative Problem-Solving) for diversity efforts and courses.

**Recommendations and Rationale**

Whitworth’s diversity effort, as far as the curriculum goes, is expressed in 432 courses across many departments, in addition to many extracurricular efforts and events. While we do have rubrics for American Diversity and Global Perspective course proposals, the materials examined by Halualani & Associates reveal “no evidence of a concerted or intentional, organizational approach/strategy to diversity and inclusion on campus”. What that means in terms of our two General Education requirement on diversity cannot be expressed succinctly without reference to the Delta Taxonomy used by Halualani to evaluate our syllabi and assignments. Their comments should be read carefully. In very broad, general terms however, we need a **clearer standard** for these courses, we need to think through whether the requirement should be **developmental**, in some sense (as our Core program is, for instance), and we need to think about **assessment and outcomes** of these courses. As we do this, we need to think through our own goals for the requirement, how they are expressed in the strategic plan, and whether we have the resources to make changes along the lines suggested by the consultants.

---

33 For expanded explanation of these recommendations, see items 9-24 in Appendix K, Summary of Recommendations
34 see Appendix G, DELTA taxonomy
The report on American Diversity (AD) and Global Perspectives (GP) general education courses prepared by Halualani & Associates suggests that we look at the desired outcomes and assessment of this program. There are multiple observations, including that it is unusual to see so many of these requirements taught as contemporary language courses, that many of them deal with monocultures (rather than looking at cultural diversity in a broader context), and that in some cases the overlap between in U.S. cultures and the broader world is not well-negotiated. The main observation is that in our 432 courses in this area, we teach largely diversity along class or religious lines (rather than looking at it more broadly), and without showing historical causes and structures of discrimination.

The key here is to look at the critique and formulate the response that best fits our intentions and resources. Most importantly, we need to look at the goals of our strategic plan as they express our on-going mission. We need to replace the Delta Taxonomy with a method of assessing our general education (GE) requirements that reflects our own goals, if only to make sure our curriculum is updated in line with our current plan, that we don’t waste resources by duplicating efforts, and that we agree on the desired outcomes for our students. Here are some questions to get us started:

- The Halualani findings pointed to some glaring gaps in the American Diversity and Global Perspectives general education requirements. In the IDC’s outreach process, the IDC found that these findings were echoed among members of the Whitworth community. Given that it has been 12 years since the Whitworth GE program was reviewed, the IDC recommends that the University Council ask the faculty and COVAC to initiate a process of review of the GE program, and that this review process take seriously the Halualani findings in regards to the AD and GP course requirements.

- Or, should we just look at these two requirements? Right now, there is a Gen. Ed. task force looking at assessment. As they do so, should we have a general conversation about outcomes of the AD and GP courses?

- To what level do we want students to engage the material? Or, in other words, what do we mean by serving God and humanity as global citizens? Our Strategic Plan has us “equipping our students to solve complex contemporary problems” in the wider world. What is achievable in this arena, given our faculty, existing structure, and resources both on and off-campus?

- When we think about outcomes of individual courses and of the program, are we looking for knowledge about culture, language, and other issues sufficient to navigate a culture, domestic or foreign, as a traveler, for business, or in other short-term capacities? The outcomes here might improve language skills, helping students to view different perspectives on contemporary issues, or familiarizing them with key cultural products.

- Or, do we want students to become aware of the deeper causes of contemporary events, of the structures that create them, and of the history of some ideas and practices? The desired outcomes would be the ability to see complex causes and structures behind societal problems, to understand individuals as products of multiple identities, and to feel confident about community involvement to address societal problems. That would mean a deeper engagement than a short mission, travel, or study program. To go further would be to enable our students to make meaningful contributions to our own society or intervene constructively in international events as a result of these classes, but it might mean stricter standards than we have now.
• Put differently, would outcomes aimed at assisting out students to develop the capacity to “evaluate-critique of power differences, privilege, and social inequalities” better-position our students to “honor God, follow Christ, and serve humanity?”

35 Halualani, “Diversity Mapping Recommendations & Insights” p. 5
Conclusion

With this report the Institutional Diversity Committee sends forth a clarion call and sense of urgency for Whitworth University to move expeditiously to take necessary and decisive steps to deliver on the promises – implicit and explicit – embedded in its enduring mission and core values. We believe that it is not an overstatement to say that Whitworth’s future – its very existence – will depend, in part, on the manner in which we respond to the opportunities, challenges and recommendations contained in this report.

Based on the evidence of God’s presence in Whitworth’s 125-year journey thus far, we are confident that God’s grace, and the commitment of Whitworth’s faculty, staff, trustees and students, will move us forward in a way that more fully honors God, follows Christ and serves humanity. We offer this prayer in closing:

**A Prayer for a Diverse Community**

by: Education for Justice

*Creator of all races and ethnicities [and other social identities],
help us see that a diverse community is the way
to deepen our lives and to know you more deeply.

*Guide us to see that entering into a vital and just relationship
with others who are different from us
is the way to make ourselves whole.

*Guard us from fear of the other,
from the fear that our own security is threatened
if we become truly willing to make a place at the table for all.

*Open us to live out what we profess to believe:

  *That our true security is in You and in your call to justice and peace,
  That we are a part of your global family,
  That, because of your Incarnation, the human dignity of everyone is sacred,
  And that we are constantly called to conversion and inclusive community.

*We pray that you help us recognize any forms of [oppression] in our hearts,
And in our legal systems and social structures.
*Forgive us our sins of exclusion.
*Heal our souls and spirits.
*Ground us in compassion for all through your grace.

*Help us take the steps you call us to take
To build a more just community,
Where difference is respected
And where we can all join hands
And rejoice in the common good.

*Through the mercy of God, we pray.

*Amen.*
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Appendices
A. Glossary of Terms

**Diversity:** Whitworth's commitment to diversity is rooted in the biblical mandate to love, respect and honor the fullness of God's human creation. The term "diversity" points to the presence and participation of people who differ across multiple dimensions of real and socially constructed expressions of human experience. Presence and participation also incorporate thoughts, customs, perspectives, methods of problem-solving, and ways of negotiating the environment that enrich the educational process.

**Inclusion:** The active, intentional, and ongoing engagement with diversity – in the curriculum, in the co-curriculum, and in communities (intellectual, spiritual, social, cultural, geographical) with which individuals might connect – in ways that increase awareness, cognitive sophistication, and empathic understanding of the complex ways individuals interact within systems and institutions. To actively demonstrate an attitude that recognizes the value and contributions of all members of the Whitworth University community.

**Equity:** The creation of opportunities for historically underrepresented populations to have equal access and equitable outcomes through educational programs that are capable of closing the gaps in student achievement and faculty and staff capacity to work and teach in ways that are informed by and responds to the diverse cultural composition campus spaces of learning, working, and living. A commitment to respect and provide equitable treatment for all members of our community, especially those from historically underrepresented and underserved communities.

**Underrepresented Racial/Ethnic Populations (UREPs):** "Underrepresentation" is meant to describe the extent to which the proportion of certain racial/ethnic groups relative to the total campus population fails to mirror their proportion in the broader U.S. population. For the purpose of Whitworth’s strategic plan and this report, the term "underrepresented racial/ethnic populations" refers to members of Whitworth University's student body, faculty, staff, administration, and trustees who self-identify with real and socially constructed human dimensions of race and ethnicity, including American/Alaskan Native, African American, Hispanic or Latino/Latina, Asian American, Hawaiian/Pacific Islander American, and biracial or multiracial.

**Underserved Populations:** These demographics may include students, faculty and staff from UREPs, but can also include social constructions that go beyond racial/ethnic identities. These may include, but are not limited to, populations such as first-generation, low income, disabilities, sexual orientation, veterans and national origin. Being “underserved” speaks can involve inadequate financial resources, inadequate pre-college college social and academic preparation to navigate the university landscape or handle the rigor of college work. “Underserve” also addresses the failure of colleges and universities who admit these students or hire these faculty and staff to introduce and provide appropriate resources and support systems designed to sustain and retain them through matriculation or employment in the academy.36

---

36 these definitions adapted from the Association of American Colleges & Universities (AAC&U, n.d.)
B. Vision 2021: Goal 4

Demonstrate courageous leadership for an increasingly diverse world.

Whitworth aspires to achieve and sustain a level of excellence that values the role a welcoming and diverse community plays in realizing its mission to "honor God, follow Christ and serve humanity." Grounded in a biblical understanding of God's character, justice and wholeness, the university will cultivate in students, faculty, staff and trustees the capacity to relate effectively across multiple dimensions of human diversity in learning, working and living environments. During the next decade, Whitworth will focus on issues of intercultural competency and equity related to gender, race and ethnicity.

- **Objective 4.1:** Strengthen Whitworth's capacity to assess, monitor, support and lead efforts to achieve institutional goals for diversity, inclusiveness and intercultural competency.
  - **KPI 4.1.1:** Establish by February 2012 a permanent representative body to provide leadership in advancing initiatives related to diversity and intercultural competency.

- **Objective 4.2:** Assess current efforts to assist students, faculty and staff in developing intercultural competencies, and measure their effects on the relational quality of the campus environment regarding the living, learning, and working experiences of all members of the Whitworth community.
  - **KPI 4.2.1:** Complete a campus-wide assessment of diversity-related initiatives and report to the campus community by fall 2013.
  - **KPI 4.2.2:** Assess the success of the current general education, American diversity, and global perspectives requirements in student achievement of learning outcomes associated with each category and report, with recommendations as appropriate, to the campus community by fall 2013.
  - **KPI 4.2.3:** Complete a comprehensive assessment of Whitworth's learning, working, and living climate and report to the campus community by fall 2014.

- **Objective 4.3:** Equip all members of the Whitworth community to live, work and learn in relationships that reflect the call to love God and to love one's neighbor through appropriate curricular and co-curricular programs, professional development and training opportunities. (See KPIs 7.2.1 and 7.3.1.)
  - **KPI 4.3.1:** Informed by the assessment processes in objective 4.2, coordinate with Human Resources, Student Life, and Academic Affairs to implement professional development and training for the purpose of assisting all members of the campus community to develop and apply intercultural competencies. (See KPIs 7.2.1 and 7.3.1.)
  - **KPI 4.3.2:** Equip all student leaders with conflict-transformation skills in order to promote effective relationships across cultural, religious and personal differences.
• KPI 4.3.3a/b: Improve Whitworth’s NSSE measures for first-year and senior students who report often or very often having had discussions with students of a different race or ethnicity.

• KPI 4.3.4a/b: Improve Whitworth’s NSSE measures for first-year and senior students reporting a campus environment that encourages contact among students from different economic, social and racial or ethnic backgrounds.

• KPIs 4.3.3 was recalibrated in 2013 with new baselines and goals based on significant changes to the NSSE.

• Objective 4.4: Strengthen recruitment and retention of faculty and staff to enhance diversity and to expand leadership opportunities for women and for individuals from underrepresented racial and ethnic populations.

  • KPI 4.4.1: Establish by fall 2012 an ongoing training program for hiring managers that addresses best practices related to this objective.

  • KPI 4.4.2: Monitor, achieve and sustain gender parity (+/− 5 percent) in hiring (overall employment), tenure and promotion to full professor, and in hiring and retention for academic and administrative leaders.

  • KPI 4.4.3: Achieve steady progress toward reflecting the racial/ethnic diversity of the U.S. population in Whitworth’s faculty and staff.

  • KPI 4.4.4: Monitor turnover rates for women and underrepresented racial/ethnic populations and seek to achieve rates that are comparable to all employees in similar classifications.

• Objective 4.5: Support Whitworth’s commitment to intercultural competency, inclusiveness and diversity by recruiting and retaining a diverse student body.

  • KPI 4.5.1: Develop by spring 2012 a diversity recruitment and retention plan reflecting best practices for admissions and financial aid.

  • KPI 4.5.2: Increase enrollment of traditional undergraduate students from underrepresented domestic racial and ethnic populations by at least 15 students per year, with a goal of reflecting the diversity of the U.S. population overall.

  • KPI 4.5.3: Achieve and maintain first-to-second-year persistence rates for students of underrepresented racial/ethnic populations that are comparable to rates of all traditional undergraduate students.

  • KPI 4.5.4: Achieve and maintain six-year graduation rates for students of underrepresented racial/ethnic populations that are comparable to rates of all traditional undergraduate students.

http://www.whitworth.edu/GeneralInformation/Whitworth2021/KPI4.htm
C. Historical Overview

Diversity-Related Developments at Whitworth University Since 1960

1960s
- African American students from New York City were recruited and admitted to Whitworth College

1970s
- A significant group of Hawaii students enter Whitworth University
- Black Student Union Established
- A Black Studies Minor is established in response to student concerns/protests
- Position for Director of Minority Student Affairs in Student Life created (part-time)
- Women’s Task Force created
- Lillian Whitehouse initiates a "Women in Transition" Program
- Black Studies Minor is discontinued

1980s
- Developments in International Student Affairs in Student Life
  - Host Family Program
  - International Student Scholarship Program
  - International Student Recruitment
- English as a Second Language Program established
- International and Multicultural Affairs combined due to budget constraints
- Affirmative Action Committee
- Affirmative Action Committee training
- Cultural Diversity Advocates program begins
- “Other Culture” gen. ed. course begins to allow for domestic diversity with 40% rule
- Women begin to outnumber men in the full-time day undergraduate student population

1990s
- Loss of professional staff in Minority and International Student Affairs due to budget constraints. The positions moved to Resident Director’s central office duties
- National Multicultural Committee Report to faculty was “received” - no implementation or action taken
- English department’s intentional design for diversity voices their courses

1993
- New president (Bill Robinson) appoints a presidential task force on the status of diversity at Whitworth
- Recommendations made

---

37 This timeline reflects dates extracted from previous institutional reports, conversations with current members of the Whitworth community and other sources. It does not purport to reflect data resulting from professional historiographical research.
• Multicultural Affairs position in Student Life made full-time and International Student Affairs (part-time)

1994
• President creates and appoints the Special Assistant to the President for Diversity onto the Cabinet (faculty position with reduced course load)
• Diversity Committee established out of the former Affirmative Action Committee

1995-1997
• Training of trainers program designed and implemented
• Cabinet trainer done first
• Diversity Committee training
• Training on campus is voluntary
• Diversity training is mandatory
• Provost Tammy Reid appoints as co-directors to create Women’s Studies minor. First intro course (WS201) offered in Spring 1998.

1998
• Diversity Summit
• Students advocate for an admissions person who is primarily responsible for increasing diversity on campus
• U.S. Cultural Studies Minor is established
• Women’s Studies Program begins
• “Other Culture” credit changed to “Multicultural” and the 40% rule rescinded
• Women’s Task Force ends
• Process to clarify institutional Sexual Harassment Policies for students, staff, and faculty initiated

1999
• Diversity Committee for HR suspended
• Admissions hires a diversity admissions counselor
• Admissions loses diversity admission counselor hire
• Assistant Dean of Students for Programming and Diversity hired and corresponding office created

2000
• President adds “contribution to diversity” onto the cabinet’s evaluation process; thereby, institutionalizing diversity
• Hewlett grant working on faculty change re: diversity in the courses
• Women in Society Everywhere (WISE), an ASWU-chartered group, started

2001
• Faculty Development Day on Unraveling the White Cocoon
• Access grant approval by Board of Trustees

2002
• Gender Study launched (with outside consultant)
• Significant increase in “faculty of color”
• Female faculty approaching parity with men at the asst. professor level

2003
• Act Six Scholarship Program Established
• On-line diversity plans up and running
• 66 “Students of Color” and 48 International Students enter fall class

2004
• Women’s Studies minor is without a director until an interim director is appointed in 2012
• Online training Preventing Sexual Harassment is required for all faculty and staff

2005
• Report of Gender Study submitted

2009
• Asst. V. Pres. for Intercultural Relations (full-time cabinet position with courtesy faculty appointment) created

2010
• ASWU submitted a resolution asking for more diverse voices to be heard in Core 250, and for a video, made by Isamu Jordan, showing diverse students’ experiences, be shown on campus to faculty and admin

2011
• The Inclusive University Classroom Lecture is established as an annual event
• Institutional Diversity Committee established by President Taylor
• Employee and student policies are modified to include new emphases under Title IX prohibiting sexual assault and sexual violence

2012
• Women’s and Gender Studies Consultation and reports submitted
• Interim Directors are appointed for Women’s & Gender and US Cultural Studies Minors
• “Sexual Orientation” is added as a protected identity in the Bias/Harassment Policy in the Student Handbook
• Open Conversations: Gay Straight Association becomes a chartered student club
• Act Six Feasibility Study/Report
• Assistant Director for International Student Programs made full-time

2012/13
• Diversity Assessments and Campus Climate Survey completed (with Outside Consultant)

2014
• 24.7% of the second largest freshmen class in Whitworth’s history are from underrepresented racial/ethnic populations
• New required training is rolled out for Preventing Discrimination and Sexual Violence: Title IX and the SAVE Act for Faculty and Staff; and Sexual Harassment - Higher Education Version
D. Diversity Master Plan Framework

Framework for a Strategic Diversity Master Plan at Whitworth University

Elements of an Effective Strategic Diversity Master Plan

- Clear and Organic Alignment with our Christ-centered Mission
- Coherent Understanding of Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, Intercultural Relations, and Excellence
- Systemic: Impacts All Aspects of the Institutional Structure
- Inclusive Planning Process: Top-Down and Bottom-Up Investment/Buy-In
- Framework of Accountability (decentralized) and Administrative Oversight of Plan Implementation (centralized)
- Framework of Assessment (informed by and responsive to unique unit/disciplinary contexts)
- Infrastructure of Incentives and Rewards
- Flexibility and Responsiveness
- Projected Costs (?)
Framing a Coherent Understanding of Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, Intercultural Relations, and Excellence

In the areas of:

- Institutional Transformation
- Educational/School Mission
- Response to Intolerant Climate
- Representation

Systemic Interdependency

Campus Climate/Intercultural Relations

Students Access/Success

Transformation

Education/Scholarship
Student Access and Success

Access
- Recruitment
- Yield
- Enrollment
- Participation Rates

Success
- GPAs
- Course Completions
- Honors
- Retention
- Persistence
- Graduation Rates
- Graduate School Attendance
- Engagement
- Alumni Involvement

Campus Climate/Intercultural Relations

-Race, Ethnicity, Gender, Class, Language, Religion, Age
Nationality, Sexual Orientation, and Ability

-Perceptions of Campus Climate
  - Psychological
  - Behavioral

-Quality of Intercultural Relations
Education and Scholarship

- New Pedagogies
- New Academic Fields
- New Course Content (infusion of underrepresented voices in required reading across the curriculum)
- Diversity Requirements (For all members of the campus community)

Institutional Transformation

- Congruence of Leadership Statements with Diversity Agenda
- Incentive and Rewards Structures to Support Participation
- Review of Policies and Protocols to Prevent and Address Discrimination
- Strategic Hiring and Retention Initiatives
- Healthy/Strategic Interactions with External Community
- Capacity for and Visibility of Institutional Leadership for Diversity
Diversity Master Plan Principles

- Maintenance of missional alignment and integrity must pervade the Diversity Master Plan.
- Negative outcomes that are correlated with group membership are suspect and should prompt.
- The Diversity Master Plan tracks negative outcomes that have a basis in group membership, not individuals who are members of groups.
- Strategies that seek to eliminate group-based disadvantage confer benefits on more than their intended targets and advances the institution’s mission as a whole.
- The plan must measure progress in terms of equity (as defined in this plan) and not merely positive numerical change.
- Without a sufficient infrastructure of support (sufficient diversity organizational structure, financial resources, incentives and rewards, policy development, accountability mechanisms) the Diversity Master Plan has no teeth.
- Diversity, equity, inclusion, intercultural relations and excellence must be viewed as profoundly interdependent concepts and core values.
E. Reorganization Proposal

The Creation of an *Office of Diversity, Inclusion, and Intercultural Relations* at Whitworth University: A Recommendation for Consideration

Submitted by: Lawrence Burnley, Assistant Vice President for Diversity and Intercultural Relations

April 26, 2014

The news of Esther Louie’s resignation from the position of Assistant Dean for Intercultural Student Affairs has sent shockwaves through various constituent groups of the University. For the past fifteen years Esther, a self-proclaimed “interculturalist,” has given exemplary service to the Whitworth community which has borne immeasurable fruit in the lives of students, faculty, staff, and the institution’s evolving awareness of the centrality of intercultural competency to our Christ-centered educational mission. Given the enormity of Esther’s presence as mentor, administrator, trainer, educator, and “safe place” for those who often feel voiceless, marginalized, and excluded from the mainstream of sociocultural norms of campus life, the announcement of Esther’s departure feels devastating for many. Add to this the increased need for Whitworth to expand its overall capacity to actualize development of intercultural competencies across the University in response to the value we place on diversity, equity, and inclusion, the news of her departure has been characterized by some as a “crisis” for our community.

A situation such as this causes me to embrace the dualistic Chinese meaning of the word “crisis” which points to both danger and opportunity. The danger associated with Esther’s departure is evident not only because it signals the loss of an extraordinary gift of God and human asset to the Whitworth community in general, and students from multiple underrepresented populations in particular, but also because of the timing. Esther’s departure comes at a time when Whitworth has launched an unprecedented demonstration of its understanding of the inextricable relationship diversity, equity, inclusion, and intercultural relations has with academic excellence and the effective delivery of a mind and heart education.

More recent demonstrations of Whitworth’s recognition of the value of inclusive excellence is seen in the creation of a cabinet level position to provide leadership to these efforts; the prominence of these efforts and core values as reflected in the Vision 2021 Strategic Plan; launching the Courageous Conversations process; renewed commitment to the Act Six Scholarship Program; the development and implementation of the strategy to recruit and retain persons from underrepresented racial/ethnic populations; establishment of a campus-wide committee; and the decision to invest in a comprehensive assessment of Whitworth’s diversity efforts just to name a few.

The opportunity associated with Esther’s departure is for us to assess Whitworth’s current situation – as influenced by external and internal developments – and reconsider that manner in which
we are utilizing existing resources to advance our strategic diversity-related goals and objectives and to consider the possibility to provide additional resources. The current financial challenges we’re facing do not make for the most optimal climate to consider “additional resources.” However, financial realities both for now and in the foreseeable future make giving attention to the issues addressed here paramount when considering the implications they have for retaining an increasingly diverse student population and the realities of rapid demographic changes in the nation and the northwest.

In the wake of Esther’s announcement, each of us recognizes the urgency to articulate Whitworth’s ongoing commitment to diversity and intercultural relations and to, at minimum, fill her position to continue, if not enhance, progress toward achieving strategic objectives. Having said this, I trust that we will not rush to “fill a position” in response to the enormous vacuum and related set of needs created by Esther’s resignation. I hope you agree that careful assessment of the position in light of our current situation and our institutional trajectory in the area of diversity and intercultural relations is critical. Regardless of the response to what I am proposing below for our consideration, I want to make known that I welcome the opportunity to work closely as an active participant with the Student Life staff, Human Resources, and others in each step of the assessment and search process for this position.

The Journey Leading to Our Current Reality

Whitworth University has an enduring and ever-evolving Christ-centered mission to “equip its graduates to honor God, follow Christ, and serve humanity” in an increasingly diverse world. In carrying out this mission the University has increasingly demonstrated a commitment to justice, equity, diversity and in doing so has created multiple staff positions, curricular and co-curricular programs aimed at helping students to achieve core intercultural competencies. These initiatives include, but are not limited to, the Office of International Education, the Intercultural Student Center, Cultural Diversity Advocates, the Center for Service Learning and Community Engagement, and the creation of a senior level chief diversity officer (CDO) with the title of Assistant Vice President for Diversity and Intercultural Relations. A key challenge and opportunity for Whitworth is to cultivate enhanced organizational efficiencies which will realize greater synergy and collaboration among these offices in an effort to achieve diversity-related strategic objectives and learning outcomes for all members of the campus community.

The strategic diversity-related goals and objectives in the Vision 2021 plan are pan-institutional in scope whose complexity will only increase as we effectively address issues related to professional development, training for faculty, staff, and student leaders, recruitment and retention strategies, development and implementation of assessment protocols for all diversity-related efforts; and achieving synergy, collaboration, and alignment of these efforts with the University’s mission and strategic objectives. Achieving this will require, indeed it necessitates, an organizational infrastructure for diversity that brings together a team of diversity professionals around a common table with a senior manager endowed with the authority to manage and lead a strategic and coordinated effort to achieve common goals. Specifically, my concern has been and continues to be with the capacity of my position and our current use and structuring of existing resources/organizations to realize sustainable achievement of the complex goals and objectives related to diversity, equity, inclusion, and intercultural
relations embedded in the Whitworth Vision 2021 Strategic Plan. The recent assessment, mapping, and
surveying of our diversity-related efforts have not only confirmed the validity of these concerns, but
have intensified them.

Questions Informed by and Responding to our Current Situation

The Assistant Dean for Intercultural Student Affairs (ADISA), the Intercultural Student Center
(ISC), and its predecessors were established over twenty years prior to the aforementioned diversity-
related developments. Since that time our global, national, regional, local, and ecclesial landscapes have
undergone dramatic changes. I will not elaborate on these changes in this space, but in light of the news
of Esther’s departure, I invite us to address several questions:

1. Is the current structure, largely created nearly two decades ago, sufficient to provide an optimal
delivery of services which best positions Whitworth to achieve the diversity-related outcomes
for its students, faculty, and staff?
2. Stated another way, is Whitworth making the most efficient use of current resources to advance
its strategic diversity-related goals and objectives?
3. Both the ADISA and ISC were created before the creation of the position of Assistant Vice
President of Diversity and Intercultural Relations. Should there be a structural and
administrative connection between these offices and would such connection better position
Whitworth to yield maximum benefits from existing financial and human resources with regard
to the achievement of diversity-related goals and objectives?
4. What can Whitworth learn from the most current research and best practices from other
colleges and universities in answering these questions?
5. What process of assessment/analysis has been employed to date which can help inform how we
answer these questions?

Consideration of the Strategic Value and Utility of Efficiency Reengineering

In light of these concerns, the findings and recommendations reported by Halualani & Associates, the increased attention to efficiency reengineering across the institution, and our resolve to
advance the core values and achieve our stated strategic goals and objectives, I am requesting that we
use the announcement of Esther’s departure as an opportunity to carefully reassess our current
organizational approach to advancing our commitment to diversity at Whitworth and to consider
making appropriate data-driven adjustments which will achieve more efficient use of existing resources.
My recommendation is informed by the findings and recommendations of our consultant as well as the
most recent set of recommended research-based best practices. It is important to point out here that
this is a recommendation the Institutional Diversity Committee (IDC) will make in its report to the
University Council in its final report on the assessment process. IDC has established a subcommittee to
advise us on this issue. The only reason I bring this recommendation forward now, out of context of the
IDC report, is the timing of Esther’s retirement.

Addressing this issue of developing a more efficient organizational structure to drive our
strategic diversity-related goals and objectives, Halualani & Associates reports the need for Whitworth
to develop,
...a key diversity organizational structure that is conducive to facilitating transformative change (4th order) around diversity and inclusion. By “key diversity organizational structure,” we refer to a comprehensive, multi-layered division or office led by your diversity leader (Assistant Vice President for Diversity & Intercultural Relations) that incorporates the following functions: a) visioning (“charting the path”) function: the proactive strategizing and planning for the future needs of making Whitworth University a highly engaged, inclusive, and productive climate around diversity and inclusion.\(^{38}\)

Halualani elaborates on both the challenges and potential negative consequences of failing to develop the kind of infrastructure which is more conducive to sustainable and high-impact diversity-related efforts. Again, they write,

This above delineated structure requires more than just 2-3 individuals; it will need to be “all hands on deck” with the strategic incorporation of related offices (multicultural center, support services for specific underrepresented groups, related roles, and positions). If not, the momentum driving the diversity work may diminish or cease altogether if it is centered around a few individuals who may move on from the university. Structures stand as more stable vehicles to bring about change and strategic efforts. Universities that are beginning their work in diversity and inclusion often commit to an unfolding organizational structure of at least 2 - 3 layers thick (with the diversity leader, support team, and key related offices and positions framed under the aforementioned functions) over two years. By incorporating key functions to a division that is dedicated to diversity and inclusion, greater credibility and valuation is afforded to that division so that it does not become perceived as a mere “nod” to diversity and inclusion [or an isolated unit that works on special case issues or circumstances (for e.g., discrimination, inequities, grievances)].\(^{39}\)

The development of a more robust and complex infrastructure to drive institutional diversity efforts has received increasing attention by higher education professionals in recent years. Regarding the efficacy of bringing together disconnected “diversity” offices within institutions, Damon Williams writes,

The immediate challenge presented by such a diverse array of services is how to ensure not only that they [detached offices] are integrated with other institutional resources in ways that are meaningful and lasting. One approach to accomplishing these goals is to develop a chief diversity officer that supports, evaluates, and strengthens these infrastructures. That said, creating a high-ranking role that has no staff, direct reporting units, or material resources contradicts the very premise of the structural framework of leadership. Furthermore, to help effect transformational change, this infrastructure must be broadly empowered within the administration hierarchy, have a host of


\(^{39}\) Ibid., 3.
leadership partners, and build on a foundation of resources, thus sending a formal and symbolic message that these efforts are a strategic priority.\textsuperscript{40}

In addition to my recommendation being informed by these sources, and perhaps more importantly, is my own lived experience at Whitworth, the expertise I bring to this work, and my commitment to Whitworth’s Christ-centered mission. My heart’s desire is for Whitworth to be successful in the development, implementation, assessment, and sustainability of high-impact diversity-related efforts that which assist students in developing crucial core intercultural competencies.

\textbf{Synergizing Diversity-Related Efforts in Domestic and Global Contexts}

The formation of an Office of Diversity, Inclusion, and Intercultural Relations is intended to bring together existing resources whose objectives are directly tied to assisting our students to develop the capacity to effectively communicate, engage, serve, and be served by persons from diverse communities in both domestic and global contexts. Given the constraints brought on by our current financial challenges, it may be helpful to imagine how optimal resourcing and organizational configuration would be necessary to achieve and sustain strategic interests in areas of diversity, equity, inclusion, and intercultural relations in a rapidly changing and increasingly diverse national and global landscape. The question becomes what would make Whitworth an attractive and preferred university for 21st century demographic realities in the northwest and beyond, and at the same time stay true, with unwavering resolve, to its Christ-centered mission.

The goal here is to bring siloed organizational entities under a common organizational and administrative umbrella. The idea here is NOT to conflate the efforts and education methodologies of these distinct yet related curricular and co-curricular efforts (domestic and global), but to create a structurally embedded approach that fosters synergistic and collaborative approach to student learning, and professional development for faculty and staff in the areas of diversity, equity, inclusion, and intercultural relations.

The creation of structures to assure greater synergy between a university’s domestic diversity and international educational effort is being recommended by the American Council on Education (ACE). In a recent study entitled \textit{At Home in the World: Bridging the Gap Between Internationalization and Multicultural Education}, ACE contends that “visible leadership and collaborative strategies that transcend the historical divide between internationalization and multicultural education are needed to ensure that students can live ethical, meaningful, and productive lives in an increasingly diverse and complex world.”\textsuperscript{41}

Bringing together disconnected institutional resources aimed at assisting students grow in their capacity to effectively engage 21st century world in a manner that “honors God, follows Christ, and services humanity” is the goal here. By “bringing together” we are not merely speaking of organizations being housed in common spaces, but creating the organizational structure that assures collaborative

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{40} Damon Williams, \textit{Strategic Diversity Leadership: Activating Change and Transformation in Higher Education.} (Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, 2013), 221.
\end{flushright}
planning, and shared assessment protocols that respond to their unique and common educational objectives related to the development of intercultural competencies. Again, ACE’s work in this area is instructive. They write,

Higher education structures and curricula reveal this same bifurcation of thinking about matters that share many points of commonality. In recent years, the vast majority of colleges and universities have introduced curricular programs and general education requirements that focus on the study of ethnic and cultural contrasts either within the United States or among groups around the globe. These studies are overseen by different groups of instructors, satisfied by different sets of courses, supplemented by different co-curricular functions, supported by different administrative structures, and generally treated as though neither their goals nor their underlying themes have anything in common. Though this divergence is readily explained by the different origins of these areas of study and the disparate motivations of both students and instructors in pursuing such study, their continuing separation from each other is a mistake. For the sake of better instruction and for the institutions’ own strategies and initiatives, the domestic and the global need to be in conversation with each other.42

Halualani & Associates invites Whitworth to consider how both reorganization and/or infrastructural development in the area of our diversity efforts can serve us well by creating enhanced curricular and co-curricular synergy and collaboration. Emphasizing this point, Halualani writes,

There were not many collaborations between campus divisions on issues of diversity (although it appears that campus divisions and offices work in alignment on university-wide diversity efforts). The aforementioned diversity organizational approach/strategy will help to actively facilitate and sediment these connections and linkages across campus. For example, more productive collaborations can occur between Academic Affairs and Student Life in terms of diversity engagement, diversity/intercultural leadership, global citizenship, and coalition building through curricular pathways, co-curricular and beyond the classroom activities and participation by Whitworth University students. A “diversity engagement bundle” can be shaped through these collaborations that incorporate specific curricular pathways (on the academic side) with concrete/demonstrative activities and roles (on the Student Life side). This type of integrated model could involve events, student organizations, peer roles, and course work as well as shared learning rubrics to gauge student performance and achievement on diversity and engagement scales.43

I, along with IDC, agree that such reorganization and infrastructural development position’s Whitworth for greater efficiencies of existing resources which will yield broader achievement of the development of intercultural competencies for all members of the Whitworth community.

**Intended Outcomes Resulting from a Reengineered Diversity Infrastructure**

42 Ibid., vi.
43 Halualani & Associates, 4
• Enhanced student learning in the areas intercultural competencies and cross cultural engagement (in domestic and global contexts) resulting from coordinated planning, training, and assessment.
• Coordinated pre-orientation and re-entry debriefing strategies for student learning and professional development in the areas of study abroad as well as domestic/local service-learning and community engagement experiences.
• Development of professional development and training opportunities for faculty and staff interested in leading and assessing Jan/May-term programs, and service-learning programs.
• Assisting students in strengthening member organizations of the Multicultural Advisory Council (MAC) with regard to their capacity to develop and implement programs, work collaboratively with other organizations, give leadership to campus-wide celebrations of nationally recognized history/heritage months, assess their efforts, and to achieve sustainable viability over time.
• Recruit and mentor student leaders organizations affiliated with MAC.
• Coordinate fall (kickoff) and spring semester (program evaluation and leadership handoff/new officer orientation) leadership retreats for offices of MAC organizations with direct staff involvement.
• Provide a support infrastructure, training, incentives, and measures of accountability for faculty and staff who serve as advisors for student organizations belonging to MAC.
• Develop strategies for honors-level learning opportunities for student leaders (Cultural Diversity Advocates, MAC leaders, Act Six Scholars, etc.) in the area of critiquing power and privilege, recognition and understanding of historical causes of persistent socioeconomic inequities and inequalities; and developing leadership skills for social change.
• Achieve a coordinated collaboration with local, regional, national, and international efforts and constituencies for the purpose of advancing strategic objectives that build student, faculty, and staff capacity to engage people who are culturally different.
• Coordinate efforts to cultivate local, regional, national, and international partnerships to support strategies to recruit and retain faculty, staff, and students from underrepresented racial/ethnic populations.
• Coordinate programing that would enhance Whitworth’s image as a regional, national, and global thought leader in addressing issues related to diversity, equity, inclusion, and intercultural relations.
• Enhanced resourcing of faculty efforts to develop and implement curriculum development and learning outcomes assessment efforts.
• Work with and support faculty to encourage and research in the areas of diversity, equity, inclusion, and intercultural competency.
• Prepare and submit grants to support a broad range of diversity efforts.
• Create mechanisms to encourage input, participation, synergy, and collaboration across the University.
• Expanded pre-orientation programing which responds to increase numbers of students underrepresented racial/ethnic and international populations.
• Develop structures for professional staff to assure shared planning, learning, and assessment.
• Design a structure that *assures sustained connectivity* to Student Life and Academic Affairs administrative staff for planning and assessment.

There is no question in my mind that our current infrastructure and the disconnected positioning of key diversity-related offices cannot achieve the strategic goals and objectives identified in the Vision 2021 Strategic Plan. In the spirit of listening carefully to the individual and collective wisdom of my cabinet colleagues, I invite you to share with me your reactions to what I’ve shared and recommended here. I also invite any thoughts you may have which support the position that our current resourcing and organizational structure represents the best and most efficient use of current resources to achieve our strategic objectives in this area.

Finally, what’s being recommended here is not unique nor is it an original thought. Colleges and universities of various types across the country have and continue to discover the need to develop more robust and complex infrastructure to advance, achieve, and sustain their diversity-related efforts. If invited to do so, I will be happy to provide both organizational possibilities for Whitworth as well as examples of what other institutions have done in this area.

Thank you in advance for your prayerful consideration of this recommendation!
F. Reorganization Organizational Chart

Includes positions/organizations with explicit/primary diversity-related responsibilities.

Office of Diversity, Inclusion and Equity detail.
G. Diversity Learning & Engagement (DELTA) Taxonomy

![Diversity Learning & Engagement Taxonomy diagram](image)

**Level 7 - Innovative Problem Solving**
Innovative thinking
Uses multiple perspectives to develop new, original, unique, impactful strategies & solutions to problematics
Relies on multiple heuristics (from all cultures, contexts, arenas of life)

**Level 6 - Social Agency & Action**
Designing Actions, Personal-Social Responsibility
Able to see connections across differences
Problem-solving, Responsive decision making
Constructive-Resistive (from the marginalized side)
Action, Advocacy, Allies,
Sharing with/Teaching Others

**Level 5 - Evaluation-Critique**
Evaluation/Critique of Power Differences, Positionality/
Compassion
Posing Complex Questions

**Level 4 - Advanced Analysis**
Perspective-Taking/Reflection/Analysis, Self-Other Dynamic
Personally invested in diversity
Unscripted/Off the Beaten Path
Free-flying among concepts, areas to ferret out the big, difficult questions and major problematics, stakes, urgencies

**Level 3 - Interaction**
Active involvement in Intercultural Interactions
Motivation, Seeking Out, Participating
Behavior

**Level 2 - Skills**
Application/Intercultural Competence/Skills-based

**Level 1 - Knowledge-Awareness**
Knowledge, Awareness, Appreciation
Touches on Social Approvability Level