
DIVERSITY ASPIRATIONS WORKING GROUP (DAWG)

CREATED: SEPTEMBER 2000

CHARGE: CHARGED BY DOUG BENNETT (AS FOUND AT <http://www.earlham.edu/~pres>)

MEMBERS: *LEN CLARK (PROVOST AND ACADEMIC DEAN) [CONVENOR]

*HOWARD LAMSON (PROFESSOR OF SPANISH)

*SHENITA PIPER (DIRECTOR OF MULTICULTURAL AFFAIRS)

*~~PHYLLIS BOANES~~ (PROFESSOR OF HISTORY AND AAS) [TECHNICALLY STOPPED GOING TO THE COMMITTEE]

*GEORGE NUÑEZ (ASSOCIATE DEAN OF STUDENT DEVELOPMENT)

KIRSTEN BOHL (ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT)

~~MARIA CHAN MORGAN~~ (PROFESSOR OF POLITICS) [ON SABATICAL]

BARBARA MERCER CULLIMORE (COMPUTER TECHNICIAN / ALUMNI DEVELOPMENT)

GAURI RAJBADYA

SARA THORP (STUDENT) [APPOINTED BY STUDENT GOVERNMENT]

KALANI SEU (STUDENT) [APPOINTED BY LEN CLARK VIA STUDENT GOVERNMENT]

MARK WHITAKER (STUDENT) [APPOINTED BY LEN CLARK (UNCLEAR IF THROUGH ESG)]

~~ROBERT POLLACK~~ (STUDENT) [JOINED JUST BY GOING TO THE COMMITTEE AND LEFT BECAUSE TOO MUCH WORK]

~~JENNY O'NEIL~~ (STUDENT) [JOINED AS A MEMBER OF STUDENT GOVERNMENT IN THE FALL OF '00-'01 (NOMINATING) AND LEFT BECAUSE TOO MUCH WORK]

*Appointed by Doug Bennett in his original charge

GOALS:

1. CONSULT BROADLY WITH MEMBERS OF EARLHAM COMMUNITY AND DRAFT A VISION STATEMENT (TO BE COMPLETED BY JANUARY 15)
2. USE VISION STATEMENT TO DRAFT A PLAN (HOPE TO BE COMPLETED BY END OF 2000-2001 SCHOOL YEAR)

SOME CONCERNS ABOUT THE COMMITTEE

History:

- Doug said that diversity, particularly race and ethnicity, has been an on-going problem at Earlham (and the nation). In fact, a committee nearly identical to this one was created about ten years ago. It created a plan and found that the plan was generally not followed.
 - [More research needed: get the plan, get the charge of the committee, who was on it?]
 - How is this approach stronger than in the past?

Charge:

- The charge lacks a focus on dealing with and paying attention to the internal diversity already present in the Earlham community. In focus groups, the conversation centered around how to get *more* diversity and didn't address how to create positive interactions between diverse groups in the Earlham community.
- Given the diverse opinions surrounding this issue, there is a danger that the committee's vision statement will be interpreted as a blanket statement covering all of Earlham's population.
- Asking questions such as "What is diversity" puts the level of discussion at a point where some minority groups may not actually feel invited.

Process:

- This committee did not merely come from Doug's recognition of diversity as an issue but out of the cry from, especially, minority students on campus.
- Doug assigned several original people to the committee (Len, Phyllis, Howard, George and Shenita, plus two students to be assigned by Student Government)
 - Why did he assign Len Clark to be the convenor?
 - Why these members of the community? (No explanation was given.)
- During second semester, Phyllis Boanes left the committee. Why did Phyllis leave the committee?
- Mark and Kalani were not nominated by student government to be on the committee (as Doug explained the *two* students would be); they were hand-picked and placed by Len Clark. Sara was placed by student government. (And Robert, a fourth student, was added just by going to meetings although he has since left due to time constraints.)
- Dipti attended *one* meeting with the committee and has subsequently been listed as a member in its publications though she is not a member and was not a member. She since asked to be removed from the list and was.
- The committee began meeting around October 2000. Doug asked the committee to finish stage one by January 15.
 - Why is it behind schedule?
 - Why the schedule? The schedule can be used as an excuse to push the process forward too fast.
- The committee has no decision-making power or inherent authority to enact its plan. If it is to address "how we have and have not made progress in the past" and has some hard answers, how do we know it will be taken seriously? (Especially given the *History*, see above.)
- The committee has no outside monitors watching the process (reports are filed to part of the GLCA but no specific involvement). Why not? The consultation has narrow goals and has specific questions that may be asked in such a way that specific (expected) answers are received. Outside monitors can help minimize this.

Membership of the committee:

- Sara is the only out queer person on the committee. How does it break-down in terms of race (4 white; 3 people of color; 3 other/unknown)? Economic class? Gender (6 men; 4 women)?
- At the beginning of last semester, Len said that the committee meetings were officially open to anyone but that he would prefer to know ahead of time who was coming.
- How do we understand internal power balances such as Len Clark as the only administrative faculty without a known job description or is it his role to decide who can come to meetings?
- With Len Clark, an administrator, as convenor, it does mean the administration has some buy-in in this process and is taking it seriously.