

WILLIAMS COLLEGE

DIVERSITY INITIATIVES

SELF STUDY

APRIL 2005

CONTENTS

Introduction	Page 3
Student Input	7
Student Recruitment and Admission	11
Student Experiences	14
Student Support Services	19
Special Academic Programs	19
International Students	24
Students with Disabilities	26
Campus Life and Student Activities	27
Student Residential and Social Life	29
Multicultural Center	30
Campus Safety and Security	37
Health Center & Psychological Counseling Center	39
Religious Life and Community Service	41
Career Counseling	45
Curriculum	47
Faculty Recruitment	50
Faculty Retention	55
Faculty Satisfaction	64
Staff	67
Alumni	69
Orientation and Ongoing Education	75
College Procedures	82
Conclusion	85
Appendices	87
Data Tables	102

INTRODUCTION

The most significant change in higher education during our time may be its increasing inclusion of students, faculty, and staff from groups that had previously been excluded from its campuses. By opening themselves up in this way, colleges and universities have played a leading role in the dramatic expansion of opportunity in America.

Williams has played its part in this historic movement. Within living memory, the College's students were assembled almost completely from a small segment of the U.S. population. Today almost a third of each entering class comprise U.S. students of color and another 6 percent are international. Half are women. U.S. students come from across the country. Financial aid policies make the College affordable to families from all levels of income. We have diminished barriers to students of different sexual orientations. We have grown increasingly able to accommodate students with physical and learning disabilities. We also have broadened the faculty and staff along similar lines, though without yet attaining the same degree of representation.

The College's mission to provide the highest quality liberal arts education is enhanced by the rich variety of backgrounds and experiences that students, faculty, and staff bring to the task of educating each other. Cultivating this diversity and maximizing its educational benefit represent important work for the College. To neglect it would be to fail our students, ourselves, and the increasingly diverse society our students graduate from here to serve.

As is true of society in general, Williams has done well in diversifying itself in some ways but not in others. This Self Study focuses on the latter.

For all the progress Williams has made in becoming more open and supportive, the case remains that some people, because of factors intrinsic to them, are excluded from the College or have less full and satisfying experiences here.

Greater awareness of this fact, resulting from the compelling testimony of current and former members of the campus community and from analysis of data on student demographics and student experiences, led to the launching at the beginning of this academic year of the Diversity Initiatives.

The goal of the Initiatives has been to generate ideas about steps the College could take to ensure that all types of students, faculty, and staff can thrive here. To achieve this goal we established a procedure that combined aspects of the strategic planning process the College conducted in 2000-01 with those of reaccreditation. The Initiatives process was to be

- the work of the whole College, not just a section of it
- action-oriented
- presented first in the form of a self study, and

- critiqued by people outside the College with experience of these issues.

As with the College's strategic planning, this effort has been coordinated by a committee chaired by the President and comprising the heads of faculty, staff, and student governance groups, which were the entities that did the work. (Membership of the Coordinating Committee is listed in Appendix A.)

To solicit input, the President has spoken about the Initiatives in numerous meetings with faculty, students, and staff and with gatherings of alumni on campus, across the country, and abroad. Input also could be provided through the Initiatives Web site (www.williams.edu/go/diversity/) by anyone with a Williams network account. This includes alumni and parents.

We set an ambitious goal of producing a Self Study in time for visitors' response in May 2005. We will produce this fall a report that will incorporate the visitors' critiques and a prioritized list of actions. We set this rapid schedule to hold our feet to the fire while acknowledging that in some areas further analysis would be needed to make suitably informed recommendations, that some outside visitors would be unable to take part until next academic year, and that work of this complexity and importance would need to carry on well into the future.

While the process has unfolded, the College has not waited to act. Beginning last fall, a number of developments have occurred that advance diversity issues. These include:

- Changes in financial aid policies that further increase the size of scholarship grants and reduce loans for low-income families, in some cases to zero. (Details in Appendix B.)
- Significant new efforts in the admission process to attract low-income students, which have already shown results. (Details in the chapter on "Student Recruitment and Admission" and in Appendix C.)
- One of the most successful years in the College's history in the appointment of faculty of color. Of 18 appointments made so far, six are U.S. minorities and two are foreign born (one in Lebanon and one in Romania), with the possibility still of the appointment of one more U.S. minority. New appointments include a new tenure-track position in Asian-American Studies and an additional tenure-track position in Latino/a Studies.
- Addition to the International Studies Program of a specialization in South and Southeast Asia.
- Addition of an introductory course and capstone course to the concentration in African-American Studies.

- Development so far of around two-dozen new courses that address diversity issues.
- Receipt of grants from the Howard Hughes Medical Institute and National Institutes of Health to conduct national symposia on ways to increase diversity among undergraduate students in the sciences.
- Development of a proposed new residential house system, one of the many effects of which will be expanded interactions among students of varied backgrounds and interests. (See chapter on “Student Residential and Social Life.”)
- Reorganization of the Dean’s Office to include the reconfiguring of two positions: one will now support international students and underrepresented minorities and the other will support low-income students.
- Advertising for a Director for the proposed Academic Resource Center.
- Expansion of the Lissack Forums as a medium for drawing ongoing attention to diversity issues. (page 79)
- Expansion of kosher and halaal dining options for students.

Some of these steps are dramatic; all of them should contribute to making the campus more diverse and to enhancing the academic and social experiences of students of diverse students.

The term “diversity” means different things to different people, as has been pointed out by several contributors to the Diversity Web site. We chose for the purpose of this exercise to consider diversity as it applied to members of groups that historically have been underrepresented at Williams and to see which issues the College community raised. Though unstated at the beginning of the process, we intended to focus on groups that had been excluded because of characteristics, such as their race or gender, that are intrinsic to them. In the many and varied discussions over these months, in person and on the Web site, the groups most discussed have been those defined by race or ethnicity. These were followed in frequency by those defined by class or income and by religion. Issues of gender and of sexual orientation have been raised, though not as much as we had expected. We do not know why these issues did not arise more often. We do not conclude that there are no such issues on campus. Statistical analysis of student experiences by sexual orientation is impeded by not knowing the orientations of individual students. This Self Study does raise some matters of gender and of sexual orientation, and the College will certainly need to continue to focus more research and action on such issues going forward.

Several submissions to the Web site raised issues regarding the political beliefs of faculty. These echo concerns expressed more publicly about college faculties in general,

usually in terms of suspected proselytizing to students. These submissions failed to gain traction through the Initiatives process, perhaps because few people, if any, on campus believe such proselytizing takes place, and because one's political views are considered to be a characteristic that is acquired rather than intrinsic.

The Self Study emphasizes academics. This is appropriate since Williams is primarily an academic institution and progress on diversity issues will best be measured by how fully members of historically underrepresented groups thrive here intellectually. A great deal of learning also takes place outside the curriculum, however, so greater success in those areas is also a priority.

How, then, will we measure progress? The Provost has led an effort to assemble a series of measures of how different groups fare here inside and outside the classroom. (See chapter on "Student Experiences.") We also have measures of satisfaction with various aspects of the Williams experience as reported by graduating seniors and alumni. These, along with other measures that may still be devised, are proposed as our measuring sticks over time. Our goal is to reach the point at which the experience of students from all historically underrepresented groups mirrors that of students in general. For that to happen, we will need also to improve our record in the recruitment and retention of faculty and staff from these groups. To put it more generally, we want to move toward the day in which every Williams student, faculty, and staff member can feel that this is their college, not a college for others to which they've been invited. We have not reached that day yet, but we will.

Measurements of student achievement or experience raise complicated issues of confidentiality. We live in a world in which increasingly refined statistical analysis is possible and increasing public reporting is expected. We also live, however, in a community that has long placed great value on protecting the privacy of individuals and of small groups of its members. Balancing these concerns takes considerable thought. For the Diversity Initiatives, various groups have discussed which data should be published to increase public understanding of the issues and which should be shared only with policy makers to ensure privacy.

As befits a Self Study of diversity, this document is made up of a series of studies conducted by various groups and written in a variety of voices.

The tables and appendices appear after the text. We asked each group to make recommendations for action and/or further study. Those have been gathered in Appendix F.

Our thanks go to all who have contributed to this important, dynamic, and ongoing process.

Principal Author: Morty Schapiro, President of the College

STUDENT INPUT SOLICITED BY COLLEGE COUNCIL AND THE MINORITY COALITION

College Council

College Council (CC) is the student government organization and the directing force of student activities. Its members are elected to represent each residential house, the first-year class, and the student body at large. CC is the forum of the student body through which concerns may be addressed and changes made around campus. Discussions of the Diversity Initiatives occurred over three CC meetings, the first focusing on First Days and Orientation, the second on student activities, and the third on student life.

Minority Coalition

In response to a call from the College's minority community for a stronger and more unified voice against prejudice and prejudicial discrimination, the Minority Coalition (MinCo) was formed in April 1990. MinCo currently is a student governance organization that facilitates the political and social interactions among 15 minority organizations and the campus at large. To this end we focus primarily on advocacy and funding in order to construct a stronger community that is more aware of minority concerns. MinCo works primarily in conjunction with the Multicultural Center (MCC).

MinCo activities vary from year to year depending on its leadership. This past year there was a greater move toward three areas: increasing internal cohesion among MinCo groups; bridging gaps between faculty, staff and students; and strengthening the College's curriculum and faculty retention initiatives. We invited the CEP and CUL chairs to begin conversations regarding curriculum and residential life. These events triggered an enthusiasm towards change that guided a large part of the semester.

Student Input for Diversity Initiatives

These recommendations are primarily a result of separate discussions on campus hosted by either MinCo or College Council. They are not absolute, rather places to start or continue evaluating diversity at Williams.

Student Residential and Social Life

- The recently recommended cluster house system cannot be seen as the sole solution to addressing the concerns of social and residential life at Williams. A clearly outlined description of the support networks that will be in place along with such a change to residential life must be drafted along with the proposal. Specific concerns among students have been a lack of peer support for upperclassmen within their residences.

- As a primary resource for both Junior Advisors (JAs) and activities coordinators on campus, the staff of the Campus Life Office should receive diversity training. The Director and Assistant Director of Campus Life should be able to lead similar training for their own staff (CLCs, HCs, and Office Assistants) with diversity workshops tailored to the makeup and goals of the College. This would reduce the burden on the MCC, Chaplains' Office, and Health Center to provide such training and free them to act more as general resources for campus.
- Maintaining the involvement of at least one of the Community Life Coordinators (CLC) with the MCC and MinCo has indispensable benefits. This liaison to the Campus Life Office assists MinCo with vital administrative functions and is an active participant in various minority organizations. In the three years that this position has existed, the presence and energy of a young professional associated with MinCo has had a significant impact. The CLC acts as a mentor, administrator, and advocate.
- The continued dissatisfaction among several students of color with the effectiveness of counseling received from the Health Center is a point of concern. Calls continue to go out from many students of color to have a *full-time* psychological counselor with cultural competency. Some students of color view the hiring of a counselor in 2004 as a failed opportunity to appoint such a counselor. We hope, in spite of this setback, that such a hire will be strenuously pursued in the future. The limitations of a homogenous hiring pool work against meeting this end. We strongly encourage the College to provide the kind of incentive, be it a full-time position, in order to get the adequate staff.
- The departure of Dean Norma Lopez and the pending departure of Dean Amy Pettengill Fahnestock leave a void in the support system given in the Dean's Office to international students and many students of color. While our other Deans function ably in assisting minorities, the overall efficacy of the support structure of the Dean's Office will be greatly improved once Deans are hired to fill these vacancies.
- Some students have recommended having more kosher food options. While the idea of making Driscoll Dining Hall a kosher/halaal facility was raised, there was some concern that this would result in the Berkshire Quad becoming a "Jew Quad." Another suggestion was to place a kosher/halaal cart in the new student center and expand this to other dining halls if it is successful. It was also recommended that the Admission Office look at the degree to which decisions by Jewish/Islamic students to attend Williams are influenced by kosher/halaal provisions.
- Except for select blockbuster events, such as the Indian Dinner and Queer Bash, MinCo groups are plagued by poor attendance by the general campus at their sponsored activities. They note that although such parties, lectures, and dinners are open to all, usually only group members attend.

- Although the College does have grievance procedures in place, many students are unaware of what steps to take when they have experienced a negative incident. Yet more clearly advertising the procedures is just a start. To respond most effectively to incidents, there should be a strong support network that students can turn to in these situations, including JAs and professors trained to be sensitive to issues of diversity.

Academics

- Students have productively engaged with the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) this year in a way that has proven fruitful for understanding diversity in the curriculum. To this end we are grateful for the improvements in the diversity of new curricular offerings. We already have some professors who have experience in culturally specific fields within their departments and we ask that they and others be encouraged to offer courses. This is one way to begin to improve the efficacy of the Peoples and Cultures component of the curriculum. We learned a lot from that experience and expect that this continued openness will persist as a way of furthering the College's goals of diversifying the curriculum.
- The Summer Science (SS) and Summer Humanities and Social Sciences (SHSS) programs serve as positive networks for academic support and achievement. There are a lot of misconceptions regarding their intent and place in academic life among students. Likewise, there are varied arguments of concern and support for the programs as pre-orientation programs and their effects on the social integration of freshman. Given the strong concern for the lack of systematic counseling and advising, particularly for upperclassmen, summer programs play a very important role in the academic success and achievement of underprivileged minorities.
- We recognize the great benefit that the proposed Academic Resource Center represents for all students. Great consideration must be given to averting any negative stigma that may be attached to those who desire using this source of academic support at an institution of such academic prestige. In the same vein, particular attention must be paid to advertising for the director of the center. We would strongly recommend there be students on the hiring search committee for this position because the nature of the center would require great involvement of students working as teaching assistants (TAs), tutors, or mentors. He or she must not only come equipped with a knowledge of the best methods in delivering academic support, but must also be sensitive to the potential forces that could dissuade some students from taking advantage of the center's resources.
- The attraction and retention of faculty of color is a particular concern for students. We recognize the administration's challenge in attracting and retaining faculty of color in an institution that is neither located in an urban setting nor has the benefit

of being a large research university. Though the College has made strides in hiring more minority faculty, its efforts need to be continued and intensified because diversity of faculty should be a direct reflection of the diversity seen among the student body. Departments should also be enthusiastic about the recruitment of diverse faculty in order to stay abreast with the goal of diversifying the College as a collective community.

- A lack of tolerance of diversity of thought in the classroom setting is an area of concern for some students. Many students expressed a wish that professors presented "both sides" more evenly, particularly in terms of liberal vs. conservative political views. Along with this, some people expressed resentment at being looked to as a "classroom spokesman" when the discussion involves something related to their own particular ethnicity, religion, political views, etc.

Orientation and Ongoing Education

- A group of students expressed an alarming lack of awareness among the Williams community on issues regarding sexual orientation, gender, and sexuality. This issue is of utmost concern, as it does not always receive much attention. Encouraging the Admission Office to seek appropriate channels for recruitment, as was seen in the office's most recent effort with students from low-income families, is a place to begin. Likewise, a simple change in the Williams application, making it gender non-specific, would be a small step toward making the College open to transgendered prospective students.
- To espouse appropriate support for queer students at Williams, students have asked to reconsider the position of MCC Assistant Director and Coordinator for Queer Issues as two separate positions. As such, broader efforts to educate the campus on such differences could be achieved outside what the Queer Student Union already does. This position, viewed as an Assistant Dean position, would help perform a much-needed evaluation on the status of queer life at Williams. From such a process, we will realize that "gender identity and gender expression" is not included in the College's non-discrimination policy, something we need our administration to notice and act on.
- Great concern has arisen from the marginality of gender and sexuality issues in the Diversity Initiatives. This is mostly apparent in the structure of the report, which fails to see these issues across staff, faculty, and students. One expressed concern was the exclusion of the MCC Assistant Director and Coordinator for Queer Issues. There may be several reasons for this, however it serves to prove why it is important that this position be separated into two, especially as the College enters the next reaccreditation process. Evaluating such a position may mean raising questions regarding the administrative frameworks of the Dean's Office, the MCC, and the Campus Life and Student Activities offices.

- Williams has come a long way with its diversity initiatives, however, the community building activities for freshmen during First Days still do not speak to this drastic change. The Class of 2008 represents the changing makeup of the student body, with the class breakdown being 11 percent Asian Americans, 11 percent African Americans, 8 percent Latino/as, with another 6 percent non-U.S. citizens. Precise diversity training for student leaders of all First Days activities is crucial for effecting a positive orientation experience for all students. A suggestion is to incorporate statistics on the gender, sexual orientation, racial, religious, and socio-economic diversity of an accepted class in workshops for their JAs.
- While First Days events, such as the diversity speaker, camping trips, and the SS and SHSS programs, are intended to initiate communication and inspire unity, many felt that they were divisive and encouraged an unproductive emphasis on differences between students. As such, the nature, purpose, and impacts of these events should be explored and re-evaluated.
- Other suggestions simply sought more creative and provocative ways of discussing issues of diversity and sexuality for the community at large. MinCo groups, as interested members of campus, expressed interest in learning about more methods for enacting, debating, or facilitating such events or discussions. This year the Lissack Forum proved to be a productive and meaningful means for discussing issues of diversity pertinent to Williams. Initiatives like this, coming from different bodies on campus, are effective.
- There was a serious debate among students regarding the value of having Windows on Williams (WOW) as part of a pre-orientation program. Given the strong hesitation from the administration to keep it from being a pre-orientation program, where it would not conflict with other mid-orientation programs, the option of having it as a mid-orientation program is one that was encouraging for past participants of the program because it comes close to offering the kind of community building that was originally intended.
- Diversity education must be ongoing and not simply during First Days. Educational opportunities and discussions should be available and encouraged throughout a student's four years.

STUDENT RECRUITMENT AND ADMISSION

Background

Student diversity at Williams has primarily taken the form of men and women from all segments of American society—ethnic, racial, and socio-economic—and increasingly also from countries beyond the United States. Over the last several decades, the College has

intentionally increased the diversity of the student body through its admission policies. (For the racial makeup of the student body over time see Table 1.) One purpose has been to educate students from different backgrounds who will then provide leadership for the varied segments of American society. The College also holds firmly the belief that all students benefit more from studying at a residential college with students from varied backgrounds than in a more homogeneous setting. By expanding access, the College can make the largest contribution to society.

Studies show that academically strong prospective students are drawn to diverse campus communities. These studies include surveys of students admitted to Williams, in which one of the attributes they most often check as describing themselves is “values diversity.”

Current admission and financial aid policies are based in large part on the policies proposed in the report of the 1984 Financial Aid Task Force, appointed by then President John Chandler and chaired by then Provost Steve Lewis. This report and its recommendations were endorsed by the College community, including the faculty and the Board of Trustees. The Financial Aid Task Force evolved into the Advisory Group on Admission and Financial Aid (AGAFA), which continues to oversee admission and financial aid policy. Chaired by the provost, AGAFA includes the directors of admission and financial aid; other administrators, including the Dean of the College; and four faculty members.

AGAFA and the Board of Trustees, in reassessing admission and financial aid policies about every five years, have reaffirmed the goals established in the mid-1980s, with minor changes. In 2002, the Board approved the reduction of loan burdens for all financial aid students, particularly those from the lowest-income families. More recently, loans were reduced even further, eliminating them entirely for the lowest-income families. (Details in Appendix B.) Need-blind admission for international students was instituted beginning with the Class of 2006.

In concert with policy adjustments over the past five years, the Admission Office has significantly stepped up recruiting efforts to enhance both the domestic and international diversity of the College. The number of prospective students brought to campus for multicultural visitation programs each summer, fall, and spring has more than quadrupled since 1999. Some can travel here by bus but most are flown in at the College’s expense. The recently initiated Parent Program, which subsidizes the travel and overnight visit of parents of admitted students of low-income backgrounds from the New York City area, has proved especially successful. For Previews for students admitted to the Class of 2009, the Parent Program has been extended to low-income parents from the Chicago area.

Overseas recruitment has also intensified. Prior to 2000, there had been very little international travel by admission staff. Recently, however, two admission staff members have traveled abroad each fall, one to Asia and one to Europe, thanks, in part, to a grant from the Davis Foundation. Primarily due to an overwhelmingly positive response to the

new need-blind policy, applications from non-U.S. citizens have more than doubled in three years.

The results of these recruitment and yield efforts are evident in the composition of the most recent entering classes. Through the mid-90s, roughly 23 percent of the student body was American students of color; that number now approaches 30 percent. In that 10-year period, international student numbers have doubled. The Class of 2008 includes among its 537 members 57 Asian Americans (11 percent), 55 African Americans (11 percent), and 44 Latinos (8 percent). Another 6 percent are non-U.S. citizens—32 students from 20 different foreign countries. Forty-five percent receive need-based aid from the College.

While these figures are encouraging, recent research by Williams economists Gordon Winston and Cappy Hill reveals that Williams, like many other highly selective colleges and universities, could do a better job of including the most under-resourced and under-served students in the nation. Only about 10 percent of our students come from families in the lowest two quintiles of the national income distribution, while more than 70 percent come from the highest quintile.

In response to this disturbing revelation, the Admission Office has undertaken several initiatives, beginning in the 2004-05 admission cycle, to identify and recruit more high-ability, low-income applicants:

- Geo-demographic data provided by the College Board through its Descriptor Plus service made it possible to target students from low-income “neighborhood clusters.” Students so identified received specially tailored letters emphasizing affordability and financial aid opportunities.
- Respondents to the low-income search have been invited to attend summer or fall multicultural programs. Those who showed interest but who were not able to attend were offered application fee waivers.
- Low-income search response data have also helped to identify high schools with pockets of high-ability, low-income students. Each admission officer has devoted more fall travel in each region to under-resourced high schools.
- Partnering with QuestBridge, a program created to establish a link between higher education and highly motivated, academically talented low-income and underserved youth in the United States, has proved very successful. (For an explanation of QuestBridge and the College Match program see Appendix C.)

While final results are not in for the Class of 2009 (as of this writing), early indications suggest that these initiatives targeted at low-income prospective students have been effective. The number of applicants requesting a fee waiver increased nearly threefold, and the number of admitted applicants identified as first-generation college students increased to 178 from 138 last year. The Admission Office is optimistic that its

continuing efforts, including those recommended below, will translate to a much more socio-economically balanced student body in the foreseeable future.

Next Steps

- Study the reliability of geo-demographic data provided by the College Board Descriptor Plus Service. If we plan to continue to use this data to identify low-income prospects, we need to be more confident of its accuracy.
- Lobby the College Board for access to self-reported income data to simplify identification of low-income prospects. Currently the College Board withholds this information.
- Explore ways to communicate effectively the message of affordability and financial aid opportunities to prospective students and their families. This would include experimenting with the text of first-contact Search and respondent follow-up letters.
- Work closely with QuestBridge to obtain files in June rather than September to identify possible Quest Match Scholars for summer and fall campus visitation programs.
- Continue to expand our contacts with local, regional, and national organizations committed to helping low-income students gain access to higher education.

Principal Author: Dick Nesbitt, Director of Admission

STUDENT EXPERIENCES

This chapter discusses data on student experiences at Williams, which show that, while those experiences share much in common, they differ considerably by race and somewhat by socio-economic status and by sex.

The data (displayed in Tables 1-31) were derived mostly from student surveys and College records that provide snapshots of the student body taken at several points in recent years.

As discussed in the “Introduction,” we are balancing in this report the value of presenting as full a picture as possible of these matters with the value of honoring the confidentiality of small groups within our campus community.

We will summarize here significant differences in the experiences of groups of students in four categories (academic, support services, extracurricular and social life, and overall), make some observations about those differences, and suggest some next steps.

The numbers in parentheses refer to the relevant tables found at the back of the Self Study.

Academic

The graduation rates for African Americans and Latino/as are slightly lower than for Whites and Asians (3) but knowing this by itself doesn't tell us much.

Groups of students major in different fields on average (4). Division I has more Asian Americans, Latino/as, and women. Division II has more international students, African Americans, and students designated by the Admission Office as having lower socio-economic status. Division II has fewer Asian Americans. Division III has more international students and fewer Latino/as, African Americans, and women.

Latino/as and African Americans double major (7) more than average, and international students much more than average. Low-income African Americans double major at a much higher rate than other African Americans (8), a finding not seen in any other racial group.

African Americans take tutorials and do theses at a lower rate than would be expected given their representation in the student body (9).

Women, international students, and Latino/as are more likely than others to study away (14).

African Americans and Latino/as are less likely to be TAs; international students are more likely than would be expected given their representation in the student body (15).

International students, Latino/as, African Americans, Asian Americans, and socio-ec students, are more likely than Whites to win Williams scholarships and fellowships (16). (These are separate from the College's need-based financial aid.) International students and socio-ec students are much more likely to win other Williams awards and prizes—those usually awarded on Class Day.

African Americans and Asian Americans are less likely to report participating often in class discussions (19).

In terms of post-graduation academic experience, Williams ranks 10th among 31 highly selective colleges and universities in the percent of recent graduates who have earned PhDs; the rank for our African Americans is 24th (31).

Support Services

As a source of advice on academic courses, African Americans are three times more likely than Whites to list academic deans. As a source of advice on academic goals, African Americans are more likely to list academic deans and students on residential life staff. Asians are less likely than others to list parents as a source of advice about academic goals (20).

African Americans are more likely to experience a Williams-supported internship than would be expected given their representation in the student body (11).

African Americans and Asian Americans make more use of the Office of Career Counseling. Whites are less satisfied with OCC services than other groups (25).

Extracurricular and Social Life

International students, Asian Americans, Latino/as, African Americans, and socio-ec students are all underrepresented among varsity athletes (10).

African Americans and Asian Americans are more likely than others to be JAs. African Americans and socio-ec students are more likely than others to be HCs (12).

Men, African Americans, Asian Americans, and international students are more likely to serve on College committees. Men are much more likely to serve on College Council; international students, Latino/as, and African Americans are also more likely (13).

African Americans and Latino/as are more likely to participate in art exhibitions or theatre productions (19).

African Americans and Asian Americans report drinking very considerably less than do others (23).

Students of color are roughly twice as likely as Whites to have attended a meeting on racial or cultural awareness during the year (24).

Students of color are also more likely to have attended a meeting on financial planning (24). African Americans did so at three times the rate for Whites.

Overall

Students of color are more likely than Whites to feel that the financial impact of college on their families is considerable or severe. African Americans and Latino/as are twice as likely as Whites to anticipate borrowing \$2,000 or more for the year (18).

Asian Americans are less likely than others to have questioned their political beliefs or values at Williams. African Americans are more likely than others to have questioned their religious beliefs. African Americans and Latino/as are more likely to have questioned their moral or ethical values (26).

Students of color are more likely than Whites to have questioned their beliefs about a racial or ethnic group other than their own and their beliefs about people with a sexual orientation other than their own (27).

In the 2002 national elections, students of color voted at much lower rates than Whites—African Americans at less than one third the rate of Whites. African Americans are less than half as likely as other groups to identify themselves as conservative or far right (28).

In terms of overall satisfaction with their Williams experience, African Americans and Asian Americans are less likely than Latino/as and Whites to rate that experience as excellent (2). Still, 42 percent of African Americans rate their Williams experience as “Excellent.” When asked if they would definitely choose to attend Williams again, 64 percent of Latino/as say yes, compared with 57 percent of Whites, 52 percent of African Americans, and 47 percent of Asians.

Observations

The compilation of these statistical observations may describe no single student but it shows patterns that are important for the College to understand when setting policies and procedures.

The data presented here show only a few differences in the experiences of men and women. Women are more likely to major in Division I and to study away; men are more likely to serve on College committees and on College Council. (Men are also more likely to be varsity athletes but that is attributable almost completely to the existence of football.)

Students given the socio-ec attribute in the admissions process are less likely to be varsity athletes and more likely to major in Division II and to win Williams-based scholarships, fellowships, and other prizes.

International students are less likely to be varsity athletes and more likely to major in Divisions II and III, double major, study away, serve as a TA, win Williams-based scholarships and fellowships, win other Williams prizes, and serve on College committees and College Council.

The number of differences is greater for racial groups. For instance, Asian American students are high in the rates at which they major in Division I, win Williams-based scholarships and fellowships, use and value OCC, serve as JAs and HCs, serve on

College committees, work on racial/ethnic awareness, and question their beliefs about another racial or ethnic group or people with a different sexual orientation. They are low in the rates at which they major in Division II, participate often in class discussion, use parents as a source for setting academic goals, play varsity sports, drink, question their political values, vote in the national election, rate their Williams experience excellent, and say they would choose Williams again.

Latino/as are high in the rates at which they major in Division I, double major, study away, win Williams-based scholarships and fellowships, use and value OCC, participate in art or theatre, work on racial/ethnic awareness, work on financial planning, feel the impact of college costs on their families, incur college debt, and question their political and moral values and their beliefs about other racial or ethnic groups and people with a different sexual orientation. They are low in the rates at which they major in Division III, serve as TA, and play varsity sports.

African Americans show the greatest differences. They benefit less than their student colleagues from the College's academic offerings—majoring less in Division III, taking fewer tutorials and doing fewer theses, participating less often in class discussions, serving less as TAs, and obtaining PhDs at a lower rate. They seek academic guidance more than other students, a finding relevant to discussions of the mentoring burden felt by faculty of color (page 65). At the same time, they take on the added academic challenge of double majoring, with low-income African American students doing so the most. They are more engaged than others in such extracurricular activities as art, theatre, and dance; serving on College committees and College Council; and working on racial/ethnic awareness. They earn Williams internships, scholarships, fellowships, and other prizes at a high rate. Their experiences outside the classroom differ from the rest of the student body in other ways. For instance fewer of them play varsity sports and they drink much less. At the same time they more often, while at Williams, question their values and beliefs. Their sense of academic and social separateness seems compounded by financial concerns. They feel more acutely the financial impact of their education on their families and are more concerned with financial planning and more often report taking on education loans. They use and value OCC more. All told, it's perhaps not surprising that fewer of them consider their Williams experience excellent and fewer believe they would choose Williams again.

All of these snapshots by group raise issues for the College to act on or to understand further and then act on. All groups at Williams needn't have identical experiences but the College needs to serve all its students. We admitted them because we wanted them as part of our community of learning. We need, therefore, to do all we can to see that they thrive here. As primarily an academic institution, we should focus our greatest attention on supporting them academically. As noted in the "Introduction," we have already taken steps this year to do so. These include adding diversity to the faculty and curriculum, reorganizing support services, and reducing (in some cases to zero) the debt burden for students from families with low incomes. Experience and these data indicate that more will be required of us to reach the goal of having students from all groups feel similarly that this is their college.

Next Steps

- Create a subset of these data to use as measures of progress toward improving the experiences of historically underrepresented groups at Williams. Policy making bodies should review those data regularly and report them publicly as appropriate.
- Create a more sophisticated system for the early detection of students who may become academically at risk and for more actively providing them with support.
- Continue to look for opportunities to reduce financial pressures on students from low-income families.

Principal Authors: Cappy Hill, Provost, and Nancy Roseman, Dean of the College

STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES

The Office of the Dean of the College coordinates certain academic efforts, such as first-year advising, study abroad, and academic standing as well as non-curricular aspects of undergraduate life. Reports on selected areas of student services follow. An exception is the report from the faculty-student Committee on Undergraduate Life (CUL), which is not part of the Dean's Office. The CUL's report, "Student Residential and Social Life," is included here because of its relevance to other aspects of student life outside the classroom.

SPECIAL ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

Background and Process

Discussion of this topic took place among, and information was gathered from, various individuals and groups concerned with academic success: the deans; the Multicultural Center (MCC) staff; the Summer Humanities and Social Sciences faculty and staff; the MCC reading group on retention of minority students in the sciences; and the Committee on Diversity and Community (CDC), which this semester has looked at race and ethnicity in relation to the academic choices students make.

The general questions guiding these discussions were: Is there sufficient academic support for all students at Williams? Are all students equally benefiting from these services/programs? If not, why? Are students from certain backgrounds discouraged

from pursuing certain majors and academic experiences, and, if so, what should we be doing to encourage all students to avail themselves of all of the College's offerings? Is the College doing everything it can to ensure the high achievement of all students? If not, what more should we be doing?

Surveys show discrepancies by race/ethnicity in the levels of satisfaction with various academic services at the College and in rates of participation in such academic activities as tutorials, independent studies, honors theses, and TA-ing (See chapter on "Student Experiences.>"). These data suggest that perhaps the College could be doing more in terms of academic support. This is not a new idea, and, in fact, the Dean of the College has made plans for the new student center to include an Academic Resource Center, and she intends to hire its director by fall 2005.

Currently, through the Office of the Dean of the College, Williams offers the following forms of academic support, each of which is described briefly and, to some extent, in relation to diversity issues.

First-year advising, arranged by the Dean's Office for all incoming students, focuses on course selection. All faculty and certain self-selected administrative staff members serve as advisors and meet with their advisees prior to registration for each semester.

Experiences with advising seem to vary, but, according to the Senior Survey, few students are very satisfied with "academic advising before declaring a major" (about 8 percent in 2002). After the first year, there is no formal advising until students select their major, and then each department handles advising differently. The lack of advising for sophomores has been acknowledged to be a problem.

Students on **academic probation** are required to meet regularly (at least four times during the semester) with a dean for academic counseling, and those who receive **first-year warnings** are required to meet with a dean once (their advisors are also notified).

The **Writing Workshop** provides drop-in and scheduled assistance with papers Sunday through Thursday evenings. The tutors are trained sophomores, juniors, and seniors. In addition to the drop-in centers, professors can request that a tutor be assigned to their classes for the entire semester, and students can sign up for sustained help from one tutor during the course of a semester. The director reports that the workshop is well attended by students of all backgrounds. He makes a special effort in the nomination process to recruit tutors of color.

The **Math and Science Resource Center** provides drop-in tutoring Sunday through Thursday evenings for introductory math and science courses. Attendance is tracked on a simple tally sheet and varies widely from course to course and night to night. The number of tutors from underrepresented groups is small (typically less than 10 percent). The Chemistry Department has been particularly helpful in recommending tutors of color, often former Summer Science students.

The **Dean's Office** offers individual **peer tutoring** across disciplines. Departments nominate tutors for the specific classes in which they believe such help will be needed—generally the introductory ones. Not all departments participate, and not all students nominated choose to tutor. This year, tutoring is available for courses in 16 departments or programs, and approximately 80 students are serving as tutors. Usage is not tracked, other than for payroll purposes. Based upon observation of tutors at training meetings, the overseeing dean reports that a disproportionately small number of the tutors are of color.

Academic Survival Workshops are offered each fall by the Office of Special Academic Programs and the Senior Advisors. Senior Advisors are nominated by each department and program to advise students on course selection and majors. As part of their efforts, they hold a course fair each semester. The workshops are informal and address time management, class participation, and preparation for finals. Held in Hardy House, part of the MCC, they serve a small number of students (typically 10 to 20 per session), which includes a high percentage of students of color.

Windows on Williams (WOW), which, along with the general orientation schedule, has been transformed over the past few years, includes some discussion of academic success. Faculty and student panels have addressed questions of expectations, time management, class participation, and classroom dynamics. (For a fuller description of WOW see page 31.)

TA sessions and review sessions provide help for many large classes. The Enrolled Student Survey shows that in 2003 only 5 percent of all African American students served as a TA compared with 13 percent of all Latino/a students, 19 percent of Asian students, and 16 percent of White students.

The College hosts a few special programs designed to enhance the academic experiences of students from groups not traditionally represented at Williams and ensure their high achievement. The Office of Special Academic Programs, staffed by a coordinator and a secretary, was created in 1996 in recognition of the need for administrative support for some of these programs. They are:

Mellon Mays Undergraduate Fellowship (MMUF)

Funded by the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, this program began at Williams in 1989. Its goal is to increase the number of students from underrepresented groups in graduate school and on the faculties of colleges and universities. The program funds students for two years of faculty-mentored research in lieu of campus and summer jobs. Five new fellows are selected from each year's sophomore class, and they stay in the program through graduation. Fellows spend the summer after their sophomore year in the residential Summer Research Colloquium, learning advanced research techniques and beginning their own research projects. The second summer is spent working more independently but still under the close supervision of a faculty mentor. During the school year, fellows are funded to spend about eight hours per week on their research projects or working as a

research assistant for their mentors. The Coordinator plans monthly meetings and events for the MMUF and Williams College Undergraduate Research Fellows (see below), takes them to the annual MMUF Northeast Regional Conference, and assists in all aspects of the process of applying to graduate schools. The MMUF is limited to US citizens and permanent residents and to students interested in graduate school in the humanities or selected sciences and social sciences. Those who go on to PhD programs in MMUF-designated fields are eligible for a loan repayment program as well as for other MMUF graduate student benefits.

Williams College Undergraduate Research Fellowship (WCURF)

This program was designed to replace previous programs funded by the US Department of Education and the Ford Foundation, and, like the MMUF, its goal is to provide research opportunities and exposure to graduate school options for students from groups traditionally underrepresented at Williams. Its eligibility criteria are broader than those for the MMUF: there are no disciplinary restrictions, and all first-generation college students as well as all underrepresented students (including international students) are encouraged to apply. The two programs are run together, and the undergraduate experience, programming, and requirements are virtually identical.

Summer Humanities and Social Sciences (SHSS) and Summer Science (SS)

These are pre-enrollment programs directed by tenured members of the faculty and open to all African American, Latino/a, and Native American students and all first-generation college students expressing an interest in pursuing the respective academic divisions. Both programs are designed to aid in the transition to Williams by offering classes comparable to those first-year students take and by introducing the students to the campus and to some key faculty and staff members. The programs also strive to tap into the intellectual vitality of our students and spark an interest in research and graduate school. SS hires its “alumni” to serve as tutors during the summer program, and SHSS hires upperclass teaching assistants, some of whom have been program “alumni.” The teachers of these programs serve as the students’ first-year advisors, which usually leads to a stronger than normal advising relationship.

Discussion

The data on student experiences and performance suggest that we need to be asking ourselves continually if we are doing enough, and doing well enough, for all of our students. While the tutoring programs we offer appear to be functioning well, and while they provide good help to those students who show up, we don’t know if the most needy students are receiving that help, or if that help is sufficient to ensure that all students have the best possible academic experience at Williams. The stakes are high: Academic performance and grade point average affect participation in certain Williams activities and programs (such as thesis writing, Williams-Exeter Programme at the University of Oxford, fellowships, etc.) as well as postgraduate opportunities.

Having tutors and TAs of color is important in several ways. One, some students of color will be more comfortable seeking help from other students of color. Two, these positions provide opportunities for students to rise to leadership positions within a discipline, and, if we are concerned with the educational and career trajectories of all of our students, we need to make sure that all have access to experiences that will foster self-confidence and leadership. Finally, for students to serve effectively as role models and mentors, they need to represent the diversity of our student body. In this case, affirmative action might mean looking beyond those students most assertive about pursuing such jobs and those students with the strongest grades to make sure that all of the qualities that make a good tutor or TA are considered.

The Academic Survival Workshops are the only programmatic means by which we currently address time-management and study skills—areas we know are weak for many students. We also know that students are coming to Williams with diagnosed learning disabilities at an ever-increasing rate, and yet we offer little assistance outside of arranging for accommodations. These are both areas that the new Academic Resource Center will address.

Much of the academic support at Williams happens informally. Certainly, the high level of interaction between faculty and students is one of the most important and effective forms of support. Likewise, many staff members, from the Dean's Office to the MCC to Psychological Services, counsel and advise students on academic issues. This kind of advising, though, is not systematic, and we don't know how effective it is. The Enrolled Student Survey (2003) shows that students rely more heavily on family members for advice about academic goals than on College faculty and staff, and that only a little more than 50 percent relied on their academic advisors for advice about course selection.

The two pre-enrollment programs serve between 35 and 40 incoming first-year students each summer. The Director of Institutional Research and the staffs of those programs are beginning to try to evaluate their strengths and weaknesses by comparing the academic performances of participants to non-participants of the same peer group. SHSS and SS "alumni" report that the programs aided greatly in their transition to Williams, and they tend to stay involved with their professors. Whether these students do better academically than they would have without the programs remains to be seen. SS has been particularly successful in involving its "alumni" in laboratory research, and several (11 in four years) SHSS students have been selected for the Mellon Mays Undergraduate Fellowship and the Williams College Undergraduate Research Fellowship.

The MMUF and WCURG programs have worked well on our campus. In fall 2001, the Provost's Office evaluated the programs by interviewing current and past participants. While the overall level of satisfaction with the programs was high, what emerged as the greatest strengths were mentoring, encouragement and support, and the opportunity for independent research. Over the past few years, the applicant pool has improved in quality, as has the work the students produce. While we would like to see more of our

fellows go on to academic graduate school, the programs are clearly having a positive effect on their undergraduate experience.

Next Steps

A thorough evaluation of the academic support programs already in place would be a good first step in understanding how well we are meeting the needs of all students. From there we will be better able to identify areas for improvement and new services and/or programs that should be offered.

The Academic Resource Center presumably will improve and add to academic support on campus. Because this is a new concept for Williams, the director should have significant experience. The director should also be particularly well attuned to diversity issues, and the job description should be written with these issues in mind. The center should also address the needs of some students regarding study skills, time management, and ways to succeed at Williams.

In terms of supporting the high achievement of all students, we should look closely at data on positions that mark high achievement: tutoring, TA-ing, tutorials, independent studies, thesis writing, departmental advisory committees. This spring the CDC plans to conduct focus groups on the reasons behind students' academic choices; the results should help explain the data and point to areas for increased support and encouragement of those students not fully participating in academic life at Williams. We can also encourage departments to make a conscious effort to encourage the participation of students from all backgrounds in these positions and activities.

Principal Author: Molly Magavern, Coordinator of Special Academic Programs

INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS

Background

International students have long been a part of the Williams community. The average number per class has grown from 12 to 18 to 32 to 35 in the past decade. There are currently approximately 120 undergraduate international students. Until recent years, there was a very limited amount of financial assistance for international students; consequently, it was necessary that the College consider the financial resources of all international applicants. A very small number of students from developing countries, previously referred to as "Haystack Scholars," were awarded financial assistance and were very well looked after. However, the result was an international student population with most students at one economic extreme or the other. Times have changed. The shift to a need-blind policy for international students has resulted in significant changes in the

geographic diversity and academic achievements of this population. There are significant numbers of students from Asia, Africa, Eastern and Western Europe, Canada, and the Caribbean. International students are well represented at the top of each class and contribute significantly to the social and cultural life of the College.

Since the changes in immigration policy and the development of the Student and Exchange Visitor Information System (SEVIS), the support of international students has focused in large part on the maintenance of immigration records. The initial contact with incoming students, in April or May, concerns primarily the completion of the required forms. The international student handbook, typically given to students upon their arrival, is being revised and will be sent to new students as a CD, with their immigration documentation. This change will afford students more time to review the material and become increasingly informed early on about the College.

The new First Days orientation schedule has made it necessary to condense a four-day international student orientation program into a morning. Consequently, the schedule consists of a series of administrative tasks required either for SEVIS compliance or for the business of the College. A group of upperclass international students, referred to as I-Peers, is involved in orientation and attempts to add a social element to the experience. The international student orientation program is less than satisfactory. Due to the brevity and nature of the half-day meeting, it is difficult to establish connections with the students; this, in turn, makes the goal of an ongoing orientation program difficult to realize.

To monitor the progress of first-year international students, the international student advisor invites each of them in for a one-on-one conversation. Typically, these meetings occur in early October since that is when culture shock can set in or intensify. At that point, issues of adjustment, homesickness, social engagement, academic pressures, interaction with entry mates/JAs/I-peers, etc., are addressed.

At the beginning of each academic term, it is necessary to register each international student in the SEVIS system and to verify that the information in the system is current and accurate. Beyond that, there are times throughout the year when larger numbers of international students visit the Dean's Office: prior to travel outside the country, during the spring semester when it is time to pursue employment authorization, in anticipation of major events such as international week, the annual Thanksgiving trip, spring break activities, and senior recognition events. Also, the advisor meets with the officers of the International Club to plan events or discuss issues of mutual interest or concern; visits to local elementary schools and other community service activities have been initiated through these exchanges. In addition, there have been efforts made to increase the interaction between the undergraduate student population and the graduate students at the Center for Development Economics (CDE). The international student advisor tends to be sought out by international students who need financial assistance, counsel, or advice, although this doesn't happen as frequently as it once did. If the initial connection is not made during the international student orientation, which is very likely given the current

schedule, students feel less comfortable approaching this individual. This is an unfortunate and significant loss to the students and to the advisor.

Next Steps

International students at Williams need additional support. An effective and substantive orientation program should be developed and implemented; the College needs to commit to providing transitional housing and housing during major breaks; workshops regarding such issues as cultural adjustment, work visas, fellowship opportunities, the honor code, English language usage, and study skills could be created. In addition, it would be helpful for the College community, particularly those staff members with direct contact with students, to have training regarding cross-cultural communication and sensitivity.

Principal Author: Amy Pettengill Fahnstock, Assistant Dean and International Student Advisor

STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

Background

Williams has long tried to accommodate students with documented disabilities. Their number at the College has nearly doubled over the last decade. There are currently approximately 70 self-identified students receiving accommodations for documented disabilities. Although the largest percentage of them have learning disabilities or attention deficit/hyperactivity disorder, the number of students with psychological disabilities is growing annually. Students with depression, bi-polar disorder, borderline personality disorder, and obsessive-compulsive disorder have self-identified and requested accommodations. In addition, there are typically a few students with physical disabilities, chronic illness, or traumatic brain injuries every one-to-two years. The College's reaction to the growth in this population has included the establishment and revision of policies and procedures as well as a mechanism by which students can pursue out-of-the-ordinary accommodations, such as reduced course loads.

Contact with most students with documented disabilities begins during the spring/summer prior to their arrival. Students complete accommodation request forms and submit supporting documentation for review. They are informed as to whether the documentation they have sent meets the College's criteria. In some cases, due to the need for recorded materials or other assistive technology, regular correspondence between the student and the individual coordinating the accommodations ensues. Students may self-identify and request accommodations at any time during their Williams careers; it is not unusual for students to wait until their sophomore year or later to pursue accommodations.

At the beginning of each semester, students who have submitted documentation are invited to come in to talk on an individual basis with the person responsible for coordinating accommodations. Once final course selections are made and appropriate accommodations are determined, official correspondence is generated and sent to faculty members. It is often necessary to recruit recorders and note-takers to assist students with disabilities.

The coordinator of accommodations, serving in a counseling and/or advising capacity, meets with several students with disabilities on a regular basis. Such meetings are designed to help students resolve problems, organize the work at hand, manage their time, and stay on task. Students interested in requesting permission to pursue reduced course loads work with this same individual to prepare such requests for presentation to the Disabilities and Accommodations Advisory Group, which makes a recommendation to the Committee on Academic Standing.

Next Steps

Students with disabilities at Williams need additional support. It would be helpful for all students to have easy access to a learning specialist; students with learning disabilities, and attention issues in particular, would find such a resource very helpful. Further, if the specialist had expertise in the area of disabilities, he or she could develop other educational programs to aid students' understanding of their disabilities and the incorporation of the condition into their daily lives. Workshops focusing on note-taking, study skills, managing the reading load, assistive technology, etc., would be well received. Student support/peer groups could fill a void as well.

Principal Author: Amy Pettengill Fahnestock, Assistant Dean and International Student Advisor

CAMPUS LIFE AND STUDENT ACTIVITIES

Background

Student Activities Office

The activities organized and facilitated by this office, which reports to the Director of Campus Life, are open to the entire Williams community. As a department, we do not focus on issues of underrepresented groups but do fund MinCo programming. We rely heavily on the MCC to provide diversity programming for the campus.

Student activities are generally organized by clubs and organizations, the student-led group All Campus Entertainment (ACE), and the MCC. Only rarely do these groups overlap. Building bridges between them would benefit all.

Campus Life coordinated a “summit” last fall between ACE and MinCo groups to talk about how to work together and communicate about programming efforts and possibilities for better use of funds. While a lot of good will was shared, probably not much action resulted.

Looking forward, the new student center intentionally places ACE, MinCo, College Council, and Student Activities and Campus Life very close to each other in order to create synergies among the groups and make each more aware of the other.

Office of Campus Life

While this office is relatively new to Williams, it has quickly become engaged in virtually all facets of life on campus. The creation of the four Campus Life Coordinator (CLC) staff positions has allowed us to fill gaps in many areas of student services, and some of these areas are directly related to issues of diversity. One CLC works directly with the Chaplains’ Office on community service; a second CLC works directly with the MCC and primarily with MinCo groups. In three years, the presence and energy of a young professional associated with MinCo has had a significant impact. The CLC acts as a mentor, administrator, and advocate.

The presence of the CLC has allowed for some bridge building between Campus Life/Student Activities and MinCo groups and the MCC.

International Students

We have worked with the Dean’s Office to provide transitional/holiday housing for international students. At times, we have had to lobby various campus constituencies (such as Facilities) to provide housing for these students. Our efforts to provide this housing was not proactive, but occurred as a result of student pressure. As the profile of our international students changes, we have found that these students require more and more resources, and we often do a poor job of being proactive about those needs.

Until the arrangement of First Days and orientation was changed two years ago, first-year international students came to campus early and participated in a focused orientation program offered by the Assistant Dean overseeing international students. Since then, international students arrive on campus with the entire first-year class. They do still come together, but for a relatively brief meeting that is primarily focused on required paperwork. There has been a loss of community among our international students, and they do not feel as connected to the Assistant Dean as they once did. There is a perceived loss of administrative support amongst international students.

Residential Life/HC Program

Our office coordinates first-year housing placements, and creating diverse entries is key to those placements. Diversity here is construed broadly and includes geography, athletic participation, and even sleep habits. In the current upperclass housing system, the pick-of-four system was meant to help increase diversity within houses; while there has been some success, it is not significant. With the pending cluster system for upperclass housing, the intent is for each cluster to represent the diversity found at Williams in the same way each entry does.

During the training of HCs (students with leadership responsibilities in upperclass residences) and JAs (selected members of the junior class who live in first-year entries), we chose not to have a full-blown diversity workshop, as the attempts made in the past were lackluster at best. Instead, we asked MCC to have a discussion or a panel on the MCC's resources since our programs are largely resource-driven. MCC provided a brief discussion of resources followed by a wonderful scavenger hunt that broke the ice on MCC resources available to HCs and JAs—but certainly it had little depth (we didn't ask for depth, though). In addition, during JA training, the JAs had a diversity panel discussion and the conversations were pretty interesting and engaging, and this was certainly more in-depth.

Conclusion

While one has the sense that the Campus Life Office should be doing more for our students regarding diversity, it's not clear what that is. MCC provides a lot, however, and there is always the question of overlap. Maybe there could be more interaction between our offices, to see our roles as less compartmentalized.

We could also work with other offices and outside agencies on expanding the training of HCs and CLCs in cultural competency.

Principal Author: Doug Bazuin, Director of Campus Life

STUDENT RESIDENTIAL AND SOCIAL LIFE

Background

Because of the increase in student diversity over the past 15 years, students are now very likely, as a matter of course, to encounter and interact with others who are different from themselves. During this same period, however, changes to the housing system have made it more challenging for students to take full advantage of the peer group available to them.

A thorough treatment of these issues is provided in two documents: 1) "Report of the Committee on Undergraduate Life," February 2005 (<http://www.williams.edu/resources/committees/cul/reports/CulHousingProposal.pdf>); and, 2) "Residential College Study: Report from the Committee on Diversity and Community," January 1995 (available by e-mailing news@williams.edu).

Process

The faculty/student Committee on Undergraduate Life (CUL) has spent the last four years assessing the housing system at Williams, paying special attention to the impact of that system on issues related to diversity. The conclusion of this assessment resulted in the recent recommendation to implement a new housing system in fall 2006. This system, and the process that led to its recommendation, are described in detail in the CUL report referenced above. Further relevant information may be found in the CUL report issued in April 2002 (available by e-mailing news@williams.edu).

Discussion

The proposed residential system aims not only to increase the extent to which all of the houses at Williams reflect the diversity of the student body, but also to enhance the opportunities and incentives for the members of the houses to interact with each other in meaningful ways. To be fully successful, it must also ensure that house leadership and activities are responsive to the needs of all members.

Next Steps

The CUL will spend the coming year preparing for the implementation of the new house system. The most important aspect of these preparations with respect to issues of diversity will be the design of the house governance structure. Such governance should be not only efficient and principled, but also actively support all house members. The ideal governing structure should be thought through with substantial input from as wide a variety of students and student groups as possible.

Principal Author: Will Dudley, Chair of the Committee on Undergraduate Life and Associate Professor of Philosophy

MULTICULTURAL CENTER

Background

The Multicultural Center was established in 1989 to support the educational mission of the College by developing and supporting programs, events, workshops, and training, with a focus on the diversity of the community, including differences in gender,

sexuality, race, ethnicity, class, and religion. Its four full-time staff members, one faculty member who serves as the academic director, and Campus Life Coordinator with a part-time affiliation are diverse along lines of gender, race, ethnicity, and sexual orientation. The role of MCC staff is to develop and assist others in developing programs related to diversity, serve on College committees, and provide training and resources to campus members, especially as they relate to diversity.

MCC staff attend, participate in, and organize various training for students, faculty, and staff, including a multicultural resources and programming workshop for JAs and HCs to introduce them to the programs and resources at the center, the annual Resource Fair organized by Campus Life for information about campus resources, the Windows on Williams (WOW) orientation program, the Williams Community Building Project (WCBP) of student organizers of diversity-related education and training, and the Project for Effective Teaching (PET), which provides programs for new faculty members.

Involvement of the staff in College governance and administration includes service on a variety of committees, including the Committee on Diversity and Community, the Committee on Undergraduate Life, the Dively Committee for Human Sexuality and Diversity, the Women's and Gender Studies Advisory Committee, the Sexual Assault Response Team, and the Sexual Harassment and Discrimination Advisors.

Involvement with the wider community includes staff connections to local and regional programs such as the ABC (A Better Chance) Program for minority high school students from under-resourced urban communities who attend Mount Greylock Regional High School, the Berkshire Stonewall Community Coalition, an outreach program for LGBT youth based in nearby Pittsfield, and the Western Massachusetts LGBTQ Youth Coalition.

It is through its own annual programming for the College community and its support for campus organizations connected to the MCC, however, that the center puts its emphasis.

Annual Programs:

LGBTQ Welcome Reception: The reception for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer (LGBTQ) students, faculty, and staff occurs in September. It is designed to welcome first-year students to campus. The program was created in 2003. While no first-year students attended in the first year, the MCC felt it important to send the message that Williams was a friendly and welcoming place for LGBTQ students. In 2004, the program was moved out of First Days to late September to accommodate greater student participation. It is hoped that by moving the program after the first QSU (Queer Student Union) meeting, more students will attend.

Windows On Williams: WOW, a pre-orientation program since the 1980s, was reorganized for fall 2002 when all pre-orientation programs were discontinued. WOW now occurs in September as a welcome program for ALANA (African, Latino/a, Asian, and Native American) first-year students and their parents to discuss expectations of the

community and how those expectations relate to students of color. The program is administered through the MCC and facilitated by upperclass ALANA students. The program has undergone several changes in the past three years. WOW is structured in three parts: (1) First Days Lunch with faculty, staff, students, and parents to greet incoming frosh and their families; (2) Saturday student barbeque and activities with upperclass students and frosh; and (3) Wednesday dinners/workshops—opportunities to continue contact and discussion from First Days with other students. In 2002 and 2003, the program included a retreat, with faculty and staff workshops. The retreat was discontinued in 2004 because of low attendance, which was attributed to the timing—a daylong weekend commitment in the first month of the semester. Although attendance at the First Days luncheon, Saturday barbeque, and Wednesday dinners continued to be strong, the sporadic structure of the program seemed ineffective given its original purpose. The Parent Program suffered as well after the schedule moved from a pre-orientation to First Days program. There have been many forums and discussions on WOW and the issue remains how, if at all, a program originally intended as a pre-orientation can accomplish the same goals with a different format and schedule.

Community at Williams: This program, occurring during First Days, is led by Williams Community Building Program (WCBP) facilitators, a diverse group of students who work with the MCC to lead workshops and discussions about topics such as diversity, prejudice, racism, sexism, homophobia, and community building. Facilitators generally lead first-year entries in discussions on diversity. Traditionally, first-years watch a video titled “Shades of Purple: Voices on Community.” Small group discussions follow, during which students explore the definitions of, expectations for, and experiences of community and diversity at Williams. Students also discuss their future roles in fostering community on campus. There have been varying opinions on the success of the video. In 2003, the WCBP coordinators created a new video. However, that one focuses more on community and less specifically on diversity. In 2004, facilitators led discussions on a lecture by a guest speaker on diversity instead of the video. The change in topic for facilitators will require that they have more knowledge of the speaker’s topic and more training on diversity. Though the segment with the speaker is new and needs work, it is critical that the College continues to endorse this program. JAs are critical to this process and need more formal training in diversity as they could possibly be considered the auxiliary, if not primary, facilitators for this discussion in the future.

Students Promoting Awareness, Respect, and Community (SPARC): Community builders facilitate workshops for each first-year entry in late September and October. SPARC needs serious restructuring both within the leadership and the content. Although some logistical changes were made this year, the program needs more structure and leadership by both administration and students.

Martin Luther King Jr. Day Celebration: A Day On! Not A Day Off!: MLK Day at Williams is a daylong event organized and sponsored by the MCC and co-sponsored by the Chaplains’ Office, the Dance Program, the Williams Black Student Union (WBSU), and the Williamstown Elementary School. It consists of four parts: (1) Multi-Faith Service—a time of reflection and prayer, facilitated by the Chaplains’ Office; (2)

Community Dinner, organized by the MCC, with proceeds to benefit charity; (3) Student Evening Celebration, an event with readings, spoken word, and African, Indian, and modern dance led by the WBSU; and (4) Elementary/Community Assembly—an afternoon of selected poems and essays by members of the fifth and sixth grades with fourth-grade artwork displays. MLK Day is a good program but could use more communication among its collaborators. This year the MCC called a meeting of all the sponsors, which proved in some ways to result in a more collaborative program than a series of detached programs serving different populations. The program could use an outside speaker. The Community Dinner is possibly a good venue for this resource.

MCC Lecture Series: The lecture series invites scholars to the campus to give presentations related to multicultural education. The center works with Williams faculty to create connections with classes, curriculum, and scholarship. Series speakers also take part in the heritage programs with cultural organizations. This is a five-part series over both the fall and spring semesters. This academic year, the center hosted Philip Deloria (Native American Heritage Month in coordination with the Anthropology and History Departments), Frances Negron-Mutaner (Latino/a Heritage Month, in coordination with Latino/a Studies), Leslie M. Harris (Black History Month, in coordination with African-American Studies and the History Department), Warren Blumenfeld (Queer Pride Days), and Emily Cheng (Asian American Awareness Month, in coordination with faculty and MASS MoCA). The program was developed in 2004-05 and would benefit from more advance planning and relating the speaker with the theme of each heritage month. The collaboration with faculty and classes went extremely well. The expense for this program, however, is much higher than anticipated and has limited the MCC's ability to co-sponsor other programs by students and academic departments.

Bolin Fellow Lecture Series: The MCC hosts public talks during the year given by the College's Gaius Charles Bolin Fellows, graduate students in residence who are completing their dissertations and teaching one one-semester course. The lectures by Bolin Fellows serve both to support young faculty working in areas relating to diversity and multiculturalism and to provide students with innovative topics on diversity across disciplines. The Bolin talks are well attended; however, once again, wider participation by the general Williams community would be preferred.

MCC Reading Groups: Organized by the Academic Director of the MCC, these semester-long faculty reading and curricular planning groups are devoted to issues of diversity and multiculturalism. Faculty are invited to propose groups organized around reading in a particular body of literature, constructing new syllabi or revising existing syllabi, or considering larger departmental curricular issues. Topics have included:

- Racial Intersections
- The Multicultural Self: Culture and Cognition
- Post-Apartheid South African Fiction
- Understanding and Addressing Diversity in Athletics
- Race, Nation, and Colonialism
- Queer Politics in the 21st Century

- Underrepresented Students in the Sciences
- The Religious Right and American Politics
- The Politics of Universalism.

Thus far 60 faculty have participated in these groups, and they have been very fruitful both in curricular development and in the general study of best practices. One continuing issue is how knowledge gained by participants might most effectively be shared with the wider community. While some groups have put together forums at the conclusion of the semester, for others it is not clear what sort of outreach would be most useful. This program is quite expensive for the MCC to maintain, but in only a few years has involved a large fraction of the faculty in a very meaningful way. It seems critically important for the College to continue to support these faculty reading groups and similar programs both financially and intellectually into the future.

Minority Senior Luncheon: For three years the Dean of the College, Director of the MCC, and Associate Director of Alumni Relations have met with groups of seniors to inquire about their time at Williams. The luncheons occur three times within a two-week period inviting 10-12 students of color to each. The luncheon program encourages discussion around academics, residential life, support, and services. A short report is written based on observations and comments. The program is organized by the MCC Director.

MCC Involvement with Student Organizations:

The center works with many student organizations, providing administrative assistance and coordination, office space for some of the groups, and funding through co-sponsorship of events. The organizations the center works with regularly include:

- MinCo (Minority Coalition)
- AASiA (Asian American Students in Action)
- ATP (Asian Theatre Project)
- WBSU (Williams Black Student Union)
- CASO (Chinese American Student Organization)
- IC (International Club)
- KOW (Koreans of Williams)
- MSU (Muslim Student Union)
- NASAW (Native American Student Association at Williams)
- QSU (Queer Student Union)
- SASA (South Asian Student Association)
- SoCA (Students of Caribbean Ancestry)
- SoMH (Students of Mixed Heritage)
- Vista
- WASO (Williams African Student Organization)
- WCJA (Williams College Jewish Association)
- Queer Peers.

One way in which the center works with these organizations is the series of heritage days awareness programs. These programs, co-sponsored by the MCC and various MinCo organizations, focus on the history, heritage, and identity of particular groups, with the campus-wide events open to the general public as well. The programs are:

- Native American Heritage Month (October)
- International Week (October)
- Mixed Heritage Weekend (October)
- Latino/a Heritage Month (November)
- Black History Month (February)
- Women's History Month (March)
- Caribbean Heritage Week (March)
- Asian American Awareness Month (April)
- Queer Pride Days (April)
- African Awareness Weekend (May).

The programs include guest speakers (Williams faculty and staff as well as visitors), performers, and films relating to the theme. Generally, these programs are well attended. However, more campus-wide recognition and participation needs to happen. There is a tendency for students to over-program, which has been draining on both the chairs of the student organizations and the staff of the MCC. Although the programs are always rewarding, we have streamlined the series (i.e. limited the number of heritage programs to one per group) and continue to look for ways to make the programs successful in attendance, content, and structure.

In addition to the heritage days programs, other programs with a focus on diversity are part of the programming through the center, including certain regularly occurring ones such as Coming Out Day, Chinese Moonfest, Cinco de Mayo, and Asian Theatre Project performance, etc.

Student organizations, such as the MSU and SASA, have organized successful lectures and lecture series this year. However, non-heritage programs often struggle in this regard for financial and logistical reasons. Generally, such events are planned and hosted by individual students and raise multiple problems related to funding, sponsorship, and overall responsibility. While the programs are beneficial and excellent in the knowledge and scholarship presented, their execution requires a great deal of attention.

Student groups also host a series of themed dinners to encourage community with ethnic affinity groups including a Buena Vista Social Dinner, a Soul Food Dinner, a BSU Community Dinner, an Indian Dinner, a SoCA Caribbean Dinner, a Chinese New Year Dinner, a Korean Dinner, and a WASO African Dinner.

The dinners provide social, educational, and communal rewards for students. They are partly the reason students formed MinCo separate from other student organizations and funding groups.

Cross-departmental Cooperation:

The center cooperates with other campus offices and departments in programming. Some examples over the past two years include:

- Minority Non-Profit Fair, with Office of Career Counseling
- DuBois Conference, with African-American Studies
- “The Future of Ethnic Studies in/as American Studies” conference, with the Oakley Center for the Humanities and Social Sciences
- Stalwart Originality, with the Dance Program and Theatre Department
- Alumni of Color and BiGLATA Career Mentor Weekend, with Alumni Relations.

Next Steps

- More intensive workshops for JAs and HCs. Introduction to key diversity administrators should be an addition to separate training by professionals from within and outside Williams.
- Institutional support for programs such as the LGBTQ Welcome Reception and WOW.
- Restructuring of WOW as a mid-orientation or pre-orientation.
- Annual funding for diversity speaker during First Days to exist separately from the Community on Campus.
- Rigorous training for WCBP leaders and reformatting of the Community on Campus workshop with activities that address the College’s diverse communities.
- More cooperation and collaboration between SPARC and JAs.
- Stronger student participation, commitment, and leadership as well as more administrative direction for SPARC.
- Additional financial support for the MCC Lecture Series. The program costs in excess of \$10,000, shared between the MCC programming and academic budgets.
- More financial support for MCC Reading groups on an annual basis.
- Development of more opportunities for disseminating results of the MCC Reading Groups. For example, an MCC forum on diversity in athletics was initiated from one of the groups.

- Reorganization of heritage days programs, with the goals of having fewer, more substantive events; more faculty and staff involvement in a streamlined planning process, which should take place six months in advance; and increasing attendance by people outside the heritage group in question.
- Planning with other offices and organizations to develop a response team for minority students under MinCo as a forum for discussing incidents or concerns in the minority community.
- Continued discussion of ways to further expand MCC involvement in the planning and carrying out of faculty/staff orientation and ongoing education.

Principal Author: Gail Bouknight-Davis, Director of the Multicultural Center

CAMPUS SAFETY AND SECURITY

Background

Given the nature of Campus Safety and Security (CSS) work—the many calls and requests for service throughout the day, night, and weekends, officers often working one-on-one with members of the campus community—our patrol officers are the department’s “ambassadors” and are expected to convey an understanding of the needs and concerns of our diverse community. Equal, fair, and consistent performance standards are expected.

It is important for members of the department to receive regular training in dealing with diversity. In writing this report, I have realized that no significant training has taken place since Department of Justice training in 2001. (I describe below the training we have done in the past.) We need to bring similar programs back to campus. Several officers have been hired since the most recent training. Also, it’s important to coordinate this type of training with the Williamstown Police Department (WPD) since they interact with our diverse population.

In addition, we have been inconsistent in our practice of inviting the MCC director to a monthly staff meeting prior to the opening of school. Also, several years ago, one of the officers assumed a liaison position with the QSU, however there has not been recent interaction with the students. I would like to see greater CSS interaction with groups of underrepresented students. Perhaps we can develop a liaison program in which officers/supervisors can connect with the groups on a very informal basis. It’s important for CSS to develop a better understanding of cultural perspectives.

I’d also like to see more training for CSS staff to better understand how they are perceived and what baggage each brings to the workplace. Doug Kern from SUNY did an excellent program about how campus officers react initially and what types of

messages these actions send to members of historically underrepresented groups. Officers' actions don't always mean there is bias, however officers need to recognize how their initial response and handling of a situation can create the impression that they are insensitive. For example, it might imply they are taking sides because they allow a person with privilege or power to "tell their story first."

I especially like the social justice model in mediation training that makes a person aware of the power and privilege that exists when conflicts arise between individuals. Perhaps some type of training that identifies all the "isms" would be helpful to officers.

Although the Clery Act does not mandate it, we include in our crime statistics any bias-motivated incidents that occur on campus. Our philosophy has always been that reporting these incidents provides information to the campus community and accurately represents the campus climate. Also, it shows underrepresented groups that we take reports of such incidents seriously and we will not hide the fact that they do happen.

Fortunately, we have not had to deal with an incident that rises to the level of a hate crime. If one did occur, we'd immediately involve the Dean's Office as well as the WPD. We'd also want to work directly with members of the targeted group and the administrators who advise the group.

When a bias-motivated incident occurs, we insure that the victim feels safe. We investigate and gather facts and try to determine who is responsible. Most of our cases have involved graffiti, notes, emails, phone calls, or verbal remarks. We photograph any evidence and then, if necessary, request Buildings and Grounds clean up or remove the threatening material. Depending upon the severity, we will notify the on-call dean. We also notify the WPD because one incident may impact the Williamstown community as well.

Here is a summary of recent training related to diversity:

Yearly: All officers/supervisors who attend the six-day Northeast Security Officers Training Academy at Bates College attend a three-hour training program on "Diversity and Hate Crimes." The program is given by a detective from the State of Maine's Department of the Attorney General. The academy is held annually and all new officers attend within the first year of employment. Officers who have already attended the academy are rotated through the program again to insure mandatory training.

2001: A four-hour training session—"Command Level Hate Crime Training"—was presented at Williams by the Department of Justice's (DOJ) multi-disciplinary hate crime training team composed of an FBI agent, DOJ Community Relations Conciliation Specialist, Attorney General Victim Assistance Specialist, Assistant Attorney General, Assistant U.S. Attorney, Boston Police Sergeant-Detective, and civil rights specialist from an advocacy agency. Local chiefs of police, campus directors, and command staff officers were invited to attend.

2001: The International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators held a two-day conference at Northeastern University on “Race Relations on New England Campuses: Meeting the Challenge.” Topics covered included building a racially harmonious campus, meeting real and perceived challenges, responding to conflict, recruitment, student ideas to promote race relations, campus police and on-campus issues, free speech, and many other topics dealing with diversity. (Note: I served on a panel with David Kurz, Chief of Durham, N.H., Police Department and former Williamstown Chief of Police Arthur Parker. We discussed partnerships and law enforcement issues between municipal and campus enforcement. We focused on diversity issues arising from town-gown relationships that involve town residents, students, businesses, town officials, and College administrators, etc.)

2000: All uniformed staff participated in a joint program at Williams with the WPD offered by the U.S. Department of Justice–Community Relations Service. The program covered “Diversity Issues and Racial Profiling for Law Enforcement.” Staff from the MCC were also invited.

1999: Training for the department (2.5 hours) was presented by Doug Kern, Deputy Chief, SUNY-Albany Police Department. His area of expertise is “Campus Police and On-Campus Issues–Race Relations.”

We are proud of the diversity training we’ve had in place and believe it has helped us better serve our increasingly diverse campus community but we are unhappy to realize that we’ve let that training slip over recent years.

Next Steps

- Establish a regular schedule of diversity training, to include Department of Justice training in dealing with hate crimes.
- Discuss with the WPD chief the coordination of diversity training.
- Establish CSS staff liaisons with student diversity groups.

Principal Author: Jean Thorndike, Director of Campus Safety and Security

HEALTH CENTER AND PSYCHOLOGICAL COUNSELING CENTER

Background

In 2000, the American College Health Association (ACHA) adopted a new cultural competency statement (www.acha.org/info_resources/guidelines.cfm). Health Center staff are committed to supporting and advancing the position of ACHA. This is

accomplished through participation in educational workshops at ACHA national and regional meetings; through continued review of how we “do business” at the Health Center, including review of our forms, educational literature, barriers to care; and through staff meetings that focus on developing and improving cultural competency. For example, we have just purchased the video *Transamazon: A Gender Queer Journey*, a documentary made by a transgendered UNH student. We will use it to learn and develop skills that will increase our ability to provide sensitive, appropriate care to our students. For budgetary reasons, not all staff can attend a regional meeting every year, but the expectation is that staff attending the meeting will bring back information to present at a staff meeting. Our Health Educator works closely with Queer Peers. She and I are members of the GLBT Advisory Group, and she is a member of the ACHA Diversity Committee.

One of the goals of the Health Center is to increase our outreach. Ideally we would like to have a member of the staff contact each of the underrepresented student groups early in the academic year to establish a relationship. We hope that if these students know at least one member of the staff, they will feel comfortable coming to the Health Center and will make us aware of how we can best serve our minority students. Health Center staff participate in MCC orientation activities and other events. This year we have increased our outreach effort to the graduate students at the College’s Center for Development Economics (CDE). In the fall we held a reception for CDE students at the Health Center, providing an opportunity for them to meet staff and to learn about the services we provide and how to access care. We have since organized a “stress buster” at CDE following the exam period in November. Plans are not finalized for a spring event, but interaction between our staff and CDE students will continue.

Last year our Smith College intern compiled and began to analyze statistics related to the use of Psychological Counseling Services by our minority students. This year’s intern is continuing the project. She will meet with the Director of the MCC to discuss the data and determine if we need to do outreach, more staff education, etc.

Next Steps

The Health Center staff is not as diverse a group as we would like, but the individuals are committed to being allies to our students. We will do all we can to train them in cultural competency. We also will continue to do all we can to diversify our psychological counseling staff. Our attempts at increasing diversity within our hiring pool through the alumni office and others have not been successful.

Principal Author: Ruth Harrison, Director of Health Services

RELIGIOUS LIFE AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

Most of the current programs and activities that promote or reflect on diversity as part of the work of our office(s) address two aspects of the campus culture that, while quite important facets of the whole reality of diversity at Williams, are not usually at the center of discussion on the subject: religious differences and strata of social class.

Leadership Training

Chaplains participate in various ways in the training of the student leaders whose attitudes play a very large role in shaping the campus culture vis-a-vis diversity: JAs and HCs. Generally the formal part of this participation is limited to one presentation as part of a panel—usually just before the fall semester begins, but sometimes in May just after the school year has ended. Last year, in addition, there was a fair at which we handed out brochures along with dozens of other student services staff, doing whatever explaining we could do in a very few hectic minutes. In neither case is anything like training really possible. In most of the past five years, the panel sessions have not been interactive; they've been thumbnail presentations, which seem to leave little lasting impression on the trainees. Most of the focus of our participation in these panels is on religious diversity—a subset of multiculturalism, but a manifestation of diversity that is much less often considered.

One indicator of the importance of religious diversity as an aspect of the larger challenges of diversity is apparent in the results of last spring's CDC survey. While the majority of those who responded said that Williams is a "religiously tolerant community" (82 percent), 16 percent said it is not. Sixty-nine percent see the campus as "religiously diverse" but 29 disagree, and 77 percent find the campus "religiously comfortable," while 17 percent do not. In a community that regards diversity as an important goal and educational resource, there appears to be room for improvement in the way one out of every six or seven students experience religious diversity here.

Another set of figures is perhaps even more relevant. Two-thirds of the respondents perceive that religion/spirituality is at least "somewhat" important to their college experience, and 7 percent say that it is "essential" or "very important" to their experience here. Yet for only half of the respondents is interaction across lines of religious difference an important part of their experience here, and 17 percent say that it is not important at all. Again, on a campus that values diversity so highly, there's an evident gap between the high value that the College places on diversity as an instrument of education, and the extent to which students actually understand and take advantage of the educational resource of religious diversity.

Orientation

In addition to leadership training on religious diversity, one other way in which our offices engage Williams' richness and complexity comes in the form of "Where Am I?!"

(WAI), the mid-orientation program whereby some 120 first-year students are introduced to the people and issues of the region surrounding the College. One active goal is to help students, as early as possible in their career here, to perceive the socio-economic realities around them, and to cultivate a thoughtful, constructive and engaged relationship to them, freed from one-dimensional hearsay. We train the student small-group leaders who are the backbone of the experience to help their frosh see beyond whatever class stereotypes they may have brought to campus with them, or may have learned almost instantly upon arrival. Student WAI leaders are responsible for facilitating the most constructive interaction among members of their groups, which could entail higher levels of sensitivity to all manifestations of diversity—especially class diversity—than exist among most current students.

One other aspect of orientation bears mention. For many of our international students in particular, ethnicity is often intimately linked to religious background. Yet surprisingly few of our students of any background have any real lived experience of religious diversity prior to matriculation. And the realities of the de facto class system in the United States may be little known to them. Until the special orientation program for matriculating international students was discontinued two years ago, the Chaplains' Office played a small role in opening some of these manifestations of diversity to their consideration.

Community Service

Perhaps 20 percent of the student body does volunteer work regularly. Though, generally speaking, the focus in this realm of our work is on class-ism, there are certainly ways in which racial diversity plays a part in the dynamics of student engagement in the wider life of our area. For the past several years we have been trying to teach and to inculcate a sense of service as a medium of partnership that can only truly succeed when a genuine mutuality exists, and all parties to the partnership can acknowledge what they gain from each other in the exchange. This modeling of social justice—of transformative working partnerships among equals rather than of condescending or patronizing paradigms of charity—speaks to the heart of the agenda of affirming diversity in the life of Williams. We hope those students' experiences of engagement in the community, and the opportunities for reflection that we set up to follow them, offer a sound laboratory for exploring changes of perspective about differences of class.

Counseling and Spiritual Guidance

Each of the three chaplains spends considerable time in one-on-one supportive conversations with students. Often part of our role in this setting is to help students grapple with the experiences that have thrown them off-balance and the challenges of living in a very close-knit community that is, for almost all of them, far more diverse than most other places.

A special case of this kind of counseling is our work with students who are dealing with yet another important manifestation of diversity: non-majority sexual orientation or

gender identity. Because the synapse between religious institutions and human sexuality is such a flashpoint in our culture at this time, our interactions with students in regard to these special challenges of their maturing into adulthood are, in many cases, a very important resource in helping students reflect on who they are and who the people around them are.

Nicaragua Winter Study Travel Course

One of the highlights of my work, personally, is the biannual Winter Study course I have led in Nicaragua, called “Explorations in Solidarity.” The premise of the course is that the essential first step in relating to the people and issues of Nicaragua is to share the lives and hear the stories of some of the most marginalized people in our hemisphere. Though the number of students who are reached by this experience is small, it’s clear to me that many students return to campus after the Nicaragua Winter Study determined to continue the process of changing their attitudes toward the poor, toward the processes of economic “development” currently at work. There is ample evidence of the connections that the student “alumni” of this Winter Study experience make to other forms of marginalization in our culture and in the world.

Multi-faith Programming

Several programmatic pieces of our work involve the continued gathering together of students of religious (and, therefore, often cultural and racial) difference to work together to plan and lead activities—services, discussions, celebrations—that tend to foster an appreciation for the differences between people. Almost no student who becomes involved in planning, leading, or taking part in these programs brings any experience of such close collaboration with other religious traditions into the experience—because these are still so rare in the cultures of our world. These programs can be profound learning experiences for students as they cross the boundaries out of their own religious world-view for genuine and candid relational experiences of religious identities very different from their own.

Recommendations

Orientation and Training (for JAs, HCs, etc)

- Replace the models of “information fairs” and perfunctory “panels” of student services staff with substantive, interactive explorations of the lived experience of diversity—for instance, using case studies, group discussion of articles and essays, etc., to increase the engagement of trainees in the heart of these important, sensitive, difficult matters.
- Take steps to change the culture of these training sessions so as to add a far stronger sense of the gravity of the matters that we are counting on these students to address. Equipping JAs to be more effective teachers about issues of diversity, and more effective front-line enablers of community, would be a far more

valuable way for them to spend their very limited training time (especially in May) than “bonding” with each other. Why is bonding with each other more important than spending time taking a hard look at the way race and class still have sharp edges at Williams? And what can be done to encourage seriousness of purpose among JA trainees whose eyes glaze over during the sequence of “panels” that constitute much of their “training” at present, especially in September just before the frosh arrive?

Community Service Programs

- Deepen the training which “Where Am I?!” leaders get in noticing and confronting class stereotypes, for particular use as they help introduce their first-years to Pownal and North Adams during the program in September.
- Increase the role which reflection plays in the experience of students who engage in community service. Fight the uphill battle for time in their over-crowded, under-prioritized schedules, and offer them as many inescapable opportunities as possible to ask, “What did I just see? Why is it there? Why did I see it that way?” The recent Lehman Council retreat at the City School in Boston was a fine example of the kind of critical reflection that’s possible when students make the time to think out loud together about what they’ve seen, heard, felt, and done off-campus.

Winter Study

- As a result of the powerful experience many of my students have had in Nicaragua during Winter Study, the College might look for more ways to make use of January as a time to get students off campus and into settings where they can experience and reflect on cultural, racial, economic, religious differences. Certainly more such courses could be offered. Our faculty (and staff!) bristles with people who could design very potent encounters of this kind all over the world, with educational benefits that may well exceed the administrative costs.

Beyond the Bubble

- An urban campus has one important resource that Williams doesn’t: a multi-racial/ethnic/cultural community just beyond its every threshold. The College can’t change its location. But it might put more resources at the disposal of students, offer them more pivotal experiences, to increase and facilitate their access to North Adams and Pittsfield, Albany and Troy. Except for community service projects, artistic events at MASS MoCA, and a few courses with experiential components, few of our students have any reason, occasion, or incentive to spend time in these nearby cities. If there are projects that involve substantive collaboration with the Massachusetts College of Liberal Arts and Berkshire Community College, they don’t have much visibility. The priority we’re presently giving to diversity might offer an opportunity for faculty to make

a greater commitment to exploring the possibilities for experiential education in those urban laboratories.

General

- For many Williams students, “issues of race” and even economic class are familiar challenges—they know they’re supposed to be thoughtful, and they know there’s a lot at stake in how we handle these matters as a community. But the realities of religious diversity might offer a way to break through the layer of predictability that, for many, “diversity training” may have acquired. Most Williams people have been asked to think, maybe frequently, about how they view racial differences, and perhaps even economic differences. Fewer of them may have been asked to think about how they view religious differences. It could be that this topic would offer a fresh avenue of approach, during orientations and trainings, to the common heart of the matter, which is sensitive, thoughtful, educational engagement with the realities of difference between people.
- The word that is mostly missing from the vocabulary of the College’s reflection on the challenges of diversity is “privilege.” Perhaps it would help if a number of highly effective speakers were brought to campus who could help unpack that reality—speakers who could help us to see and name and understand the kinds of privilege that operate in our society, and the kinds which all of us carry (to varying degrees and in different ways) simply as a result of our being “of Williams.”

Principal Author: Rick Spalding, Chaplain to the College and Coordinator of Community Service

CAREER COUNSELING

Background

The Office of Career Counseling (OCC) strives to identify and promote programs and services to meet the special needs of our students. Accordingly, opportunities to engage in OCC services are open to everyone without regard to race, color, national origin, sex, sexual orientation, or disability. Additionally, we require employers to comply with federal and state laws, which mandate affirmative action and/or prohibit discrimination in recruitment, hiring, training, promotion, and retention. In addition to providing general career counseling services to students we offer the following diversity resources:

Programs

- OCC offers numerous programs in various career fields each year. When OCC staff develop each program, a conscious effort is made to identify alumni

affiliated with various affinity groups that represent a cross section of our student body.

- OCC collaborates with the MCC, Chaplains Office, Alumni Relations Office, and a majority of academic departments in identifying alumni and providing outreach to students to promote our programs.
- OCC staff meets with leaders of a diverse range of student organizations to generate ideas for OCC programs that include diversity initiatives.
- The OCC web site (www.williams.edu/resources/occ/) includes numerous links for students from historically underrepresented groups and for students interested in careers related to diversity issues.
- OCC recently engaged nine students to assume the role of OCC Student Ambassador to promote OCC programs to a diverse range of student organizations.
- A number of recruiters with diversity initiatives come to campus to identify students for their programs. We continue to actively seek organizations with similar objectives to actively recruit Williams students.
- We receive dozens of postings each year regarding job, internship, and fellowship opportunities for minority students. The information is posted in our newsletters, on our website, and in our job/internship database.
- An OCC staff member acts as a liaison to the MCC, participates in the annual Windows on Williams program, and was a member of the Committee on Diversity and Community for two years.
- Each year OCC facilitates the Alumni Sponsored Internship Program that provides more than 100 grants to students who wish to perform an eight-week summer internship within non-profit organizations that address the needs of marginalized sectors of our population. On average 35 percent of the students chosen for these grants are students of color. The selection committee is made up of faculty members and staff members from the MCC, Chaplains Office, Admission Office, Alumni Relations Office, and Campus Life along with the Pre-Med Advisor.
- In a process that includes BiGLATA alumni representatives, the internship coordinator facilitates the selection process for the Michael Dively '61 Internship Program, targeted for students with an interest in BiGLATA issues.
- OCC promotes and co-facilitates graduate school admission programs targeted for students of color with the Coordinator of Special Academic programs.

Next Steps

Although OCC has made strong efforts to identify diversity resources for our students, we need to continue to promote these services. We recently proposed to link our diversity resources to the MCC home page, which was positively received by the MCC Director. We recognize the importance of getting these valuable resources to our students and will continue to explore ways of disseminating this information.

Principal Author: Fatma Kassamali, Director of Career Counseling

CURRICULUM

Background

Charged with investigating the state of the curriculum with respect to matters of diversity, and with finding ways to foster improvements in this area, the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) identified three areas in which to concentrate its efforts this year: (1) learning more about student interest in particular courses with such a bearing that might be offered by faculty currently at Williams; (2) helping to determine priorities for judicious new hiring that would enable the College to enhance its curricular diversity; and (3) preparing for a re-examination of the Peoples and Cultures course requirement for students, which is due to be reviewed in the near future together with other curricular requirements that have been introduced in recent years.

The last two of these matters will occupy the Committee's attention during April and May. In recent years, the CEP has played an important role in assessing departmental and program staffing requests as part of its annual business. Late in the spring semester, in a joint meeting with the Committee on Appointments and Promotions, which has an important effect on the College's hiring policy for the following year, the CEP will present its views on the priorities to be established among competing claims. Prominent among our thoughts will be curricular needs related to diversity, the impact of recent successes in minority hiring on programs and departments, and ways in which new hiring might support these gains. The impact of the Peoples and Cultures requirement on curricular diversity seems more ambiguous. This requirement (that each student take at least one semester course centrally concerned with non-North American, non-European peoples and cultures) has virtually no effect on those students most concerned with diversifying the curriculum (who do not need a requirement to prompt them to take courses of this kind); nor has it markedly affected the curricular choices of most other students, inasmuch as approximately 90 percent of the student body, in the year before the requirement was put in place, would already have satisfied it of their own choice. Later in the spring, the CEP will therefore begin the process of assessing the value of the requirement as it stands, and of exploring for future consideration other options that might have a greater impact on curricular choices (among the latter, we will revisit an alternative "social justice" requirement that was proposed in 2001, and was narrowly

defeated in a faculty vote). We hope that the Initiatives' outside visitors may be able to assist us by suggesting other mechanisms for enhancing students' exposure to courses addressing issues of diversity.

During the past three months, the CEP's endeavors concerning diversity have focused on gathering student opinion on new courses that would meet perceived needs of this kind. To that end, we solicited suggestions from all students late in the fall semester, and some members of the Committee also participated in a very helpful meeting with members of the Minority Coalition. In both instances, anticipating that students' first thought would be to urge substantial new hiring that would in practice be difficult to carry out in the short term, we called their attention to the longer time-frame necessary for developing entirely new faculty positions, and asked that they suggest particular courses or sub-fields related to the teaching interests of faculty already at Williams that they would like to see offered. We acknowledged that competing demands on our faculty members, as well as limitations in their areas of expertise, would prevent many of these suggestions from being carried out, but pointed out that if even a few current faculty members were to offer new courses as a result of their suggestions, these improvements could be effected much more quickly and economically than would be the case with new hiring.

We received proposals from a substantial number of students, well over 100, the majority of whom coordinated their efforts and produced quite comprehensive slates of suggestions for new or restored course offerings in three fields in particular: Asian-Pacific-American Studies, Arabic language, and Jewish Studies. Members of the Minority Coalition had also expressed in more general ways their concern to see expansion of the curriculum related to South Asia, as well as enhancements in the African-American Studies concentration. The CEP is distributing our findings in summary form to department and program chairs, with the recommendation that they encourage interested faculty to consider offering such courses. While for the most part these suggestions will only begin to affect course planning next December and January, we have already succeeded in prompting the late submission of at least two courses – one in Jewish studies and one in the literature of British colonialism—to be taught next year. It is therefore clear that this process can result in valuable, if modest, gains in diversifying the curriculum. We would like to thank the members of the Minority Coalition, and particularly the Asian-American Students in Action, the Muslim Students Union, and the Williams College Jewish Association, for their efforts on behalf of this initiative.

Meanwhile, it is a pleasure to note that, as described elsewhere in this report, several departments and programs anticipated many of the needs expressed by these students, and have already succeeded in new hiring that will significantly enhance educational opportunities in these areas. Most notably, American Studies has hired a specialist in Asian-American literature, Classics an assistant professor able to teach a variety of Jewish Studies courses, and Comparative Literature an assistant professor whose areas of expertise include the teaching of Arabic—the kinds of courses that drew the heaviest responses to our solicitation. (The ongoing efforts to hire a senior African-Americanist will also, if successful, strengthen that program considerably.) Moreover, the CEP

supported, and the faculty approved, proposals by the International Studies Program to add a specialization in South and Southeast Asia, and by the African-American Studies program to revise its concentration, adding an introductory and a capstone course; these structural improvements will enhance the curriculum of those concentrations. Although the course offerings for next year have not yet been finally determined, it is clear that as a result of all of these efforts, approximately two dozen new courses relevant to students' suggestions have already been developed in time for next year's curriculum.

It is clear that interest among students in diversifying the curriculum in several different fields is lively, already quite widespread, and apparently growing. The CEP is also convinced that the College in general, and several departments and programs in particular, have been earnestly and energetically engaged for some time in trying to hire new faculty to meet these needs. That no review of diversity in the curriculum was necessary to spur such efforts is evident by the fact that every field in which students responding to our solicitation called for enhanced curriculum was already being successfully strengthened, by new hiring and by structural improvements to interdisciplinary programs, even as these suggestions were being forwarded to the committee. Nonetheless, the College will need to continue its efforts to hire new faculty to meet these emerging needs, though the CEP recognizes the importance of doing so judiciously, with due consideration to the need to sustain existing programs at a time when the size of the faculty cannot be further expanded to any significant degree.

Recommendations

Given the College's successes this year in diversifying the curriculum, our recommendations for the future are relatively modest.

Recommendations concerning new hiring will have to await our review of staffing requests later this spring. For the moment, our predisposition is to urge a balancing of considerations: on the one hand, that newly introduced fields of study (e.g., Arabic language) be supported by modest further hiring where this may be necessary to allow these programs to take root; and on the other hand, that these fields establish their claims to further commitment of faculty resources by sustaining a pattern of steady enrollments over time.

Individual departments and programs are being apprised of particular course and sub-field suggestions relevant to them that we received from students. We are recommending that the chairs concerned canvas their departments for faculty members who may be willing to create or to reintroduce courses that would meet some of these needs. To the same end, we will recommend that in future years the CEP regularly solicit student opinion concerning such curricular needs (whether by appealing to all students or by meeting routinely with the Minority Coalition and its constituent organizations), and channel students' suggestions to the relevant departments and programs. We have also urged students interested in promoting curricular diversification to work through the

Majors Committees that many departments have established, and we are reminding chairs of the value of garnering such advice.

We will be recommending that next year's CEP take up consideration of the Peoples and Cultures requirement and of possible alternatives to it, with a view to bringing this matter before the faculty. If our own discussions of this subject this spring should result in any consensus on the current requirement, or disclose an alternative mechanism that seems to us promising, we will pass along our views to the new Committee.

Principal Author: Stephen Tift, Chair of the Committee on Educational Policy and Professor of English

FACULTY RECRUITMENT

Recruiting a diverse faculty is a common goal among American colleges and universities. At Williams, we believe this should be a top institutional priority, for several reasons. The first is the reason traditionally advanced for affirmative action: namely, that in correcting the injustices of the past, we need to make a concerted effort to bring members of traditionally underrepresented minorities (students and faculty) into our traditionally White institution. Doing so functions as a form of collective restitution and works to level what has been historically an uneven playing field.

The second reason, at least as important, is that as student populations diversify so too should the professoriate. We have made great progress in bringing more students of different ethnic and racial backgrounds to the campus. To thrive, they need to see themselves, their experiences, and their intellectual interests represented in the curriculum and in the faculty. Faculty members, too, derive benefit from interaction with a diverse group of colleagues, as they bring together different ideas, different experiences, and different scholarly traditions.

Williams College has been actively committed to recruiting a diverse faculty since the early 1970s, when the Civil Rights Movement and the move to coeducation forced the issue. The history of the effort is best recounted in the Appendix to the Annual Hiring and Affirmative Action Report. The January 1995 Report from the Committee on Diversity and Community (CDC) also provides a nice insider's view of the rationale for diversity, among students and faculty alike. (Both documents are available by contacting news@williams.edu.) For the external view, various reports track diversity at Williams in context with groups of highly selective colleges and universities.

One shows that, while Williams was above the group mean for Black and Hispanic faculty in 1992 and 2002, the rate of progress has been slow. Over those 10 years, the number of Black and Hispanic professors in the peer group as a whole increased at a rate

of about 3.2 percent per year, but their representation among the total population of professors in the group increased only at a rate of about 0.15 percent each year, i.e., from 4.5 percent in 1992 to 6.0 percent in 2002.

At Williams, Black, Hispanic, and other minority faculty are few, and even the appointment or departure of one of them can skew the statistics, but it appears that our growth has been very slightly slower than that reported for the peer group. Between 1992 and 2002, the number of Black and Hispanic professors at Williams increased from 15 to 19, or at a rate of about 2.7 percent per year. Within the total Williams faculty population, their representation increased at a rate of 0.14 percent per year, i.e. from 7.1 percent in 1992 to 8.5 percent in 2002. Table 32 shows a graphical breakdown of these statistics. As we shall see, we have enjoyed more success in increasing minority representation on the faculty over the last few years (Tables 40 and 41).

Data Collection

Producing statistics based on such small populations can be misleading. Therefore most of the analysis conducted for this report is based on aggregate data. We look across 5- to 10-year periods of time; we combine all ranks to compare faculty growth between men and women; and we combine Blacks, Hispanics, and Asians (including Asians and Asian Americans) to chart the success of our recruitment efforts. The peer group institutions have a combined faculty population of approximately 10,000, and at that level it is possible to look at diversity within the different ranks of the professoriate and across the major academic divisions. That type of analysis at Williams would be unreliable given the relatively small number of data points.

This report draws on three data sets. The first is historical data compiled by the Assistant to the President for Affirmative Action on the size and demographic composition of the faculty. The second is comparative data drawn from the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), showing faculty demographics at Williams and 10 highly selective liberal arts colleges over the past 10 years. The Office of Institutional Research downloaded and organized this large data set. The third data source is a five-year accounting of how many PhDs were awarded in fields taught at Williams within the major race groups as compared with the composition of our candidate pools at each stage of the hiring process. The Office of the Assistant to the President compiled the raw data; the Provost's Office provided the summary statistics.

Cumulative Faculty Growth

- About five years ago, the College set out to add 30 new positions to the faculty. We have now achieved that goal. (Table 33)
- In the last 10 years, the faculty increased in size from 202 to 245 full-time tenured and tenure-track positions, representing cumulative growth of 21 percent.

- We currently have 164 tenured professors and 81 assistant professors. This 2:1 ratio compares with 1.4:1 in 1994-95.
- In addition to expanding the faculty, we, of course, also have had to replace those who retired, resigned, or completed their contracts. On average, since 1994-95, we have made 14 tenured or tenure-track hires each year—from a low of six to a high of 24.
- We anticipate the size of the faculty next year to be 256. Among similar liberal arts colleges, Wesleyan and Oberlin have about the same number of faculty (but more students), while the others all have faculties numbering well under 200. Although members of the latter group generally have fewer students than Williams, our student to faculty ratio is favorable, accounting in part for our high position in nationwide college rankings.

Recruitment of Women

In the not so distant past, Williams was a male-dominated institution. As reported in the Hiring and Affirmative Action Report in the Annual Report of 1994, the College only began hiring women in significant numbers after the move to coeducation in the late 1960s and early 1970s.

- Table 34. It is therefore noteworthy that women now represent nearly 39 percent of the faculty, up from about 32 percent a decade ago. It is also encouraging that women represent 50.6 percent of assistant professors, up from 45.3 percent a decade ago. Male professors still comprise the majority of the tenured ranks, but as they retire the College should move closer to overall balance between men and women.
- Table 33. In absolute numbers, there were 66 women on the faculty in 94-95 and there are 95 this year. Thus, while the faculty as a whole has grown by 21 percent in the last decade, the number of women has grown by 44 percent, the number of men by 10 percent.
- Table 35. Compared with a group of peer institutions, we are in the middle of the pack in terms of the representation of women on the faculty.

Recruitment of Minorities

Our commitment to recruit a diverse faculty has gone particularly well this year. Among an incoming cohort of 17, six are Black, Hispanic, or Asian. We have one additional target-of-opportunity offer outstanding, which we hope will yield an additional minority woman faculty member. In addition, two foreign-born colleagues will join us next year.

But one strong year is no indicator of long-term success. To take a longer view, we conducted a simple analysis of the racial composition of our candidate pools for tenure-track positions (Table 36). Between 1999 and 2003, we conducted 101 searches. Twenty percent of them resulted in minority hires. We compared our percentages to the percentages of PhDs awarded annually to non-White scholars in fields taught at Williams. We also compared it to the number of candidates for our positions who self-identified as minorities, and to the racial composition of the candidate pools at the semi-finalist, finalist, and offer stage.

Between 1999 and 2003, 18 percent of those awarded PhDs nationally in fields taught at Williams were non-Whites. As noted above, we hired minorities at a rate of 20 percent over that time but there remains considerable room for improvement. Twenty-five percent of our candidates during these years self-identified as minorities, and 25 percent to 26 percent of them made it to the final stages of the hiring process, with 26 percent receiving offers.

If we look at the breakdown by division, we see similar patterns (Table 37). In the languages and arts (Div. I), we appointed minorities in 21 percent of our searches, compared with their 16 percent representation in the national pool. In the social sciences (Div. II), we appointed minorities in 20 percent of our searches, compared with their 17 percent representation in the national pool. In the sciences we were less successful, appointing minorities in 19 percent of our searches, compared to their 20 percent representation in the national pool. The department-by-department view is presented in Table 38.

Table 32 and 39 to 45 present several more views on our efforts to recruit minority faculty colleagues.

- Table 39. As with women, the growth rate for minorities on the faculty over the past decade is faster than the overall rate. While the faculty has increased in size overall by about 21 percent, the number of minorities has increased by about 45 percent—from 29 in 1994-95 to 42 this year.
- Table 40. The appointment of minority faculty has increased significantly in the last five years. In 2000-01, minorities represented 14.7 percent of the faculty. This year they represent 17 percent, and next year we project that rising to 18.8 percent.
- Table 41. We have about 50 percent more Asian and Hispanic faculty members than a decade ago, while the number of Black non-Hispanic colleagues has remained virtually unchanged.
- Table 42. Compared with our peers, we are slightly above average in the recruitment of minority faculty. Perhaps it's not surprising that one of our peers located on the west coast has a consistently high percentage. But it's interesting to note that another—located in the heart of the Midwest and not within a major metropolitan area—has seen stronger growth among this segment of their faculty. Others have grown at about the same rate we have, and just a few have really struggled.

- Table 43. We are slightly below the mean among our peers in percentage of Black non-Hispanic faculty (now representing 3.2 percent of the Williams faculty). However, the number will increase next year, for the first time in several years, pushing us up to about 4 percent.
- Table 44. We have made steady progress in our recruitment of Hispanic colleagues (now representing about 5 percent of the faculty), especially given our commitment to Latino/a Studies. We stand in the middle of the pack among our peers, and our number will increase with next year's cohort.
- Table 45. Asians compose 9 percent of the faculty this year, and, again, the number will go up next year. We are somewhat above the mean among our peers.

Next Steps

The following recommendations may facilitate our efforts to further diversify the faculty.

- Continue to allocate FTE to curricular areas in which we are likely to attract minority candidates. Critical to our recent success in bringing minorities onto the faculty has been that we have begun hiring into interdisciplinary programs (Latina/o Studies, American Studies, African American Studies). Such hires not only serve the goal of diversifying the faculty, but also allow us to develop specific curricular areas not associated with the traditional academic disciplines, and also to enhance interdisciplinary pedagogy at Williams.
- Make multiple hires. One appointment made this year appears likely to result in a second, target-of-opportunity, hire in the same field. This could be a model for future searches.
- Make additional target-of-opportunity hires. One easy route is through our Bolin Dissertation Fellowship Program. Indeed, the Bolin Program provides us with the opportunity to recruit from within our own ranks of visitors. Bolin Fellows are from underrepresented groups, and with 2-3 of them here each year, we have a steady pool of strong candidates to consider for promotion to the tenure stream. To date, only two of the Bolin Fellows in the past 20 years have been appointed as assistant professors. One of this year's fellows, however, will join the tenure-track faculty this July.
- Ensure that search committees are diverse in representation and informed on student diversity concerns.
- Ensure the success of the Williams in New York Program. The promise of this program has already proven attractive to prospective minority colleagues.

Principal Author: John Gerry, Associate Dean of the Faculty

FACULTY RETENTION

In 1994-95, Williams had 202 full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty members. Now, ten years later in 2004-05, the size of the full-time academic faculty stands at 245, representing cumulative growth of 21 percent. Most of this growth has come in the last five years as 30 new positions have been added (Table 33).

At the same time, departments have worked to replace a number of colleagues who have either not been reappointed or promoted, or who have chosen to resign voluntarily. On average, six professors resign each year, for a total of 54 since 1995-96 (Table 46). This section of the Self Study attempts to examine the reasons for those departures and to determine whether there are any common threads, especially as they might relate to demographics of race and gender. As Williams works to diversify the curriculum, to keep class sizes small, and to attract students of many ethnic and socio-economic backgrounds, faculty retention is an important concern.

Background

There are perhaps two primary questions that present themselves in a study of faculty retention. First: Who leaves? This question is perhaps best studied using quantitative data, to determine whether there are any patterns in the departures. Are they predominantly men or women? Are they predominantly White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, or of any other racial/ethnic group. Are they tenured or untenured? Are they married or single? Data on all of these variables are kept by the Dean of the Faculty and are therefore easily compiled and studied. Other demographics that might prove interesting within this study are sexual orientation/identity and religious affiliation. However, the Dean of the Faculty does not keep track of these things, so no empirical observations are possible.

The second primary question to ask about departing faculty members is: Why do they leave? This question is perhaps best studied using qualitative data, gleaned from exit interviews and retrospective surveys, as well as from the first-hand knowledge of deans, department chairs, and other colleagues. The Dean of the Faculty's Office has, in fact, kept a running record of the reasons offered for faculty resignations since 1995-96 (Table 47). Otherwise, the College has not conducted any systematic studies of faculty retention.

Some turnover in the faculty ranks is inevitable. Colleagues resign for a variety of personal and professional reasons over which the College has no control. Our goal in this study is to determine whether there are any institutional practices or environmental factors—over which we do have control—that might be adjusted to prevent unnecessary attrition, especially among underrepresented groups within the faculty.

Process

The Office of the Dean of the Faculty was assigned primary responsibility for conducting this study, together with the Committee on Appointments and Promotions (CAP). The Faculty Steering Committee has also taken an active interest in the methods and results of the study, and the Assistant to the President for Affirmative Action has provided historical data, advice, and reference material. Our progress has been sporadic. We made steady headway throughout the late fall and early winter but lost some momentum during the faculty-hiring season. Indeed, our efforts to *recruit* a diverse faculty this spring have taken precedence (for this is surely a key factor in the effort to *retain* a diverse faculty). The retention and faculty satisfaction studies will therefore have to be an ongoing effort, and our discussion in this report should be considered preliminary.

On the quantitative side of the study, the Dean of the Faculty's Office and the Affirmative Action Office have been tracking the comings and goings of faculty for years. The Administrative Coordinator of Faculty Affairs compiled cohort data spanning recent years. For each academic year, she started with the sum total of professors hired and broke that number down into male vs. female counts and into racial categories—White, Black, Hispanic, and Asian. She then tracked retention statistics for each cohort at five points in time: 1) before their reappointment reviews; 2) just after, and as a result of, the reappointment decision; 3) after reappointment but before the tenure review; 4) just after, and as a result of, the tenure decision; and 5) after receiving tenure. This data tracks the number of professors of each sex and each race who have left Williams and at which stages of their careers (Table 48).

On the qualitative side of the study, the CAP formulated several questions to ask of faculty members who have voluntarily left the College since 1995-96. As indicated above, there are 54 who have done so. However, some of those (N=14) left because they were given a clear signal that they would not be reappointed or tenured. The CAP determined that we should not call those individuals. Indeed, the retention topic is moot in these cases, as it is for a whole separate set of former faculty members: those who served out their contracts after being denied reappointment or tenure. The CAP eliminated a number of additional names (N=12) from the survey pool for a variety of special circumstances. The Associate Dean of the Faculty was charged with contacting those remaining on the list (N=28) by phone. To date, he has located and spoken to 21 of them. Three of those remaining have not responded to several messages, and may not want to participate in this study. We have not been able to find contact information for the final four.

Given this sampling strategy, it is important to point out the study is non-random. It is possible that those who weren't interviewed have views on diversity at Williams that are not represented among those who were interviewed. The Faculty Steering Committee has also questioned the wisdom of having these interviews be conducted by a member of the Dean of the Faculty's Office. Their preference would have been for an outside consultant to place the calls, to avoid any possible conflict of interest between the interviewer and the respondents.

These cautions aside, the interviews were conducted with promises of confidentiality. Moreover, the questions were crafted to elicit broad response and so as not to force the topic of diversity into the conversation. The phone calls ranged in length from 10 minutes to nearly two hours, depending on the respondents' level of interest.

Survey Results

This section will summarize, in turn, the responses given to each of the five survey questions. The sample population to date consists of 21 individuals, including 10 women, 11 men, and seven minorities. All but four of them resigned from Williams as assistant professors. In the next discussion section, we turn to an explication of quantitative data drawn from the cohort study.

Question 1: In general, during your time at Williams, how did you find the climate in your department?

The topic of diversity was rarely raised in response to this question. Most of the answers focused on the social climate, mentorship, and collegiality within the departments, or on habits of work. The commentary was mostly positive. Many of those who were assistant professors while at Williams recalled an atmosphere of friendly support in their departments. The workloads were demanding but they felt that their senior colleagues were watching out for them and providing good mentorship. A few were effusive in their praise of department climate, recalling their time at Williams with great fondness and nostalgia. They spoke of intellectually stimulating dialogue, of friendships formed, and of careers enhanced. But this wasn't true in every case. A couple members of one department complained of "insane" workloads—too much teaching, to the detriment of scholarship—and of curmudgeonly senior colleagues. They were demoralized and felt as if they were constantly being evaluated. In a couple other cases, individuals recalled feeling isolated within a small department, where nobody shared common scholarly interests. A few of those who had long careers at Williams recalled that the climates in their departments were mostly healthy and civil (if not "wonderful"), with an occasional period of dissension and complacency. But again, negative commentary was rare.

Subjects of diversity were raised spontaneously by just two of those interviewed. One assistant professor (White female) sensed that women were not highly valued in her department, to the extent that they were not paid as well as men. She cited several sexist remarks made by the department chair that contributed to her eventual decision to leave the College. Another assistant professor (minority male) complained of a hiring bias in his department. For several years he watched silently as many qualified minority applicants were passed over in favor of White applicants. In his view the discrimination was deliberate, and he pinned the blame on several senior members of the department. When a new chair took over, he and a colleague took the initiative to voice their concerns and the situation reversed itself almost immediately.

Question 2: *In general, during your time at Williams, how did you find the climate within the College as a whole?*

For the most part, the responses to this question focused on issues relating to faculty advancement and intellectual climate. On average, the College as a whole was described as being less friendly and nurturing than the departments, though most claimed to have enjoyed their time here, saying that Williams was professional, friendly, and supportive. Several (including male and female minorities) said that they had loved Williams and that it was a terrific place to be a teacher.

Nevertheless, a common theme among the assistant professors was that the tenure process was arduous and that they often felt stressed out. There was little time for them to do anything but work. One (White male) described it as a “pressure-cooker” environment, with too much emphasis given to Student Course Surveys (SCS). Another (White female) said that she was expected to give 90 percent of her time to teaching, 100 percent to research, and that a hobby would be frowned upon. Another (White female) described the academic climate as “driven” and the overall climate as “cool.” She commented that Williams is a very “east coast” institution and that there is a surface cordiality that is tough to break through. A few others made similar comments about their colleagues being friendly but distant, because they were all so busy working. It was hard for them to make friends beyond their own departments. Young, unmarried faculty members in particular, remarked that they often felt lonely.

In terms of the intellectual climate, the consensus opinion was that the College values academic achievement and places an especially high value on quality teaching. At the same time, some felt that students were short-changed because there were not enough intellectual demands placed on the faculty. One assistant professor (minority male) thought that the faculty should be encouraged to publish more and to conduct more research, as this feeds back into the classroom. A professor (White male) who had a long career at Williams before leaving felt that the College lost some of its intellectual vigor during his time. He said that there were too many positive tenure decisions and that the complacency of the faculty grew to match the complacency of the students, to the point that the notion of Williams as a “research college” was lost.

Subjects of diversity were volunteered by three of those interviewed. One of them (White female) commented as follows:

The climate overall was a tad too homogenous.... There was not enough visible diversity in faculty, staff, and students’ ethnic and socio-economic status backgrounds and/or sexual orientations. The result was a larger degree of intellectual conformity in both faculty and students as compared to other institutions I had experience with (Ivy League). There were many intellectual achievements at Williams but not as much creativity and innovation.

A second assistant professor (White male) closely echoed these sentiments. He thought the diversity statistics were misleading and that the campus was overwhelmingly White. He spoke of a “strange sense of homogeneity.” The third (minority male) recalled an incident of racism involving a member of the College support staff and some students. He says that he tried to advocate on behalf of the students, but that the administration was unresponsive to his efforts. This same assistant professor remarked that there was racial bias involved in making key administrative appointments.

Question 3: *In general, during your time at Williams, how did you find the climate in the wider community?*

The responses to this question were nearly unanimous in characterizing Williamstown as small and isolated. Indeed, most respondents felt that they never really got to know the town beyond the College, in part because of the perception that “the College is the town,” but also because they focused so intensely on their jobs that they didn’t have time to participate in community activities. Some liked the smallness, intimacy, and familiarity of the town, but others found it dull and constricting. An extreme version of this opinion was voiced by a faculty member (White male) who characterized Williamstown as “too cozy... too closed... stultifying... not terribly social... and a goddam Yankee town.” Several others remarked that it was very difficult and lonely to live in Williamstown as a single person. Ultimately, several young faculty members left Williams even though they loved their jobs, because they felt that there was no promise of a meaningful social life here.

It is interesting to note that this question elicited more commentary on the subject of diversity than any other. Seven of those interviewed had something to say about it. At one end of the spectrum was an assistant professor (White female) who said that Williamstown is amazingly diverse compared to where she ended up, and that she misses it. At the other end of the spectrum was an assistant professor (White female) who said that the racial and socio-economic homogeneity of Williamstown was the major factor in her decision to leave. Others spoke about religious intolerance in the town, about feeling isolated as a gay person, and about it being a difficult place to live as a person of color. One faculty member (minority male) characterized the town as “just plain White” but said that he never found it to be a problem. He thought that the lack of diversity was noticeable at the community level but not within the College. Finally, one faculty member (minority male) complained of growing irritated with the community and the College because he routinely found himself being trotted out as a token. He was invited to many special events and dinners, he is sure, only because he was one of the few people of color on the faculty.

Question 4: *Did you find that Williams was supportive of your needs—for teaching, scholarship, and community life?*

The responses to this question were typically short and direct. Most often the answer was

an unequivocal yes. Only one person complained of being poorly paid, while several others said that they were very well compensated. Some complained of the heavy teaching load (since reduced), but most said that the College was very supportive of their efforts in the classroom. The assistant professors received good mentoring from their senior colleagues, and the Project for Effective Teaching (PET) was often cited as a valuable resource. Also, quite a few individuals said that the funding opportunities for curricular development were excellent or “fantastic.” Several bemoaned the lack of similar resources at their current colleges or universities.

They were similarly enthusiastic about the research funding available at Williams, though a few mentioned that scholarship should have been given greater precedence. One professor who had quite strong feelings about this said that teaching was emphasized to the detriment of scholarship, and that productive scholars were not given adequate recognition, financially or otherwise. More than one assistant professor had similar feelings. One of them said that it was hard to get a research program going while prepping for teaching and “getting hit over the head with quintiles” (a reference to SCS scores).

Another set of critical remarks focused on the lack of support for life in the community. A few found the housing situation difficult. Others said that the College could have done more to support faculty spouses and partners, by providing employment opportunities and/or consistent daycare.

This question really did not elicit any prolonged commentary on diversity issues. Two members of the same department mentioned that women were not well supported by their chair or senior faculty colleagues.

Question 5: Would you be willing to discuss, generally, your reasons for leaving Williams? Were there particular negative/positive aspects of your experience here that were important in your decision to leave? What were the particular positive/negative aspects of the new location that were important in your decision to leave?

The most common response to these questions focused on the spouse/partner employment issue, especially for those individuals whose spouse or partner was also an academic. Several of those interviewed stated unequivocally that they left Williams because there was no real promise of a meaningful career for their spouse or partner. When they were offered positions at institutions that were willing to hire their spouse/partners, they felt that they had no choice but to go. Others left for positions in metropolitan areas, where employment opportunities were greater, even when their spouses or partners didn't yet have firm offers in hand. For those involved in weekly or daily commuter relationships, they said that being on the road grew wearisome. In one case, a daily commute of one hour added enough stress to the family dynamic that the couple leapt at the chance to relocate. Among the seven who mentioned spouse/partner employment as a major factor in their decisions to leave, most said that there wasn't much the College could have done about it; two of them, however, left feeling that the

College could have done more to help their spouses/partners, and thus hadn't worked hard to retain them.

The second most common set of responses to these questions focused on the issue of social isolation. Young faculty members, in particular, left Williams to expand their social networks and to settle in livelier communities. They spoke of the natural beauty of the Berkshires as a real plus, and of the wholesome outdoorsiness they enjoyed, but said that these things were not enough to offset neither the loneliness that they felt, nor the dearth of social opportunities available here. More than one of them observed that Williamstown is wonderful for families; it is clean, safe, quiet, and oriented toward children. But they continued to say that it is too small and isolated, not "hurly-burly" enough, for single people. The only suggestion they offered was that the College work harder to promote more community building events among the faculty and staff.

Social isolation was not just a factor for young, single faculty members. Several of those who were married while they were here said that they left because they wanted to live in urban settings. The commute to New York or Boston was just a bit too long.

A final common theme among the responses to these questions focused on the "aura" of Williams. One assistant professor (White female) said that she left primarily because Williams was "too White and too upper class." Another (White male) said there was a sense of eliteness ("Aren't we special?") to the College that really turned him off. Others were less extreme on this point but nevertheless said that the intensity of the work ethic ("too much teaching, too much service"), and the seriousness with which most faculty members took their work, was not to their liking. A third assistant professor (White male) commented on his relationship with the students, and described it as a poor ideological fit. He explained that the students here, while spectacularly smart and capable, were largely from a different world than he was accustomed to. He had trouble relating to them and didn't feel that he was making much of a difference in their lives. He left to work at a college where the students are not as talented, but where they appreciate him more. Moreover, there's less pressure in his new job, thus more research productivity. He only complained that his earnings potential is not as high now as it would have been if he'd stayed at Williams, but he has no regrets about leaving.

In a topic related to diversity, a couple of faculty members said that they left in part because they felt that Williams was not a truly intellectual place. They sought a research environment where a higher premium was placed on scholarship (in tenure reviews, for example) and less emphasis given to teaching. The draw of working with graduate students was part of this, as was the allure of belonging to larger departments, with more colleagues sharing similar research goals. But most of all they said that they needed to be in a place where new ideas were being generated, and that this was most likely to happen at a university, where there would be a larger and more diverse faculty, and a larger and more diverse student body.

There were just a few additional comments about diversity that were raised in response to this question, but this topic seemed not to be as important as the other reasons listed

above. Diversity was sometimes seen as a “pull” factor in their decisions to leave, rather than a “push” factor; i.e., they left to go to a new job where there would be greater diversity, and this was seen as attractive, but they didn’t leave Williams because they were bothered by—or pushed away by—diversity issues here.

Everybody who was interviewed for this study had a reason for leaving Williams. In listing them above it is easy to focus on the negative commentary. Nevertheless it is important to note that most of the respondents spoke fondly of their time at Williams. They felt as if they were well paid and had good benefits, they felt that they were well supported as teachers and scholars, and they mostly liked their colleagues and the students. By and large they were not unhappy, and many of them chose to leave for personal or professional reasons that the College could not respond to. However, as mentioned in the preamble to this discussion, it’s possible that the sample population chosen for these interviews is not entirely representative. Table 48 presents a more neutral but less nuanced picture of why faculty members have resigned over the past decade. It is built not from the telephone survey data, but rather from an annual accounting of departures compiled by the Office of the Dean of the Faculty.

Cohort Study Results

A more quantitative approach to the study of faculty retention is provided by tracking attrition within faculty cohorts through time. Between 1994-95 and 2004-05, Williams hired 153 full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty members, but given attrition, the overall size of the faculty has only increased by 43 positions. Table 48 shows cohort attrition history between 1989 and 2000. The years 2001 to 2005 are not included in the summary analysis since most of the faculty hired in the last five years have not yet been reviewed for tenure, and many not even for assistant professor reappointment. Thus, they have not yet been through several of the career landmarks that contribute to attrition.

In looking at the breakdown of the summary data as it tracks attrition among men and women (Tables 50), it appears as if fewer women stay at Williams (47 percent) than do men (54 percent). But this trend is not due to a disparity in promotion rates. Men and women were both denied reappointment at a rate of 1 percent, and both were denied tenure at a rate of 19 percent. However, it seems that women choose voluntarily to leave earlier in their careers than do men, either before the reappointment or before the tenure review. After being tenured, 6 percent of the men and only 1 percent of the women on the faculty chose to leave.

The view on the retention of minority vs. non-minority faculty is somewhat less dependable given that there were just 22 minority faculty members hired between 1989 and 2000. Nevertheless, as Table 49 illustrates, the attrition rate among minorities (60 percent) is significantly greater than among non-minorities (49 percent). This difference is accounted for primarily by the fact that minority faculty members leave in greater numbers after being tenured. Breaking these data down by racial group renders numbers too small to analyze.

Next Steps

We posed two questions on the subject of faculty retention at the outset of this report: 1) Who leaves? and 2) Why do they leave? In response to the first, there are no strong patterns in the data. Women leave slightly more often than do men, and minorities seem to leave somewhat more often than do non-minorities. It is difficult to explain these trends. There does not appear to be a significant bias in promotion rate between men and women; and while minority faculty members left slightly more often than non-minorities due to reappointment and tenure decisions, the sample size is too small to indicate whether this is a real trend.

In response to the second question, there are many answers. The reasons most often cited had to do with the spouse/partner employment situation, the intensity of the teaching work load, the geographic isolation of Williamstown, and the dearth of social opportunities for young, unmarried faculty. Diversity issues were only occasionally mentioned as a factor in the decision to leave.

Our recommendations are broad and simple.

- Encourage recruitment of faculty within curricular areas that are likely to attract applicants from underrepresented groups. We need to keep in mind that we teach in a traditionally White college in rural New England. And, despite recent demographic changes, we still live in a largely White society. As a result, White Americans are frequently not conscious of their racial identity and tend therefore to underestimate its importance for those belonging to racial minorities. Racial consciousness develops particularly when one finds oneself in a racial minority. If one is non-White in the US, one is racially self-conscious in a way that White people are not. That self-consciousness can take the form of the potentially oppressive sense of oneself as being different from most everyone else. Here at the College, having a racially diverse faculty (and student body) reduces self-consciousness as a sense of alienation and has the potential to increase self-awareness, empathy, and understanding. In a sense, by increasing the diversity of the faculty, we reduce the “minority” experience here at Williams.
- Continue to build diversity within the student body in terms of race and income.
- Continue to support the spouse/partner employment initiative. The first Spouse/Partner Employment Counselor was hired on a trial basis. It is now clear that this position is important and has become a permanent part of the administrative staff. We should encourage more outreach via the Professional Development Fund for Spouses and Partners, and we should continue to participate in the Academic Career Network, which puts us in contact with nearby colleges to advertise tenure-track and adjunct job opportunities.

- Continue to support the Project for Effective Teaching. This program provides young faculty members with an important social network that cuts across disciplinary boundaries.
- Maintain high funding levels for curricular development and faculty research. Almost everybody who has left agrees that the financial support they received at Williams was outstanding.
- Support community-building initiatives.
- Since the retention of minority faculty and the experience of minority students are enhanced by the presence of minority staff, continue to increase efforts to recruit such staff, perhaps from the nearest metropolitan areas.

Principal Author: John Gerry, Associate Dean of the Faculty

FACULTY SATISFACTION

This part of the Initiatives addresses how effective Williams is in creating a workplace that serves the needs of a diverse faculty. The Faculty Steering Committee is taking a three-pronged approach to this question, consisting of surveys, informal meetings, and confidential interviews. Because the results of surveys and confidential interviews will not be available until this fall, the recommendations presented here are necessarily preliminary. They are drawn from the suggestions made to us at meetings on diversity issues to which all faculty were invited. While we invited discussion of all aspects of faculty diversity, the majority of comments we received centered on issues of race and ethnicity. This may be due to the strong awareness among faculty of the events in summer and fall 2004 that lead into this initiative. Some concerns about diversity of sexual orientation and of religion were also brought to us, however they were sufficiently sparse that we cannot yet pull them together to suggest solutions. We hope that the surveys and confidential interviews will shed more light on these important topics.

Surveys. The College is collecting quantitative data on faculty satisfaction through the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) survey administered by UCLA, and these data will be available for study over the summer. The results will allow the Steering Committee and administration to gain some insight into how faculty perceive their work and the demands on their time, as well as their satisfaction with the culture and practices of the College. Since the surveys were designed for use at a variety of campuses by HERI, they leave unasked some questions that are important at Williams. Furthermore, no multiple-choice survey can capture the nuances of faculty experience, satisfaction, and hopes for the future. To gain a more complete insight, we put together informal open

meetings to which all faculty were invited, as well as confidential interviews to take place this fall.

Informal Meetings. The Steering Committee invited all faculty to relate their experiences and observations about diversity at Williams at group open meetings and individual meetings. Eighteen faculty ranging from newly hired to almost retired took part in these discussions, and several major themes emerged.

1) Mentoring responsibilities. One problem raised repeatedly is the large mentoring burden that rests disproportionately on faculty of color and creates significant workload issues. This inequity originates in the fact that the student body is rapidly becoming more diverse, while the faculty lags somewhat behind. The ultimate solutions to this mismatch include: a) hiring more faculty of color (particularly in those areas of cultural studies in which students are very eager to seek role models); and b) finding ways for more White faculty to become effective mentors for students of color. However, a number of administrative approaches to reducing the mentoring burden were also proposed.

- *Organized mentoring roles within departments.* The CAP should consider requiring all departments to establish a mechanism to distribute advising roles among their faculty. Suggested approaches include having one person in charge of advising (and giving that person appropriate course release) or assigning each major to a specific advisor in the sophomore year. (In the second case an equitable distribution of advising responsibilities among department faculty should be carefully maintained.) Any departmental scheme should include general academic advising as well as mentoring for Mellon-Mays fellowships, summer research, etc. Such a system would ideally serve the dual purpose of distributing advising/mentoring roles more equitably, as well as providing recognition for those faculty who do take on particularly heavy advising responsibilities.
- *Teaching load adjustments.* Most faculty we spoke to did not support long-term teaching load reductions as either a hiring tool or to compensate for common mentoring responsibilities. However, short-term teaching load reductions to compensate particular mentoring/advising responsibilities were encouraged by a number of faculty.

2) The challenges of working within small programs. Challenges reported to us included intellectual isolation, the demands of program building, and the curricular struggles of teaching courses whose value is not always recognized by a department. Many of the solutions to these problems relate to hiring and to institutional commitment to and structuring of programs (for example, whether faculty who teach in programs operate independently or are gathered under one overarching cluster, and whether the individual programs are large enough to ensure that program building does not fall to just one individual).

3) Hiring and critical mass. The key issues of job satisfaction brought to us by faculty of color come back, at least in part, to the numbers of such faculty on campus and to our effectiveness in hiring. As a result, many of the conversations we had about faculty experience centered on improving our recruitment of a diverse faculty. While some departments have been quite successful in this regard, others have diversified very little. The challenges in recruiting discussed at our meetings ranged from spousal hiring to salary, teaching loads, and problems with curriculum and particular departments or programs. We heard again and again that the College must keep a keen eye on how well it competes in hiring a diverse faculty, and must continue an absolute commitment to making strong offers even when this entails significant expense. A number of specific recommendations for hiring were brought to us.

- *Hiring strategically for programs.* Program building and the College's commitment to programs are critically important for hiring as well as for faculty satisfaction. Strong programs to which the College is clearly committed are a huge incentive when hiring, while struggling programs are off-putting to many candidates. The CAP can address this by continuing to consider hiring in clusters and hiring senior as well as mid-career and junior faculty into programs. We are encouraged at the progress made this year, and urge a continued commitment.
- *Strengthening and broadening programs for bringing new minority PhDs to campus.* The Bolin Fellowships have been quite successful in bringing doctoral candidates to campus for a year. Some of these fellows then go on to become Williams faculty in the humanities and social sciences. However, these fellowships do not work well at all in the sciences, where doctoral students are typically put at a large disadvantage by leaving their home campuses, and where post-docs are almost universally required. The CAP should work closely with the Science Executive Committee to develop one or more programs to bring PhD students and postdocs of color to campus. Possible programs would range from summer or winter study visits or teaching opportunities, which might last a month or more, to shorter visits of a few days to give a talk and meet with departments. The development of such programs is critical in the sciences where even fewer candidates of color are in the doctoral pools than in the humanities and social sciences.
- *Working to improve the effectiveness of the Bolin Fellowships.* Particularly in the semester when a Bolin Fellow is not teaching, he or she may end up quite isolated in the department and at the College. We recommend that the CAP consider adding modest additional structures to the Bolin, such as a meeting each semester for all chairs who have a Bolin Fellow to strategize about mentoring, and a requirement that each Bolin give a job talk followed by feedback and assistance from the department in developing their application and CV.
- *Increasing the recruitment of international faculty.* The College needs to increase its expertise in reaching and recruiting candidates abroad. The Office of the

Assistant to the President should work with the CAP to develop this expertise and to track our success in bringing international faculty to campus.

- *Being aware of the material needs of those teaching and researching in new fields.* Faculty pointed out that costs for research abroad and for teaching necessities in new fields need to be acknowledged and borne by the College for some of our new hires to flourish.

Confidential interviews. Informed by the conversations this spring as well as by the survey results, the College will undertake a set of confidential interviews with faculty this fall. The questions in these interviews will be designed by the Steering Committee and Dean of the Faculty, but the interviews themselves will be performed by an outside consultant. In this way faculty participating can be assured of complete confidentiality. (The College used a process like this in studying the experiences of mid-career faculty in the Mellon “tenure +12” cohort last year.) Our final assessment of faculty satisfaction will be completed at the end of this fall, when both the HERI survey and interview data are available. At that point we will make a more complete set of recommendations for change.

STAFF

Background

Approximately 770 non-faculty employees work at the College. Roughly 280 of them are administrative staff—senior- and mid-level managers, exempt from federal overtime regulations. Some 490 are support staff—non-exempt, hourly workers.

Williams recruits staff at the national, regional, and local levels depending on the position. Senior managers are recruited nationally, mid- and entry-level administrative staff may be recruited regionally or nationally, and, for the most part, support staff are hired from Williamstown and the surrounding communities.

The College has had limited success in diversifying the staff at the senior- and mid-management levels. Williams has and continues to broaden its outreach for jobs at these levels in a number of ways, including hiring search firms with diverse networks, sending job announcements through our Alumni Relations Office to alumni of color, and advertising in publications targeted to minority groups.

We have been more successful in diversifying jobs within the support staff, albeit from a much more homogenous area. Much of the minority representation among the support staff, however, has come as a result of the College’s ability to hire members of families who came to the area from Honduras and Cambodia in the late-70s to mid-80s. Demographic information for the local area as of 2004 US census data is as follows:

Berkshire County:	
Asian/Pacific Islander	0.9 percent
Black	1.7 percent
Hispanic	1.4 percent

Bennington County:	
Asian/Pacific Islander	1.1 percent
Black	1.2 percent
Hispanic	1.3 percent

By comparison, Williams’ support staff is 5 percent non-White; the figure for upper- and mid-level administrative staff is 7 percent.

Factors other than local demographics affect levels of minority representation among staff. One is low turnover. Resignations and retirements have averaged between 4 percent and 7 percent in each of the past four years, and in the single digits for many more years.

Another reason is the College’s success in promoting from within. While we have recruited nationally in recent years for a number of senior and mid-level managers, internal candidates demonstrated a strong knowledge of the organization and their profession and were promoted. The College understands the need to balance its value of diversity with its value of developing and promoting current staff.

One way the College has attempted to diversify its employee population and to provide career development opportunities in specific fields has been by designating some positions as targets-of-opportunity for recent graduates from historically underrepresented groups. These positions generally have a fixed term and in some cases have been created as internships. They are primarily in athletics, alumni relations, campus life, admission, and financial aid. The College has been fortunate to hire talented recent graduates. Unfortunately, after their term many of them leave to pursue jobs elsewhere or to attend graduate school.

Williams continues to expand its efforts to recruit a more diverse non-faculty employee body. While aware of the challenges, we remain determined to find new avenues for spreading word among target populations of our job opportunities.

Next Steps

- Diversity in employment at Williams can take many forms. One way is the recruitment and retention of women in jobs in which they are historically underrepresented, such as the trades. The College has had some success in this area, but identifying such candidates and hiring them for these jobs within the local community will remain a challenge.

- More productive resources that enhance the diversity of applicant pools for positions that are recruited nationally should be identified.
- Managers should be further educated and supported in identifying and, where possible, hiring qualified candidates from historically underrepresented groups.
- Managers should be further educated and supported in orienting new members to the College and assisting in their transition into Williamstown and the surrounding communities.
- Preliminary discussions have begun of formally assessing staff satisfaction. Any such effort would need to include a look at whether employee experiences differ by background and how staff members experience the College's growing diversity.

Principal Author: Martha Tetrault, Director of Human Resources

ALUMNI

Overview

Under the leadership of Francis Oakley, Williams experienced an unprecedented influx of minority students. During his presidency (1985 to 1993) students of color grew from 11 percent to 25 percent. Since then, minority students have continued to matriculate in double-digit numbers, subsequently increasing the number of graduates of color from slightly more than 1,000 when I returned to Williams in 1992 to more than 2,700 in 2005. (For data on alumni see Appendix D.)

Although the critical mass of minority students on campus today has certainly made a difference in the comfort level enjoyed by non-White students, there are still vestiges of an elitist, homogeneous culture that may be limiting the ways minority students experience Williams and ultimately impede the way these students become engaged alumni. The life-long relationship with the College that seems to come so naturally to the majority alumni population is often elusive to the minority Williams graduate.

This report will explore how the undergraduate experience for many students of color is less rewarding than it is for their White counterparts. We will look at some of the reasons why and how this sense of dissatisfaction lowers the desire of minority alumni to re-engage with Williams, particularly without the support of other graduates of color. And we will explore how affinity connections after graduation help to promote reconciliation. In addition, we will look at new solutions to resurfacing issues that may make a

difference in buoying the level of confidence graduates of color have about Williams, hence enabling this cohort to change its visiting status to that of permanent resident.

The Undergraduate Experience for Alumni of Color: Visitors in Their Own Home

Both quantitative and anecdotal evidence support the fact that many students of color at Williams are less satisfied with their undergraduate experience than their White counterparts. Why is this? After interacting with a number of alumni of color from all eras, the theme which resonates throughout my many discussions is the same: The College administration may value diversity, but does it value pluralism “–a state of society in which members of diverse ethnic, racial, religious, or social groups maintain an autonomous participation in and development of their traditional culture of special interest within the confines of a common civilization” (Webster’s New Collegiate Dictionary)?

Simply put, at Williams are we celebrating diversity or simply tolerating it? Many minority alumni believe, and have experienced, that regardless of one’s racial/ethnic background, it is more advantageous to simply assimilate and take on characteristics of the majority culture in order to succeed and be accepted. Any deviation from this schema of “blending in” is seen by the majority culture as threatening and militant. An example of this is when students of color gather together for meals or for other social interaction. Assumptions are made by Whites that these groups are segregating and “Balkanizing” themselves from Whites, or “don’t like Whites.” The reality is people find comfort in associating with their own kind. This is certainly evident in the number of “White tables” that make up an average dining hall. Or in the number of White-only tailgates at the annual Homecoming game. The issue becomes exacerbated when Whites expect minorities to take the giant step forward and integrate into a world that is still ambivalent about acceptance and parity. These issues were prevalent when I was a student 30 years ago and, unfortunately, seem to be just as common today.

Even students of color who are better able to straddle the socio-economic gap, having attended privileged schools or having been raised in predominantly White settings, are quickly reminded by their White peers that they are still different. Minority students in this category bear the burden of proving how they are able to “afford the comforts supposedly only enjoyed by Whites.” Justin Lewis, a Black alumnus in the Class of 1995, and a graduate of St. Paul’s School in N.H., recounts a story about using his laptop in his dorm room when a White student remarked, “How can you afford a laptop, you are a minority student.” Justin’s story is one of thousands in which students of color are bombarded with racial stereotyping and ignorant assumptions made by people who learn about race and culture via the television sitcom and MTV.

It is only recently in the classroom that students of color hear celebrated the lives of their ancestors. This progress is the direct result of minority students taking over campus buildings, engaging in a hunger strike, or going sleepless for weeks while they simultaneously prepare for midterms and minority heritage month programs—hardly the

kind of extracurricular activities that lend themselves to fond memories of a college experience. Or, how about that lone minority student in a classroom suddenly asked by a professor to “speak for her race”, or being told by another professor that she can’t write and he can’t believe she got into Williams?

Students of color recruited from the poorest high schools in terms of resources are measured against students from the wealthiest and most privileged secondary schools. Where do these students turn for the special assistance needed beyond the summer programs without being stigmatized? Who bears the responsibility for providing the appropriate support? There are whispers in the dorm room and in the classroom that Juanita doesn’t belong here, and she is only “taking the place of a more qualified White applicant.” There is no psychologist of color on staff when times get tough or enough faculty who are seasoned in cultural competency to make a difference. There are only a handful of faculty and staff of color who are already over-burdened with responsibility as they are constantly expected to know, “What’s wrong with them? Why won’t they participate? Why won’t they give back?”

One of the most disconcerting conversations I’ve had since being back at Williams was with Ebony Chatman ’99, a young woman from Oakland, Calif. When Ebony was a senior she told me that she would go over to Rice House (The Black Student Union) only to find students sitting around watching television day in and day out even though they all had the same challenging work load as their peers. Although we are not psychologists, Ebony and I both believed that these students were suffering from depression brought on by an environment they felt was hostile. Much like the unemployed street corner society of Tally’s Corner, these students had lost confidence in their own abilities to succeed.

Sterling Brown, Class of 1922, although now deceased, remains one of the College’s most esteemed graduates. After attending Williams, he graduated with a PhD from Harvard and went on to Howard University where he led an enviable career as a scholar and poet. In 1997, the Black Alumni Network celebrated his work in Washington, D.C., at an affair culminating the end of a successful fundraiser for a visiting professorship named in Brown’s honor. White alumnus Barton Jones ’68—a guest of the event—asked, incredulously, why, during his four years at Williams as an English major had he never heard of Sterling Brown? How could it be that Brown, this esteemed son of Williams, had become invisible and forgotten as are countless other alumni of color, about whom all students could learn and be proud to have followed in their footsteps? Learning about Brown and engaging in more culturally relevant scholarly work seems to be a missing ingredient for many students of color.

Jamaican student Laurie Ann Jackson ’05 told me recently that she wanted to do a paper on the evolution of West Indian political thought and the impact of that evolution on the modern Caribbean community. Laurie said she was told by her professor that she couldn’t do the paper because there was no one in the department who taught a course in that area and he didn’t have time to work with her because he was busy working with students who were writing senior theses. Laurie Ann is among a number of students who

feel that Williams needs to become more “academically open” in encouraging and supporting those whose intellectual interests fall outside the Western canon.

Astonishingly, White students, particularly those whose lives have never been touched by people from different races and cultures, can graduate from Williams having never increased their breadth of cultural competency, thus limiting them to engaging in an ignorant and faulty belief system throughout their tenure at the College. It is also easy for White students to interact exclusively with other Caucasians, never having to concern themselves with multiculturalism much less celebrate it. College staff who work the closest with students on a daily basis—cleaning their dormitories, serving them lunch, and supervising their work study—are rarely, if ever, trained in becoming more sensitive to the nuances of life beyond the Berkshires. This fall an African work-study student was told that he could not have a particular campus job because people wouldn’t be able to understand his accent!

After four years of explaining themselves, listening to ignorant questions, constantly having to educate majority students and staff about why they are culturally distinct, organizing and preparing for countless heritage events (with, by the way, limited attendance from those who could benefit from the experience the most), while, at the same time, taking on everything else expected from a Williams student, minority students are simply exhausted once they graduate from Williams. In the words of psychologist Alvin Poussaint, it is a slow death by a thousand nicks. Many minority alumni need more than the average break from the College; they lack the sense of ownership that most graduates feel about their alma mater. They are visitors in their own home and have little or no vested interest in sustaining contact, much less supporting the institution financially. The only connection minority alumni want to sustain after Williams are the close connections with other alumni of color, since these were the communities on campus that consistently provided encouragement, sustenance, and support.

The Networks

In 1982, two Black undergraduates, Robin Powell ‘82 and Byron Walker ‘82, lamented the fact that they had a limited knowledge of Blacks who graduated from Williams before them and little or no history of the journey taken by these graduates. Seeking to remedy this lack of exposure to other Black alumni, Robin and Byron proposed to the administration that the College support a separate organization of Black alumni, sanctioned by the Society of Alumni, in order that this cohort could return to the College to provide mentoring to other Black students and come together socially on occasion in the name of Williams.

Since its inception in 1982, the Williams Black Alumni Network continues to foster mentoring relationships between alumni and students with its career mentoring program in the fall, engages in collaborative work with the MCC, and hosts special events throughout the year and significant one-time events. Examples of these programs include the Martha’s Vineyard Clambake; the Sterling Brown Weekend in Washington, D.C.;

quinquennial reunions named after the first Black graduate, Gaius Bolin; and collaborative events with regional alumni associations across the country.

During the College's Bicentennial in 1993, the Alumni Office co-sponsored with the President's Office, a special weekend celebrating ethnic and racial diversity as well as diversity of gender and sexual orientation. This special weekend was the impetus for other minority groups to want to model the Black Alumni Network in mentoring students and gathering together socially to share experiences and, for many, to begin a process of healing from a less than satisfactory undergraduate experience. The Williams Asian and Asian American Alumni Network (WAAAN) and the Williams Latino/a Alumni Network (WLAN) were organized, as was the Bisexual, Gay, and Lesbian Alumni Network (BiGALA), later changed to BiGLATA to acknowledge transgendered alumni.

Though WAAAN, WBAN, and WLAN each continued to focus on culturally specific issues, in 1996 they formed an alliance, the Alumni of Color (AoC) Networks, sensing that there were similar underlying themes bonding all the minority groups. As a result, there were greater opportunities for students of color to meet more alumni who shared their triumphs, frustrations, and career goals.

Today, the AoC Networks leadership meets quarterly at the Williams Club in New York City to discuss issues affecting minority populations, organize events, and serve as consultants for various departments on campus. The Networks have been helpful in encouraging College communications that are more representative of a diverse student and alumni population and in assisting President Schapiro as he leads the campus to a greater commitment and understanding of diversity issues.

Last year the AoC Networks leadership was revamped and organized into task forces to better reflect diversity in terms of age, geography, and ethnicity (one White, Jewish member) and to reflect the goals of both the Networks and the Society of Alumni (Appendix E).

Networks as Farm Teams

In 23 years since the inception of WBAN, the College has benefited from the experience and expertise of alumni who have emerged from the Networks as leaders. These network volunteers go on to become members of the Executive Committee of the Society of Alumni, College Trustees, Tyng Administrators, Class Officers, Alumni Fund Volunteers, and Regional Association Presidents. The AoC Networks are our strongest indication that the care and feeding of affinity associations allow alumni who experience Williams differently to forge a lifelong relationship with the College while maintaining their primary identity.

New Solutions to Resurfacing Issues

When the incident between two faculty members came to light last fall we *all* took several giant steps backwards. As information was sent out over the Networks list-servs, several alumni of color responded by saying “Well, why I am not surprised. Here we go again! It’s the same kind of stuff that happened when I was a student.” While there are no easy answers, and issues involving diversity and community are not solved in a day or even in a decade, we must begin to at least stop the cyclical occurrence of similar incidents. A pluralistic environment takes careful planning, appropriate training, and perpetual vigilance. And the work of the Diversity Initiatives Coordinating Committee is a big step in the right direction but needs the institutional commitment for permanent change.

Diversity and Community from an Alumni Relations Perspective

Despite the less than positive undergraduate experiences endured by students of color, younger alumni of color are returning to campus in strong numbers to mentor minority students and share career advice during Career Mentor Weekend. Now in its 23rd year, the weekend encourages spiritual, social, and career connections for alumni and students of color. This year the alumni staff welcomed back for Homecoming and Career Mentor Weekend more than 60 alumni of color—70 percent of them members of the youngest five classes. (Over the past three years, the youngest group returning to Career Mentor Weekend has hovered close to that 70 percent range.)

In addition, once students graduate from Williams they tend to feel well equipped to handle the complexities of the real world, and those who take advantage of the Williams network find generous, good-spirited alumni who assist with jobs and acclimating to new communities. Many minority alumni begin to see the doors that open when they are armed with a Williams diploma. These post-graduate experiences, I believe, are part of the reason that, as noted in various studies, alumni of color do begin over time to soften about their Williams experience.

My colleagues in the Alumni Relations Office have done some good preliminary work on alumni of color returning for their class reunions. In 2004, the percentage of quinquennial alumni returning for reunion was 34 percent. For alumni of color it was 29 percent. In 2004, 17 percent of all quinquennial reunion-goers were active volunteers for Williams. Thirty six percent of alumni of color reunion goers were active volunteers—more than twice the rate of the majority population. For the five years that data were pulled, an average of 12 percent more alumni of color volunteer for Williams than the entire population of reunion goers. These preliminary findings indicate that the gift of time for minority alumni may be more culturally meaningful. And the appropriate recognition of such a gift may make a significant difference in the way minority alumni relate to the College going forward, and may even have a positive influence on any monetary gift they are asked to make.

Quinquennial reunions are organized by two of the three AoC Networks. This fall marks the fourth quinquennial for the Black Alumni Network, which in the past has taken place on campus, but will take place in Chicago as a collaborative effort with the Chicago Regional Association. This occasion also is being held off campus with the hope of attracting those Black alumni who continue to be disengaged and hesitant to return to campus. Members of both the Alumni Relations staff and the Development staff are part of the planning committee for this event. The second Latino/a Reunion takes place in 2006 on campus and will coincide with Reunion Weekend so that those also celebrating their class reunions can participate in both. And the Asian Network is working on hosting its first major event in New York City late spring at the Williams Club.

The Alumni Fund staff, in collaboration with the Institutional Research Office, organized focus groups in San Francisco and New York, the results of which suggest that we have to think outside the box and more creatively to fully engage alumni of color in fundraising initiatives. The initial excitement and ultimate success of the Sterling Brown Endowment for visiting faculty of color is a testament to the good will engendered by linking fundraising to culturally relevant projects that benefit the entire campus.

In summary, as the diversity of the campus increases, the traditional, one-size-fits-all way of engaging alumni should become one of a number of ways in which we engage alumni, rather than the only way.

Principal Author: Paula Moore Tabor, Associate Director of Alumni Relations

ORIENTATION AND ONGOING EDUCATION

Members of the subcommittee for this chapter begin with the notion that orientation is the way in which students, faculty, and staff are introduced into the Williams community. Ongoing education is defined as formal and informal training, both mandatory and non-mandatory. Orientation for students, faculty, and staff should be—and in some cases is—a part of the institutional structure with a focus on diversity. It is more difficult to identify what constitutes ongoing education for students, faculty, and staff. The content and form differ for each group.

Students

Currently the College has one diversity program for incoming students as a part of First Days. This program is administered through the MCC by the Williams Community Building Program. There is no mandatory training or orientation for upperclass students. However, students who volunteer to serve in minority organization positions or as diversity program facilitators usually undergo some form of training and/or educational engagement with diversity issues. In this section, orientation and ongoing education as

they relate to students can be divided into four areas: (1) orientation and receptions; (2) educational programs and events; (3) training; and (4) educational workshops.

Orientation Programs

Orientation during First Days consists of a formal introduction to campus, with events planned for the first week of arrival for incoming students. This year, the College had an outside speaker on diversity followed by breakout discussions facilitated by WCBP members and JAs. Prior to 2004, WCBP members facilitated a discussion on diversity and community based on a viewing of a video titled “Shades of Purple.”

Mid-orientation is a specified period during First Days. It is a four-day period for first-years to pursue a variety of individual interests. Programs initiated as mid-orientation programs in fall 2002 included Where Am I?! and Williams Outdoor Orientation for Living as First Years (WOOLF), while Exploring the Arts was initiated in 2003. Last fall there was no mid-orientation program with a focus on diversity.

For a description of Where Am I?! see page 41.

WOOLF was a pre-orientation program from 1977 to 2002 and now takes place mid-orientation. It is organized by the Williams Outing Club and offers overnight camping experiences in and around the Berkshires.

Exploring the Arts is a mid-orientation program that gives students an opportunity to explore the arts resources on campus and in the area.

Other Welcome Events

LGBTQ Welcome Reception: page 31

Windows On Williams: page 31

Current Ongoing Educational Programs/Events:

Heritage Days Awareness Programs: page 34

Non-heritage Programs: page 35

Martin Luther King Jr. Day Celebration: page 32

MCC Lecture Series: page 33

Leadership Training

Diversity Panel for Junior Advisors (JAs): JAs are juniors who volunteer to live with first-year students and help them acclimate to college life. JAs attend a diversity panel with College administrators. The panelists include Deans, Directors of the MCC, the

Chaplain, and Campus Life Coordinators. This session has generally been an introduction to various individuals and departments rather than actual training. JAs may participate in an exercise organized by the panel on campus issues.

Williams Community Building Program (WCBP) Spring and Fall Training: WCBP facilitators are a diverse group of students who work with the MCC to lead workshops and discussions on topics such as diversity, prejudice, racism, sexism, homophobia, and community building. Facilitators generally lead first-year entries in discussions on diversity during First Days. Later in the semester they conduct SPARC workshops, which focus on community at Williams. Facilitators generally undergo a day of training with an outside facilitator once a semester.

Multicultural Resources and Programming Workshop: HCs and JAs attend a joint workshop conducted by the MCC. The program introduces them to MCC programs and resources.

Resource Fair: Table fair organized by Campus Life with information for students about campus resources. MCC staff provide information and resources to JAs and HCs about the MCC and MinCo.

WOW Fall/Spring Training: WOW facilitators traditionally undergo training on diversity since the position requires leading “ism workshops” and dealing with diverse members of the community.

Workshops:

Community at Williams: page 32.

Students Promoting Awareness, Respect, and Community (SPARC): page 32.

Conclusion

Mid-orientation offers an opportunity to demonstrate to students that Williams is a community committed to diversity. The College should continue to support the program that brings a diversity speaker during First Days and to support student diversity programs. Extensive training for residential staff such as HCs and JAs is crucial. There must be more of a commitment to planning such training. Leadership training for WCBP facilitators needs to be more consistent because of their role with the first-year workshops. Educational programs should in some way be endorsed by the College in a way that affirms the commitment to diversity.

Faculty

At present, the College does not mandate focused training on diversity issues for faculty. The non-discrimination policy is published in the Faculty Handbook (Section II.R.1) and

all faculty are sent an annual incident report on the uses of the College's discrimination grievance procedures. The report is circulated with a brochure explaining those procedures and reminding all members of the Williams community of their responsibilities and obligations as instructors, supervisors, and peers. Cultural competency and sensitivity to diversity issues are expected, but there is no formal institutional instruction on how to meet those expectations.

However, many faculty, individually or with the MCC, do undertake projects on diversity issues in parts of the curriculum. We will first describe the existing structures in which orientation and ongoing education take place for faculty and which provide opportunities to enhance faculty dialogue on diversity. We will then discuss plans that are in place for new opportunities for faculty education on issues of diversity. Finally, we will offer conclusions and thoughts for the future.

Existing programs

New Faculty Orientation

Each fall the Dean of the Faculty and the Dean of the College convene an orientation meeting with new faculty to introduce them to the culture of teaching at Williams. Diversity is one of the subjects covered. While this meeting provides assurance that every new faculty member has some introduction to diversity issues, more in-depth discussions throughout the year and throughout faculty careers are necessary for faculty members to do their best work in our increasingly diverse community. Several venues for this sort of ongoing education already exist, as discussed below.

The Project for Effective Teaching (PET)

PET is a voluntary program that brings together new faculty members to talk about teaching, foster a sense of community, and provide mentoring. Under the guidance of the Kenan Professor, PET holds informal discussions over lunch twice each week during the academic year. Participants set the agenda and occasionally an outside speaker or experienced faculty or staff member is invited to join the group. All are encouraged to share ideas and strategies on teaching, as well as any questions or concerns. Last year one PET meeting was devoted specifically to classroom diversity issues. Guests for this meeting were the MCC directors. This meeting was very well received and will likely become an annual event. However, it only reaches those new faculty who happen to come to the meeting (typically less than one third of eligible faculty attend any given PET meeting, mostly due to conflicts with teaching schedules.)

Since 2003, PET has also sponsored a one-day conference at the beginning of the fall semester to provide tips for new teachers. At this event, experienced faculty members lead panel discussions and talk about course administration, classroom dynamics, and methods for teaching. A keynote address or breakout session on diversity would fit naturally into the agenda for this event, and would reach essentially all faculty in their first year. This would complement, but not replace, the discussions at PET meetings during the year, since these discussions are based on, and take advantage of, the real-time classroom issues that new faculty are facing.

MCC programs with faculty

The MCC offers a number of other resources to faculty to educate themselves about issues of diversity.

MCC Reading Groups: page 33.

Bolin Fellow Lecture Series: page 33

Lissack Forums:

The current Lissack Chair for Social Responsibility and Personal Ethics has initiated a set of “Lissack Forums” on a variety of topics. This spring their focus has been on diversity issues. Topics have included an open forum on “minority” status, the Diversity Initiatives (with the President), affirmative action (with the Director of Admission), diversity in the first year, socio-economic diversity (with the Provost), and diversity in the classroom.

The forums seem successful in a number of ways: there has been good attendance drawn from all quarters of the College community, discussions have been lively and fascinating, and some good concrete ideas have emerged from them. They will continue in the coming years, and effort will be focused on bringing in the widest possible range of voices.

Future plans and possibilities

COPE Recommendations

In May 2004, the Committee on Pedagogy and its Evaluation (COPE) issued a report that contained recommendations intended to enhance the support of pedagogical development. Among them were several that could be tailored to address diversity issues. For example, COPE recommended the establishment of a pedagogy workshop series (three each year), at which faculty would discuss topics of mutual interest. These workshops would serve for general faculty a role similar to that played by PET for new faculty. As for PET, some of the workshops could be used for faculty to learn new ideas for working effectively in a diverse classroom—a topic about which a number of faculty have expressed interest. The committee also recommended that the Dean of the Faculty sponsor a monthly lunch discussion on pedagogy. Finally, COPE proposed that the College prepare a teaching handbook for faculty containing general advice and information about classroom culture at Williams and how to identify and use existing resources. This teaching manual would be less policy-laden than the Faculty Handbook. Within each of these recommendations lies potential for enhancing faculty awareness and sensitivity to diversity issues.

Hughes Grant

In 2004, The Howard Hughes Medical Institute granted the College \$1.6 million. Among the goals of this grant is to improve recruitment and retention of minority students in the sciences. In particular, the grant’s faculty director is planning several national symposia

on best practices for increasing diversity in undergraduate science programs. The knowledge gained in these symposia will be brought back to Williams for implementation.

Conclusions

A number of venues exist for faculty to increase their cultural competency and learn more about issues of diversity. A large percentage of the faculty take advantage of these opportunities, many of which are very effective. However, with the exception of the brief new faculty orientation, there is no system to ensure that all faculty engage issues of diversity in a focused way. There are still many faculty who wish to learn more but who have not found the right resources on campus to do so. In many ways, the present opportunities are rather episodic—available to new faculty via PET or to those in an MCC reading group in a particular term. The community would benefit from more sustained discussions, such as those proposed in the COPE report, that would make them part of the Williams culture for all faculty to weave diversity issues into their roles as professors throughout their careers.

Staff

Diversity considerations are incorporated into various aspects of human resources functions, including management, supervisory and general training sessions, and employee orientation programming. Workshops on hiring and performance management examine bias in the selection process and examine the principles of affirmative action and equal employment in hiring. Components of the orientation program are designed to provide a consistent foundation for new employees in their first six to nine months. Unforeseen barriers are apt to be removed by creating a better understanding of College norms, thereby improving the individual work experience. Substantial opportunity remains to elevate the dialogue and education surrounding diversity on both the office and institutional level.

Current programs

New Employee Orientation

Orientation for new employees happens in two parts. The first takes place within the first three days of employment as required by law. Employees complete “new hire” paperwork for tax and IRS purposes and receive information about payroll, benefits, and College policies. They are directed to other departments for their ID and parking sticker.

The second part occurs between six and nine months of employment. Employees are invited to attend a full-morning of presentations by members of President’s Staff and Human Resources to educate them about the College’s organizational structure, its mission and goals, its history, its role as an employer and educational institution, and its core constituencies (faculty, staff, students, and alumni).

The purpose of both parts of the program is to provide consistent information for new employees entering Williams from different backgrounds and experience levels. Given the diversity of backgrounds, it is important that a forum be established to educate staff on what it means to be an employee at Williams.

Staff Development Programming

In the past ten years, a number of workshops and programs have been offered for managers, supervisors, and general staff to educate them on topics associated with the performance of their jobs. Programs have been offered for individual departments, for groups within departments, and for groups across departments. While training on diversity has not been specifically targeted, it has been incorporated into many of the programs.

Supervision

A supervisory training series has been offered for front-line supervisors and managers in Dining Services and Facilities. It has included modules on sexual harassment and on discrimination.

Hiring and Performance Management

Issues associated with bias and difference are integral parts of the hiring and performance management programs.

HR Programs

Programs on improved communication skills have included listening, conflict resolution, improving interpersonal communications, and problem solving. Better communication skills facilitate greater understanding and awareness.

Legal Seminars

Periodic legal seminars have been presented for managers, department chairs, and supervisors. Sexual harassment training has been included.

Management Forums

Management breakfasts and administrative forums offer a more informal educational setting. Hosted by the Director of Human Resources, they are an opportunity for managers to discuss institutional policies and broad campus issues relevant to the College's senior administrative leadership.

Other Administrative Forums

The Vice President for Administration and Treasurer sponsors administrative forums that are both educational and community building. The entire administrative staff, approximately 260 members, is invited to attend semi-annual meetings to learn about specific issues related to their jobs, and to meet and network with one another.

Counseling and Training

An integral part of the human resources function is "in-the-moment" counseling and training. This is ongoing when working with employees and supervisors. Assisting

employees to improve their problem-solving skills in regard to a myriad of topics related to difference is crucial to maintaining a successful operation.

Off-Campus Training

Many College offices provide opportunities for off-campus training for their staff. These give employees opportunities for job growth and development and better prepare them for possible promotion.

Next Steps

Although diversity issues are addressed in a variety of staff orientation and ongoing education programs, the College needs to think more systematically about how to do this to maximal effect and how to expand such offerings in order to make cultural competency a vital part of professional development at Williams. Plans are underway to engage a consultant to aid us in this planning.

The Associate Director of Human Resources will soon attend a program designed to train people in such positions to train other staff on diversity issues.

Principal Author: Gail Bouknight-Davis, Director of the Multicultural Center

COLLEGE PROCEDURES

The College includes statements of its nondiscrimination policy in all of its official literature and has in place well-established procedures for hearing and investigating incidents that violate that policy. During its review of the discrimination grievance procedures with students, faculty, and staff, however, the subcommittee made up of the Dean of the College, the Dean of the Faculty, the Associate Dean of the Faculty, the Director of Human Resources, and the Assistant to the President for Affirmative Action and Government Relations discovered that the availability and effectiveness of its procedures are not widely known or understood.

Students, faculty, and staff can express concerns or register complaints about behavior that may be discriminatory in several ways.

One option is to use the Discrimination Grievance Procedures described in College handbooks. These procedures were extensively reviewed and revised by a faculty/student/staff committee chaired by the Dean of the Faculty in 1990. Two major changes included an expanded sexual harassment policy regarding “consensual relationships” and the addition of an advising component whereby a group of six special discrimination grievance advisors (two faculty, two staff, and two students) would be available for confidential assistance.

Members of the community who choose to use this route are required to make a somewhat formal written complaint through the offices of the Dean of the College (for students), the Dean of the Faculty (for faculty), and/or the Vice President for Administration (for administrative and support staffs) in order to initiate an inquiry. While these procedures are intended to provide clarification of the alleged behavior, resolution for the person who is bringing the complaint, and sanctions against those who have violated College policy, the procedures are necessarily time-consuming, even elaborate, because of the necessity of ensuring a careful and complete inquiry for all concerned. Perhaps for these reasons, or other reasons noted below, the Discrimination Grievance Procedures have been used only four times in the past five years, three for complaints of sexual harassment and only once for racial discrimination.

Less well understood options for resolving bias complaints allow students, faculty, and staff to raise concerns before deciding whether to proceed with the Discrimination Grievance Procedures. In fact, deans, special advisors, staff of the MCC and Health Services, peers, and many others, may be useful as “advisors.” On occasion, a conversation with anyone of these administrators, or a respected faculty or staff member, or a student advisor, may encourage the aggrieved person to confront the other person directly and thereby stop the offending behavior. Or that conversation may encourage the person, accompanied by the “advisor” or peer, to take the concern to an officer who can intervene. Even senior officers may be able to work with concerned students, faculty, and staff before a decision is made about moving into the Discrimination Grievance Procedures.

These less formal ways of identifying and dealing with bias-related behavior are less well known, although we are aware of numerous occasions when incidents have been brought to the attention of someone “official” and corrective action has resulted. The deans and others estimate having conversations about the resolution of incidents several times in a given year. These occasions usually are of a less serious, although troublesome, nature. For example, a student may have been bothered by a passing remark, nevertheless of a potentially inflammatory nature, which can be acknowledged and resolved through the informal conversation between the Dean and the offending person. Or a staff member may have received an overture from another person that was suspect or could be open to interpretation, and an “advisory conversation” between an official and the person who made the overture may provide an educational moment and an end to that behavior.

Regrettably, the availability of options is not well known despite the regular publication of the procedures and names of advisors. Even when options are known, opportunities to identify or discuss discriminatory behavior with someone who may be able to take appropriate action are not pursued, perhaps understandably, for a variety of reasons:

- A member of the community may not seek out someone in authority because he or she is unclear about the severity of the incident, or may not know what will happen once he or she chooses to go forward.

- A student/faculty/staff may not choose to seek out a dean or someone in Human Resources because of the fear that once a concern gets to an “official,” it will automatically become a complaint and trigger a more formal procedure that the aggrieved person is not yet ready to undertake. The person will lose control, or not be believed, or be fired, or get someone into trouble, or word will leak out into this very small community.
- Others may choose not to go to someone “official” because of the assumption that deans (and other administrators) have access to or know about everything that happens on campus, so if there’s been no response to an incident that means “the administration” doesn’t care and therefore condones the behavior.

Despite the availability of advisors other than the senior officers, advisors who are trained to be familiar with options, few members of the community seek those advisors out and, rather, go to someone he or she already knows and/or to MCC staff and/or to friends. We have discovered that in some cases sharing details of an incident through e-mail with friends has become the first point of notice, after which word of the incident is passed along and community outrage fueled.

So, we are hopeful that this report will encourage members of the community with concerns and grievances to bring unacceptable or questionable behavior to the attention of those with authority who can provide resolution as early as possible.

Next Steps

During its meetings the subcommittee discussed the possibility of the appointment of a special ombudsperson with campus-wide availability and authority to initiate intervention and/or the development of an expanded group of advisors with responsibilities similar to the Sexual Assault Response team. Although our discussion was limited and no consensus was reached on this topic, our group is in full agreement on the following recommendations:

1. The College should include a statement of its commitment to a diverse community and the value it places on that diversity in the mission statement required in the next Self Study for Reaccreditation to be developed in 2006-2007. Such a statement will include an acknowledgement that the College is a community of men and women of diverse races, religions, national or ethnic backgrounds, and sexual identities and orientations. That statement would complement the existing nondiscrimination statements published in the Catalog and in faculty, staff, and student handbooks, and it (or a portion of the statement) should be conspicuously publicized.
2. In the meantime, the present nondiscrimination statements and grievance procedures should be placed in more prominent locations in student, faculty, and staff handbooks, and be more easily accessed through the table of contents and indices of those publications. In addition, links to that statement and procedures should be included on the home pages of the Dean of the College, the Dean of the Faculty, the Vice

President for Administration, and the Director of Human Resources as well as through home pages of selected student organizations. A further editorial recommendation for the Faculty Handbook is a rewording of disciplinary procedures in terms of the process rather than the sanction to be applied at the end of the process (i.e., “dismissal,” “major sanction other than dismissal,” “minor sanction”).

3. The College should continue its annual report of the use of the Discrimination Grievance Procedures and include enough information about the context of incidents reported to provide education and awareness about discriminatory behavior. In line with current practice, other serious bias incidents may be communicated to the community on a “need-to-know” basis.

4. Recognizing that some other bias-related incidents may be more informally resolved, or unreported, the Dean of the College, the Director of the MCC, and the Committee on Diversity and Community should meet at least annually, or more often as necessary, to discuss and assess the campus climate.

5. To highlight the availability of grievance procedures and special Discrimination Grievance Advisors, education and training about the existing options for informal and formal resolution of concerns and complaints about discriminatory behavior, including classroom incidents, should be made available to academic and administrative heads of departments; to all student services personnel, including CLCs; and to student leaders/groups such as JAs, HCs, Peer Health Counselors, etc. In addition, the availability of the Discrimination Grievance Procedures for any kind of discriminatory behavior, only one of which is sexual harassment, should be highlighted.

6. Education and training about ways of responding to expressions of concern about possible discriminatory behavior should be made available to all faculty and staff. One vehicle for faculty education could be the Project on Effective Teaching (PET). A vehicle for administrative and support staffs may be programs through the Administrative Council or the Personnel Advisory Board.

Principal Author: Nancy McIntire, Assistant to the President for Affirmative Action and Government Relations

CONCLUSION

Having read to this point, you now have a fuller sense than perhaps anyone has ever had of the status of diversity at Williams, especially of its prospects and challenges.

We have produced for the Diversity Initiatives’ outside visitors, and for ourselves, a rich resource on these important issues. Our thanks go again to the countless people—on campus, through the Web site, and at alumni gatherings across the country—who have contributed over the year to the deliberations that led to this document.

Its many pages contain numerous stories. Perhaps the most important one for our purposes is how on average some groups of students experience Williams as a place that exists for others and at which they are visitors. They do not feel as welcomed and they relate stories of incidents that signal to them that they do not fully belong. The consequences are extensive. They do not take as full advantage of the College's academic offerings. They benefit from fewer role models among faculty and staff than do majority students. The burden of working on diversity issues has typically fallen on them and on a relatively small number of faculty and staff. At the same time they are disproportionately burdened by financial concerns. As a result, they graduate somewhat less connected to the College. The experiences of individual students vary widely but this portrait most closely describes students of color, particularly African Americans.

While race has captured much of the attention of this year's efforts, Williams clearly needs also to work on other aspects of diversity, including class, gender, and sexual orientation.

There is much to celebrate about diversity at Williams and we should continue to do so through other avenues. The purpose of this effort, however, is to take steps to improve the College by making it more a place in which all its members can thrive.

We have taken action already this year to do that (as listed in the "Introduction"). The many groups that worked on this Self Study produced a long list of recommendations and next steps (Appendix F). With the help of our outside visitors we will now critique the Self Study and its many suggestions, develop a prioritized list of actions and ways to measure progress, and move forward at making Williams a community of learning in which all its members know they equally belong.

Principal Author: Morty Schapiro, President of the College

APPENDIX A

COORDINATING COMMITTEE FOR DIVERSITY INITIATIVES

Morton Owen Schapiro, Chair, President of the College and Professor of Economics

Alexander Bal '06, Co-President of College Council 2005-06

Stephen R. Birrell '64, Vice President for Alumni Relations and Development

Sarah Bolton, Chair, Faculty Steering Committee and Associate Professor of Physics

Gail Bouknight-Davis, Director of the Multicultural Center

Gina M. Coleman '90, Associate Director of Admission

Nicole A. DeCesare '05, House Coordinator and JA Advisory Board

William C. Dudley '89, Chair, Committee on Undergraduate Life and Associate Professor of Philosophy

Thomas A. Garrity, Incoming Director of the Project on Effective Teaching and Professor of Mathematics

John P. Gerry, Associate Dean of the Faculty

Catharine B. Hill '76, Provost and John J. Gibson Professor of Economics

Jessica Howard '06, Co-President of College Council 2005-06

Eric C. Hsu '05, JA Advisory Board

Ilunga Kalala '05, Co-President of College Council 2004-05

Sherron E. Knopp, Chair, Committee on Academic Standing and John Hawley Roberts Professor of English

James G. Kolesar '72, Director of Public Affairs

Regina G. Kunzel, Academic Director of the Multicultural Center, Member of the Committee on Appointments and Promotions, Chair of History, and Fairleigh S. Dickinson Professor of American History

Thomas A. Kohut, Dean of the Faculty and Sue and Edgar Wachenheim III Professor of History

Molly Magavern, Coordinator of Special Academic Programs

Nancy J. McIntire, Assistant to the President for Affirmative Action and Government Relations

Veronica M. Mendiola '05, Co-President of College Council 2004-05

JoAnn Muir, Senior Executive Assistant to the President and Secretary to the Board of Trustees

Richard L. Nesbitt '74, Director of Admission

Helen Ouellette, Vice President for Administration and Treasurer

Nancy A. Roseman, Dean of the College and Professor of Biology

Stephen D. Sneed, Associate Dean of the College

Rick Spalding, Chaplain to the College and Coordinator of Community Service

Paula Moore Tabor '76, Associate Director of Alumni Relations

Martha R. Tetrault, Director of Human Resources

Stephen J. Tifft, Chair, Committee on Education Policy 2004-05 and Professor of English

Christina S. Villegas '05, Co-Chair, Minority Coalition

K. Scott Wong, Chair, Committee on Diversity and Community and Professor of History

Ricardo A. Woolery '05, Co-Chair, Minority Coalition

APPENDIX B

WILLIAMS LOWERS LOAN EXPECTATIONS FOR LOW-INCOME STUDENTS

WILLIAMSTOWN, Mass., Jan. 18, 2005 – Williams College has announced that it will lower the amount of loans it expects students from low-income families to take out, in some cases to zero. The difference will be made up with increased Williams-based scholarship grants.

The announcement comes amid reports that loan limits for college students are rising nationally.

"The College has taken another step toward ensuring that a Williams education is accessible to students from low-income families," Williams President Morton Owen Schapiro said in a letter to the campus community Monday. This is the second time in two years that the College has reduced loan levels and made up the difference by increasing grants.

Loan levels are based on the amount of money parents are expected to pay, based on formulas that take into account their income and assets. Under the new scale, Williams will expect no loans from the group of lowest-income families, whose average income is \$20,000. From the next group, with an average income of about \$40,000, the College will offer loans amounting to \$3,900 over four years. The next group, with an average income of about \$60,000, will have a loan limit of \$8,000 over four years. The remainder of financial aid students will have a maximum of \$14,000.

Until now, the lowest-income families at Williams typically have had loan expectations of \$3,900 over four years and the next two groups \$8,000 and \$14,000.

These changes will go into effect in the coming academic year for all students, including those already at the College.

Williams expects the new policy to cost about \$250,000 per year. About 100 of the College's current students would qualify for zero loans under the new policy but that figure could rise as Williams works to increase the representation of low-income families in entering classes.

Schapiro described the change as "important to our mission of providing the best possible liberal arts education to students from all segments of society and of preparing all our students for the increasingly diverse world in which they will live and work."

END

APPENDIX C

QUESTBRIDGE COLLEGE MATCH 2004-05

As part of the College's efforts to recruit high ability, low-income students, the Admission Office initiated a partnership with QuestBridge, an organization that identifies such students and helps to place them in highly selective college and universities. This year, we are one of eight QuestBridge partner institutions seeking to match with qualifying students. The others are Amherst, Bowdoin, Duke, Grinnell, Rice, Trinity (Conn.), and Wheaton (Ill.).

In this first year, Williams successfully matched with 14 high-ability, low-income students and admitted another seven as non-matched Early Decision applicants. By "matching" with our 14 students, per QuestBridge's guidelines, Williams guaranteed the students a four-year, need-based financial aid package that includes no parental contribution and no student loan. Students will be required to complete on-campus work-study and will have the same summer earnings expectation of other financial aid students. The Financial Aid Office is confident that these students' parental contributions will continue to be assessed at zero and that the families' incomes will not increase significantly over the next four years.

QuestBridge College Match (www.QuestBridge.org) debuted in 2003 as a pilot program run by Dr. Michael McCullough at Stanford University. It followed from a successful summer program called Quest Scholars that, starting in 1994, brought high-ability, low-income students to the Stanford campus for enrichment and college counseling. Though the pool of students served through Quest Scholars was small, the long-term results were tremendous: 99 percent of the students graduated from selective four-year colleges.

QuestBridge's mission is to expand the scope of Quest Scholars by identifying top low-income students from across the U.S. through an online application process and matching them directly with partner institutions. By using a dual-preference match process, QuestBridge guarantees mutual interest between the student and the college. If a college decides to match with a student, it guarantees that student a four-year financial aid package free of loans and parental contributions.

The search process for QuestBridge students began early in the year. QuestBridge mailed thousands of applications to students through College Board searches (using PSAT parameters), through community outreach organizations, and through a proprietary network of counselors, teachers, and professionals. These students were encouraged to fill out a free online application.

QuestBridge screened all of the applications based on academic achievement, educational opportunity, and information on family income, as determined by tax returns the students must submit. Finalists for the college match program were determined, and their completed applications were forwarded to the partner colleges. Finalists were encouraged

to research the partner schools, with the assistance of QuestBridge counselors, through the summer and early fall while the colleges reviewed their applications.

Williams received the first of two batches of files of roughly 200 QuestBridge Finalists in early October. QuestBridge did a second student mailing in August/September to attract a larger applicant pool, netting an additional 300 finalists. We received this second batch in early November. Associate Director of Admission Gina Coleman and Assistant Director Mark Robertson reviewed files of all QuestBridge Finalists' applications through mid-November. Each of the 469 files numbered 8 to 10 pages.

After our initial sorting, we received information from QuestBridge on students' interest in Williams. We further refined our list by limiting our choices to students who identified themselves as being "highly interested" or "interested" in pursuing a match with Williams. This narrowed-down list was submitted to the Office of Financial Aid for need analysis.

Financial Aid Director Paul Boyer assessed the need for all candidates and identified those he was confident would have zero parental contribution over four years. The family income of these students was generally below \$35,000. Paul returned a list of these students to Gina who submitted a potential match list to QuestBridge.

QuestBridge contacted all the potential matches in early December to receive final financial aid documentation, including the CSS Profile. Upon review of the Profile, Paul finalized the list of match-eligible students. QuestBridge informed the students that Williams had offered a match and they had three days to accept the offer.

Upon agreeing to the match, students were asked to fax the binding Early Decision Agreement form to Williams immediately. All students were also required to complete documents required of other Early Decision candidates, including the Williams Supplement and Secondary School Report to finalize their applications.

We encouraged students who made our "potential match" list but who we were not confident would remain at zero parental contribution for four years to apply Early Decision, with the understanding that the need-based financial aid package would include a loan and a parental contribution. Thus an additional seven QuestBridge students were admitted Early Decision, yielding a final E.D. group of 21 students identified and matriculated through QuestBridge.

Those 21 break down as follows: 7 male, 14 female, 4 African American, 4 Latino/a, 5 Asian American, 1 Native American.

They come from 11 states, ranging from Maine to Hawaii.

APPENDIX D

WILLIAMS COLLEGE ALUMNI STATISTICS

As of 4/15/2005

Current Active Alumni Body	Number	Percent
Total Count:	23,750	100%
Females:	7,454	31.39%
Males:	16,295	68.61%
Median Class Year		1982
Alumni Married to Alumni	1,934	11.18%
Percent is of alumni since coeducation.		
Graduate Degrees: (excluding Williams BA holders)		
Graduate Art Program		334
Center for Development Economics		830
Decades:		
1910s	0	0.00%
1920s	13	0.05%
1930s	251	1.06%
1940s	1,033	4.35%
1950s	2,202	9.27%
1960s	2,635	11.09%
1970s	4,274	18.00%
1980s	5,260	22.15%
1990s	5,344	22.50%
2000s	2,738	11.53%
Geography:		
New York	3,800	16.00%
Mid-Atlantic	3,113	13.11%
South	2,561	10.78%
Southwest	817	3.44%
Midwest	2,409	10.14%
New England	6,127	25.80%
West	3,914	16.48%
Non-Contiguous	171	0.72%
Foreign/Other	838	3.53%
Ethnicity:		
White	14,943	62.92%
Black	1,046	4.40%
Asian	934	3.93%
Hispanic or Latino	533	2.24%
Native American	31	0.13%
Mixed Heritage	117	0.49%
Other	54	0.23%
Unknown	6,092	25.65%

APPENDIX E

AOC TASKFORCES AND OBJECTIVES 2004-2005

Campus Administration

- Sensitivity training for faculty and staff
- Aiding Minco Chairs with their initiatives to create a historical perspective of student issues
- Liaison with the CDC

Young Alumni and Undergraduate Outreach

- Come up with a strategy to recruit young AOC leaders (w/YANAC)
- Do outreach for Career Mentor Weekend
- Foster communication between student leaders and former organization Chairs

Regional Association

- Work with LA, DC, San Francisco, Chicago, New York and Boston to get reps in regional committees
- Plan at least 2 culturally relevant programs each year
- Plan an AOC event each year

Classes and Reunions

- Facilitate outreach for Reunion
- Do one on one outreach to get people to submit news

Fundraising

- Work with Alumni Fund on dollar campaign, Bolin Portrait campaign
- Consulting with the fund on the analysis of the Buckets for the 2004 Alumni Fund

On Campus Administration

Rory Kramer '03 (Leader)
Medha Kirtane '00
Kamille Williams '03
Anim Steel '94
William Spriggs '77

Undergraduate/Young Alumni Outreach

Sharifa Wright '03 (Leader)
Sergio Espinosa '02
Susan Sutler '74
Dayna Baskette '03
Andy JinJia Cho '00

Regional Association

Cesar Alvarez '89 (Leader)
Bobby Walker '95
Frank Reynolds '02
Al Gentry '78
Rebecca Salazar '89

Classes and Reunions

Leonora Dodge '95 (Leader)
Felton Booker '01
Lezli White '75
Adrienne Denson '00
Ben Bahn '84

Fundraising

AOC Chairs
Valda Christian '92 (WBAN)
Caroline Fan '03 (WAAAN)
JC Calderon '84 (WLAN)

APPENDIX F

RECOMMENDATIONS AND NEXT STEPS

This is a list of recommendations and next steps from the chapters of this Self Study. Some recommendations have already been vetted by the appropriate bodies. Some next steps are already underway. Some of the listings overlap. The College will develop a streamlined and prioritized list with the help of the Diversity Initiatives' outside visitors, which will appear in a final report this fall.

PROCEDURES

Develop a statement of institutional commitment to a diverse community and the value it places on that diversity in the mission statement for the next Self-Study for Reaccreditation (2006-2007); include that statement (or a portion of it) to complement the existing nondiscrimination statements for the Catalog and faculty, staff, and student handbooks; and seek other ways to make it visible.

Place current nondiscrimination statements and grievance procedures in more prominent locations in student, faculty, and staff handbooks, and more easy access through the Table of Contents and Indices of those publications; add links to that statement and procedures on the home pages of the Dean of the College, the Dean of the Faculty, the Vice President for Administration, and the Director of Human Resources, as well as through homepages of selected student organizations.

As a way of discussing and assessing campus climate, institute a discussion at least annually of other bias-related incidents, informally resolved or unreported, by the Dean of the College, the Dean of the Faculty, the Vice President for Administration and the Director of Human Resources, the Director of the MCC, and the Committee on Diversity and Community.

STUDENT RECRUITMENT

Continue to build diversity within the student body in terms of race and income.

Study the reliability of geo-demographic data provided by the College Board Descriptor Plus Service for identification of low-income prospects.

Lobby the College Board for access to self-reported income data to simplify identification of low-income prospects.

Explore and test ways to communicate effectively the message of affordability and financial aid opportunities to prospective students and their families.

Work closely with QuestBridge to obtain files in June rather than September to identify possible Quest Match Scholars for summer and fall campus visitation programs.

Continue to expand contacts with local, regional and national organizations committed to helping low-income students gain access to higher education.

Consider changing the Williams application to make it gender non-specific to make the College more open to transgendered prospective students.

ORIENTATION

Evaluate the nature, purpose, and effects of activities during First Days, including Windows on Williams (WOW).

Provide support and annual funding for diversity speaker during First Days to exist separately from the Community on Campus workshop.

Design a more effective and substantive orientation program for international students.

Provide institutional support for programs such as LGBTQ Welcome Reception and WOW.

Enhance training for “Where Am I?!” leaders to notice and confront class stereotypes, as they help introduce their first-years to Pownal and North Adams [during First Days].

Include greater attention to diversity as a topic in the orientation of faculty and staff, perhaps through PET (for new faculty) and through orientation program sponsored by Human Resources (for administrative and support staffs).

Continue to discuss ways to further expand MCC involvement with the Dean of the Faculty and the Office of Human Resources in planning and implementing faculty/staff orientation and ongoing education.

EDUCATION/TRAINING

Provide diversity training for student leaders of all First Days activities.

Provide more intensive training for JAs and HCs including introduction to key diversity administrators as well as separate trainings by professionals from within and outside Williams; expand the training of CLCs in cultural competency.

Equip JAs to be more effective teachers about issues of diversity and more effective front-line enablers of community, rather than the current focus in JA training on “bonding” with each other.

Provide diversity training for the staff of the Activities Office, which serves as a primary resource for both JAs, and activities coordinators, who in turn can lead their own diversity workshops.

Provide more consistent and rigorous training for WCBP leaders and reformat the Community on Campus workshop with activities that address the College's diverse communities.

Encourage more cooperation and collaboration between SPARC and Junior Advisors.

Substitute substantive, interactive explorations during First Days of the lived experience of diversity (using case studies, group discussion of articles and essays, etc.) with student services staff for the models of information fairs and perfunctory panels.

Continue diversity education beyond First Days, through students' four years.

Provide additional initiatives for discussing issues of diversity and sexuality for the community at large (e.g. Lissack Forum).

Initiate additional discussion about issues regarding sexual orientation, gender, and sexuality.

Provide training in cross-cultural communication and sensitivity for the College community, particularly for faculty and for those staff members who have direct contact with students.

Develop education and training of all faculty and staff about ways of responding to expressions of concern about possible discriminatory behavior, perhaps through PET and programs through the Administrative Council or the Personnel Advisory Board.

Sponsor sustained discussions about issues of pedagogy, to supplement PET opportunities for new faculty; suggestions have included a workshop series, monthly lunch discussions sponsored by the Dean of the Faculty, and development of a teaching handbook, containing general advice and information about classroom culture at Williams and how to identify and use existing resources, any of which would provide opportunities to enhance faculty awareness and sensitivity to diversity issues in the classroom.

Develop a more systematic approach for promoting cultural competency in the professional development of administrative and support staff; explore options for in-house as well as external resources for training.

Provide additional education and support for staff managers in identifying and, where possible, hiring qualified candidates from historically underrepresented groups.

Provide additional education and support for staff managers in orienting new members to the College and assisting in their assimilation into Williamstown and the surrounding communities.

Establish a regular schedule of diversity training for Campus Security, to include Department of Justice training in dealing with hate crimes; coordinate diversity training of Campus Security staff with that of Williamstown Police.

Expand training of Health Center staff in cultural competency.

Increase critical reflection by students who engage in community service about what they've seen, heard, felt, and done off-campus (e.g., using WSP as a time to get students off campus and into settings where they can experience and reflect on cultural, racial, economic, religious differences; putting more resources at the disposal of students to increase and facilitate their access to North Adams and Pittsfield, Albany and Troy including projects that involve substantive collaboration with the Massachusetts College of Liberal Arts and Berkshire Community College).

Use the issue of religious diversity during orientations and trainings as a fresh approach to more sensitive, thoughtful, educational engagement with the realities of difference between/among people.

Encourage opportunities for highly effective speakers to be brought to campus who could help us to see and name and understand the kinds of privilege that operate in our society, and the kinds which all of us carry (to varying degrees and in different ways) simply as a result of our being "of Williams."

Provide more education and training about existing options for informal and formal resolution of concerns and complaints about discriminatory behavior, including classroom incidents, for academic and administrative heads of departments, all student services personnel, including CLCs, and student leaders/groups such as JAs, HCs, Peer Health Counselors, et al.

Continue annual report of the use of the Discrimination Grievance Procedures with context of incidents reported to provide education and awareness about discriminatory behavior; continue current practice of reports to the community of other serious bias incidents on a "need to know" basis.

Give additional attention to ways to more fully engage alumni of color.

SUPPORT

Develop a clearly outlined description of the support networks that will accompany the transition to the new cluster house system.

Enhance options for kosher/halaal food in student dining halls.

Develop a stronger support network including JAs and professors for students to turn to regarding negative incidents.

Continue institutional support for Summer Science and Summer Humanities and Social Sciences, which provide significant counseling and advising to student participants and thereby enhance their academic success and achievement.

Continue to look for opportunities to reduce financial pressures on students from low-income families.

Consider concern by some students of intolerance of divergent thought in the classroom, and concern by others of being asked for opinions as “classroom spokesman.”

Evaluate the status of queer life at Williams; Admission Office to seek appropriate channels for recruitment.

Consider addition of “gender identity and gender expression” in the nondiscrimination policy.

Create a more sophisticated system for the early detection of students who may become academically at risk and for more actively providing them with support.

Evaluate existing academic support programs to identify areas for improvement and new services and/or programs that should be offered.

Develop new Academic Resource Center as a means of addressing the needs of some students regarding study skills, time management, and ways to succeed at Williams.

Use data on positions that mark high achievement (tutoring, TA-ing, tutorials, independent studies, thesis writing, departmental advisory committees) to point to areas for increased support and encouragement of those students not fully participating in academic life at Williams; encourage departments to encourage the participation of students from all backgrounds in these positions and activities.

Create a subset of data developed during Diversity Initiatives Project to use as measures of progress toward improving the experiences of historically underrepresented groups at Williams. Policy making bodies should review those data regularly and report them publicly as appropriate.

Enhance access for students with disabilities, and attention issues in particular, to a learning specialist; expand other educational programs to aid students’ understanding of their disabilities and the incorporation of the condition into their daily lives; develop workshops focusing on note-taking, study skills, managing the reading load, assistive technology, etc; develop student support/peer groups.

Provide transitional housing and housing for international students during major breaks.

Develop workshops for international students regarding such issues as cultural adjustment, work visas, fellowship opportunities, the honor code, English language usage, and study skills.

Encourage cooperation among ACE, College Council, and MinCo, as well as cooperation between those student activities and Student Activities, Campus Life, and the MCC; continue the role of one CLC to MCC and MinCo groups as liaison, mentor, and advocate for MCC and MinCo groups.

Focus on design of the house governance structure in the new house system, with substantial input from as wide a variety of students and student groups as possible.

Develop stronger student participation, commitment, and leadership as well as more administrative direction for SPARC.

Provide additional financial support for the annual MCC Lecture Series and MCC Reading Groups.

Reorganize heritage days programs toward the goal of fewer, more substantive events; promote more faculty and staff involvement in a streamlined planning process and increased attendance by people outside the heritage group.

Develop Campus Security staff liaisons with student diversity groups.

Increase outreach of Health Services to underrepresented student groups.

Identify and promote diversity resources available to students through OCC.

Continue support for PET, particularly for its development of social networks as well as teaching confidence and competence.

Maintain high funding levels for curricular development and faculty research as one way to enhance faculty retention.

Consider institutional commitment to and structuring of programs to ensure that program building does not fall to one individual.

Provide material support for research abroad and for teaching necessities in new fields so that our new hires and new programs will flourish.

Consider possible administrative approaches to reducing the mentoring burden on faculty of color, such as a more structured distribution of advising (general academic advising, mentoring for Mellon-Mays Fellowships, summer research, etc.) within departments, and/or short-term teaching load reductions to compensate particular mentoring/advising responsibilities; encourage all faculty to share the responsibility.

Consider modest expansion of support for the Bolin Fellowship Program to counter possible isolation of Fellows, such as a meeting each semester for all chairs who have a Bolin Fellow to strategize about mentoring, and a requirement that each Bolin give a job talk followed by feedback and assistance from the department in developing their application and CV.

Explore measures for assessing staff satisfaction.

STAFFING

Maintain the involvement of at least one of the Community Life Coordinators (CLC) with the MCC and MinCo, to serve as mentor, administrator, and advocate.

Pay attention to hiring staff of color in psychological counseling and in Dean's Office, and the replacement for advisor to international students.

Assure student participation on the search committee for the director of the new Academic Resource Center, and a focus by the committee on the need for the director to be sensitive to the "the potential forces that could dissuade some students from taking advantage of the Center's resources."

Make sure that Director of the new Academic Resource Center has significant experience and is particularly well attuned to diversity issues.

Create a response team for minority students under MinCo to discuss incidents or concerns in the minority community team, with MCC and other offices and organizations.

Consider making the position of MCC Assistant Director and Coordinator for Queer Issues into two separate positions, one of which would become an Assistant Dean who could help perform an evaluation on the status of queer life at Williams

Intensify attention to the recruitment and retention of faculty of color.

Support newly introduced fields of study (e.g., Arabic language) by modest further hiring where this may be necessary to allow these programs to take root; and on the other hand, ensure that these fields establish their claims to further commitment of faculty resources by sustaining a pattern of steady enrollments over time.

Encourage recruitment of faculty within curricular areas that are likely to attract applicants from underrepresented groups.

Continue to support the spouse/partner employment initiative through staffing and funding of initiatives such as the Professional Development Fund and the Academic Career Network.

Consider hiring strategically for programs, by hiring in clusters and hiring senior as well as mid-career and junior faculty, to enhance success in attracting and retaining faculty.

Develop one or more programs to bring PhD students and postdocs of color to campus, particularly in the sciences, for summer or Winter Study visits, or short-term teaching opportunities, or visits of a few days.

Increase expertise in reaching and recruiting international faculty.

Increase attention to identifying local or regional candidates for positions in job categories in which women have been historically underrepresented, such as the trades; increase attention to the local or regional markets for minority candidates.

Identify more productive resources that enhance the diversity of applicant pools for positions that are recruited nationally.

CURRICULUM

Continue the openness between CEP and students interested in diversifying the curriculum.

Develop more opportunities for disseminating results of the MCC Reading Groups.

Consider additional curricular options to enhance students' exposure to courses addressing issues of diversity.

Institute regular solicitation by the CEP of student opinion concerning curricular needs (whether by appealing to all students or by meeting routinely with MinCo and its constituent organizations), and referring students' suggestions to the relevant departments and programs.

Encourage students to promote curricular diversification through the Majors Committees that many departments have established.

Encourage consideration by the CEP of the Peoples and Cultures requirement and of possible alternatives to it.