

Summarized Working Group Meeting Findings/Research

Included with this report are Appendices that provide additional context for the recommendations made in the report and the main areas of opportunity identified in a series of meetings/interviews from Fall 2017.

Appendix A is an early bullet-point list of the possible recommendations considered by the Working Group. This document was later expanded through the use of narrative-based introductory paragraphs to become the Recommendations section of the report, above. Many of the ideas introduced in Appendix A were further refined or removed from consideration after a round of feedback from Working Group contributors and members of ExComm.

Appendix B is a collection of the distilled meeting summaries from our series of five meetings during IAP, on the following topics related to D&I:

- Advocacy and Statements
- Communication and Community
- Relationships with Student Groups
- Relationships within GSC
- Relationships with MIT Administration

Appendix C is a distilled list of all of the issues and opportunities raised from a series of one-on-one and small group interviews conducted throughout Fall 2017. Arolyn and Michael met with all inaugural members of DIS and members of ExComm interested in advancing D&I projects in the 2017-2018 Council Leadership Year. A full “transcript” of all these meetings will remain available to anyone when permanently transferred from the Working Group Google Drive folder to the GSC Archives (the GSC Secretary, gsc-secretary@mit.edu can assist with access to the Archives).

Appendix D is the 2006 Final Report from the GSC Task Force on Diversity, which is referenced in this report.

Appendix E contains the resolutions introduced following delivery of the 2006 GSC Task Force on Diversity Final Report, and supporting materials from meetings of the Council:

- 53.gsc.1.2: Creation of Ad Hoc Diversity Committee
- 2006-2007 Diversity Committee One-Year Plan
- 53.gsc.8.2: Creation of a Diversity Committee (Bylaws Amendment)
- Council meeting minutes for discussion of 53.gsc.8.2, in which the 53.gsc.8.2 was defeated following a motion for a secret/non-recorded vote

Appendix F is Resolution 64.gsc.7 to Appoint the Diversity and Inclusion Subcommittee Chair to the Executive Committee, introduce in March 2018

APPENDIX A

Preliminary Recommendations
Future of Diversity and Inclusion Working Group

D&I Representation on ExComm

- Considerations
 - How do we ensure that there is good communication between GSC leadership and D&I representatives? (GSC advocacy, communication with Administration, etc.)
 - Specifics:
 - Should the D&I liaison to ExComm be a full voting member of ExComm?
 - Who should choose the D&I liaison to ExComm?
 - Should the D&I liaison to ExComm also be a Chair of DIS/future GSC entity specializing in D&I?
- Options
 - Informal liaison from DIS
 - Not if Committee/Board is created--will have full voting member
 - Appointment by Council of Full Voting Member, “D&I Advisor”? (**Bylaws II.G.1**)
 - Could be a step toward other structural changes, with Resolution creating this position revoked in a future proposal to make other permanent change
 - Named person vs office named; removal process
 - Membership as a Standing Committee/Board Chair
 - Requires Bylaws amendment if a new Committee/Board is formed
 - Internal operating guideline change if a new/re-designated Chair on an existing Committee

D&I Representation on Council

- Considerations
 - What is our goal for Council representation?
 - Constitution mandates **five (5)** at-large positions, rather than delegating specific number to Bylaws
 - Scope of the at-large positions can be changed by Council Resolution
 - The number of at-large positions can be changed by a Constitutional Amendment
 - Current positions:
 - Women (GWAMIT)
 - “Minority At-Large”
 - Thirsty Ear/TEEC
 - Families and Parents
 - General At-Large
- Options
 - Reassign at-large Council representative positions to include more D&I representation (Council resolution)

- Remove hard-coded number of at-large Council representative positions, could later include more D&I representation (Constitutional amendment)
- *Side note:* a person appointed to the Executive Committee by Council would not vote on Council unless they were also a ad-hoc Committee Chair or held another voting position
- Develop policies on the recruitment of Council representatives that encourage more diverse representation across demographics
- DIS/(GSC entity specializing in D&I) should give regular updates at GCMs

Better Alignment across GSC Committees/Boards

- Considerations
 - How should the GSC distribute ownership of D&I?
 - “Burden” of outreach: D&I reps on each committee, or liaisons from committees to D&I group?
- Options (Committees)
 - Committees appoint voting/non-voting liaisons to DIS(/future GSC entity specializing in D&I)
 - DIS(/future GSC entity specializing in D&I) appoints voting/non-voting liaisons to Committees
 - Annual ad-hoc decision between DIS(/future GSC entity specializing in D&I) and each Committee on liaison structure
 - Potentially at ExComm transition retreat or first committee meetings of the leadership year
 - Coordinating better with P&P (Publicity and Publications Board) to communicate with the student body at large
 - Past ideas on newsletter, podcast, etc.
 - Current capacity of P&P has been limiting
 - Coordination vs oversight
 - Committee liaisons to P&P previously requested

Statements on D&I/Community Values

- Considerations
 - What are the GSC’s priorities and positions relating to D&I? Who has ownership of developing/maintaining them? What is the role of a value statement (general principles) and what is the role of a platform (specific advocacy points)?
 - Who is responsible for expressing the GSC’s opinions on D&I topics? Who is the audience? Would adopting an approval mechanism or review process would be appropriate?
 - Progress of current ExComm deliberations on statements in general
- Options
 - Creation of a Community/Quality of Life Platform
 - More general, potentially developed and maintained by HCA and passed by Council
 - Creation of an Inclusion and Equity Platform

- More specific, potentially developed and maintained by D&I structure and passed by Council
- Creation of a general GSC Platform on all topics
 - Some procedure for who has ownership over which topics
- Council Resolution to create a platform that includes a process for writing and approving statements relating to that platform
- Bylaws amendment to outline process for writing and approving statements
 - General, to apply to all Committees
 - Committee-Specific, potentially to apply to ExComm or HCA
 - Subcommittee-Specific, to apply to a continuing DIS
- Approval mechanism: should a Committee/Board ultimately pass statements?
 - HCA
 - ExComm
- Review process (as with EAB statements): should there be a mechanism for further review of statements?
 - President
 - HCA Chairs
 - DIS Chair
 - ExComm
- Audience of the Platform Documents and the produced statements
- Ownership/authorship of statements
 - Some subset of the GSC?
 - Leadership of the GSC?
 - “The GSC”?
 - Graduate Students at MIT

More Outreach to Student Groups

- Considerations
 - How can the GSC President (and Officers) can amplify student groups' voice to administrators?
 - How can we encourage more longer term relationships and consistent interactions with student groups and student group leadership?
 - Funding applications can be confusing for student groups, especially when new members plan an event and apply for funding on unclear eligibility guidelines
 - Honoraria for speakers, cost of food per person...
 - Recruitment and retention
- Options
 - Roundtable discussions with student group leaders hosted by GSC leadership
 - Constituency rep positions on DIS(/GSC entity that specializes in D&I)
 - This is a good thing and should be continued.
 - Constituency reps can facilitate student groups with similar missions organizing or meeting regularly.
 - Liaise with ASA to onboard new graduate student groups
 - Conduit assembly on DIS

- This is a **very good thing** and should be continued.
- Targeted recruitment through Nominations Board
- Standing meetings with Student Groups
 - Especially during Funding Board application windows
 - ASA help and onboarding new student groups
 - Connect to existing groups formed by ISO, Rainbow Lounge, etc.

Cooperation with Larger Institute Initiatives

- Considerations
 - Alignment with Institute when mutual opportunities arise
 - Push back against Institute when our priorities aren't aligned
- Options
 - Structural changes (above and below) to have stronger D&I representation at top of GSC leadership
 - More robust relationships with student group leaders (above)
 - Nominations Board processes to get more diversity on a variety of Institute Committees
 - Not just those with "diversity" in the name

Internal Structure

- Considerations
 - How can the GSC better support DIS/(GSC entity that specializes in D&I)? Is its structure as a subcommittee of HCA sustainable in the long term?
 - Budget or organizational barriers
 - Perception barriers/legitimacy
 - Representation on ExComm (*see above*)
 - Interlocking HCA structural opportunities
 - Internal reform
 - What is the best membership model for D&I entity on GSC?
- Options
 - Continuation as HCA Subcommittee
 - Creation of a new Standing Committee (open membership)
 - Creation of a new Board (defined voting membership)
 - Subcommittee on a different Committee
 - ExComm
 - Multi-year process
 - DIS as subcommittee
 - New ExComm Position
 - Potential third HCA Chair (Diversity & Inclusion)
 - HCA Strategic Plan
 - DIS determining its own future (within reformed HCA or new structure)

APPENDIX B

Membership and Relationships

- General:
 - Representation: What group, exactly, does a C-Rep represent? Is there bilateral communication and accountability to a larger group?
 - Empowerment: People give time and energy to issues about which they care; empower students to serve on institute committees, create initiatives on things that matter to them
 - Recruitment/Retention: Well-defined roles and direct personal contact ("hey, are you coming to tonight's meeting?") will lead to better long-term membership
 - Intersectionality: How to build opportunities for groups/students who want to do events that span the communities of multiple C-Rep?
- With constituencies, student groups, and institute groups
 - Liaisons with each constituency: would be great to have a liaison to each constituency, but there needs to be some other group that can help advocate outside GSC (like GW@MIT)
 - C-Rep Constituency Groups: Could be difficult to convene groups that meet so infrequently, but good idea to have larger groups (independent of GSC?) supporting each C-Rep
 - "Critical Mass Problem": Particular issue with highly involved URM students where they get called on to serve in multiple roles (GSC, student group, Institute Committees...)
 - Constituency networks: constituency rep should get connected with other communities, and report back and forth about what's going on; for example, Jimmy is working with the Chaplain to build a larger religious life organization that can have a liaison to DIS
 - Accountability: C-Rep could easily go back to GW@MIT to discuss issues, but other C-Rep don't have such a structured group behind them
 - Liaisons vs Open Membership: board would fit with the model of liaisons to other groups, but issues arise if this model doesn't produce a person who wants to be a liaison; also issues with open membership though
 - Multiple Student Groups: Across campus, there are many student groups with similar ideas; GW@MIT does its best to have liaisons to women-focused student groups at Sloan, etc.
 - Group Creation: GSC should not try to create new student groups--should be a gathering point for student groups
 - GSC relationship with Student Groups: Many groups feel that relationship with GSC is very transactional (funding and volunteers moving around)
 - Departments
 - Gathering Department Groups: GSC could create a space (Conduit Assembly?) for departmental groups to come together
 - Sense of community: Many students have their strongest sense of community within their own department, and GW@MIT tries to develop women's groups inside departments

- Specific constituencies:
 - International students: GSC can facilitate international student groups coming together
 - Students with Disabilities: would need to coordinate with Disability Services
 - ASA and student groups:
 - Challenges with ASA collaboration: groups find that ASA is a difficult partner due to issues with long wait times and vacancies on ASA Exec (overworked)
 - Finding student groups: Difficult to find one place with all active student groups listed, so motivated students sometimes never find a group that interests them
- Within the GSC
 - GSC Leadership
 - Supporting GSC Leadership: Ability of Officers, ExComm to speak on behalf of student groups and specific topics
 - Unclear Chain: Who serves as the best first point of contact at GSC? Random students emailing GSC President all the time may not be the best way to get things done
 - ExComm
 - Need for ExComm Representation: Many issues under DIS are important enough for all of ExComm to hear and engage, and making an ExComm position connected to D&I is crucial
 - Link to GSC leadership: very important to have a stronger link to the GSC officers; this could be achieved by having 1+ person involved in diversity at ExComm meetings; would also benefit other committees (like Orientation) to have a direct link as well; ExComm would benefit from having a voice who is always thinking about inclusion
 - Liaisons and Cross-Membership: Inclusion of EAB, HCA, and others on statement-writing efforts (and D&I group on EAB statements) could lead to people getting involved on both (sub)committees
 - Overlap with other parts of GSC
 - Ownership: D&I getting involved in issues that may have other GSC committees already working--what if close collaboration isn't possible due to timeline or conflicting views?
 - Delegation vs. Collaboration: the decision making process for what diversity and inclusion initiatives the GSC takes on should go both ways; it would be inappropriate for GSC to "hand" projects to this group (telling vs asking)
 -
 - Relationship with HCA:
 - HCA as DIS home: HCA is not the best place for DIS

- HCA as DIS home: Poor alignment between mission of DIS and what is discussed in the bulk of HCA meetings (very focused on specific dorm issues and housing-adjacent topics)
 - Overwork on Institute Committees: HCA and DIS members get called to serve on too many committees due to scope of GSC issues
 - HCA Restructure: May not have energy to do it this year, but restructuring HCA could make sure that all topic areas are covered by dedicated people (and could reduce the amount of dorm-focused discussion at HCA meetings)
 - Representation on Council: Would require Constitutional amendment to change the at-large seats, but need to find way to get more voices into Council meetings
 - Specifics:
 - Professional Development: Connected to ARC but this is a priority of other Institute Offices and could be a great way to develop initiatives with strong Institute support
 - Recruitment at Orientation: Can't rely on one person (this year, Ty) to go out and find people to fill spots, and Orientation could be a good way to get fresh volunteers involved
- With administration
 - Overlap with Administration: Avoiding competition with and duplication of groups that are being coordinated by OGE/DSL or other institute offices
 - GSC role vs. Adminstration role: When should students approach GSC vs when should students approach MIT administration?

Communication and Advocacy

- With students and student groups
 - Importance of sharing big-picture vision with students: GSC could communicate long-term goals and strategic plan to students (Orientation?; okay to say what GSC is working to improve when welcoming students to campus)
 - Role of student leaders in highlighting the importance of diversity: MIT and President Reif communication the importance of diversity, but it would be nice if the student body reiterated this message; in some sense this is already there, just need to claim it
 - Communication between students: need better communication between GSC and institute committees or groups; better to be intentional about this; need intersection of thoughts and communities; getting more organic communication between C-Reps and Conduits is the key to making changes happen
 - Communication to international students: student groups are play an important role in support and community for international students; GSC could communicate with international students better by sending messages through student organizations (international students often get info from each other)
 - Communication: Communication *from the GSC President* would be more effective (once or twice a semester?)

- Real-Time Feedback: How to use tools such as GCM surveys to get more real-time feedback on how GSC is doing and where it should focus energy
 - Anonymous communication to GSC: Email box? Physical box? How can students get info to GSC confidentially?
- Statements
 - Authorship: Communication through statements: the “author” should be “GSC”
 - Authorship: difference in authorship between “GSC” or “GSC leadership” or “GSC Diversity...” will have different impact
 - Representation: for statements, balance between efficiency and representation; statements need enough time to build consensus and get info, but fast enough that they’re timely; some options include veto power or $\frac{2}{3}$ thresholds for approval; c-reps need to be engaged for the GSC to have legitimacy in speaking on these issues; possible challenges when people don’t see eye-to-eye, even on DIS now
 - Unresolved issues: Issue raised that statement writing is perhaps the most difficult topic to resolve at the moment
 - Diversity Platform: A D&I platform similar to Policy Platform could help give guidance to issues tackled *ad hoc* recently
 - Diversity Platform: Creating something similar to Policy Platform could give preauthorization to make statements so that it’s not *ad hoc* every time
 - Diversity Platform: Many issues that students are bringing up at PP Open House are connected to D&I--could we have a similar D&I Platform?
 - Decision-making process: If structure is created, there could be a system whereby each constituency has Review power (similar to EAB Chair and GSC President on EAB statements) so that no statement is detrimental to those communities
 - Decision-making process: The desire to Review could come for many reasons: authorship (GSC D&I vs “The GSC” vs Student Body), scope of issue, overlap with other committees
- Advocacy:
 - Strengthening GSC advocacy: Working on behalf of small groups of students who will be negatively impacted by policy changes (connected to idea that some grad students might not “agree” even if they aren’t particularly affected)
 - Strengthening GSC advocacy: Ability to weigh in on internal issues (hypothetical example: changes at MIT Medical affecting trans health coverage)...
 - Accountability: C-Rep could easily go back to GW@MIT to discuss issues, but other C-Reps don’t have such a structured group behind them
 - Voice: GSC President saying something to admin has much more weight than GW@MIT saying something alone
 - Transparency: Lack of transparency with respect to decisions made by Administration, and GSC leadership sometimes doesn’t convey information down to all (sub)committees
 - Grassroots: How can GSC help get students without well-defined leadership roles get face time with administrators and GSC Officers/ExComm?

- Admissions: GSC could help develop stronger communities for current students if admissions processes were more inclusive; need to advocate in each Department/School on these issues

Additional comments:

- Structure/orgchart
 - Past GSC Initiatives: Many students and administrators do not believe that GSC can keep a sustained D&I effort based on past initiatives that have faded
 - Efficiency: Status quo would benefit from some more internal structure and more clarity on where to go in GSC for information and/or support
 - Commitment: Structure less important than commitment to issues
 - Scope: If the portfolio is very broad, it should be a larger committee/board
 - Structure: Sense that new D&I group would be best as a Board based on well-defined roles and accountability to other student groups
- Possible programming:
 - Mentorship: Internal and external programs with mentor/mentee relationships are very powerful (and are seen by participants as incredibly helpful)
 - Curricular Support: Departmental seminars/groups focused on various issues (Women in Course 6, for example)
- Team communication:
 - Recruitment and Communication: Facetime and personal messages >> Anno submissions, and this could be made easier by collection of Moira/Mailman list names for leadership in student groups
 - Team Communication: One-off emails are difficult--should we use tools like Slack?
 - Communication within DIS: Need to have own calendar or some better way of getting events and issues in one place (falling through the cracks when at end of long emails)
- Funding:
 - Funding sources: Operating budget from GSC vs OGE/DSL directly to student groups vs OGE/DSL passed through GSC (earmarked)
 - Limited funding: GSC funding is always tight
- Other:
 - Guidance to Student Groups: would be valuable to have guide for student groups on funding, reimbursement, communication with Lauren, etc.

APPENDIX C

Meeting Summary: Relationships with MIT Administration

2018-01-23, 10:00am-12:00pm, 50-220

Attendees: Michael McClellan, Peter Su, Claire Duvallet, Alex Genshaft, Yamini Krishnan (through meeting notes on Google docs), Erik Tillman (occasional check-ins through Google docs)

Note: the perspectives in this document will not be comprehensive in terms of identifying all programs and partners across the Institute. This meeting will ideally serve as a first step toward identifying all staff contacts, offices, funding programs, events, grants, and individual Faculty Champions for diversity. This Working Group cannot hope to identify every program possible, and perhaps the most important takeaway from this single meeting is that information-gathering tools on this topic should be developed in DIS, the Conduit Assembly, and other groups that interact with these Institute-based diversity and inclusion resources.

This meeting covered two main topics:

- What are the **current ways** in which MIT Administration and Institute Offices provide funding, support, and staff resources to student-led diversity and inclusion efforts?
- What are the **ideal ways** in which MIT Administration and Institute Offices **could** provide funding, support, and staff resources to student-led diversity and inclusion efforts?

Current Support

- Grants (NIH, NSF, HHMI...) to academic departments with educational or outreach goals
 - Held by grant managers, and may only be part of the departments that originally joined the grant proposal
 - Many grants such as these are often on the “chopping block” with their parent agencies due to perceived lack of quantitative results
- OGE Graduate Community Fellows
 - Outcome varies widely, year to year, on the output from these positions
 - This opens up questions of compensation/stipend support for students engaging in these crucial community development efforts
- Many helpful offices and staff contacts, but no larger email lists or wide groups to pose questions or seek advice
- Institute (Faculty and Presidential) Committees on various diversity-related topics can help drive Institute policy and priorities
 - Students are appointed to serve on these committees, mostly by GSC Nominations Board
- Any future Diversity Committee/Board/other GSC structure will need to have more direct links to key administration members
 - Ideally does not depend on year-to-year personal relationships between the leadership of that group and the administrators, but instead, something more structural/codified
 - “A seat at the table” on Excomm to help make better GSC-Admin decisions

Ideal Future Support

- The GSC President and Officers have enormous access to MIT Administration members
 - Can amplify grassroots messages from students upward
 - Can directly bring info from administrators down to student group leaders
 - Many situations where this would be inappropriate, and direct communication between Admin and student leaders is better
 - GSC ExComm doesn't meet often enough to have a definite say on issues where the GSC President must provide instant/quick answers
 - Communication after the fact could be considerably better
 - Having an ExComm member focused on Diversity would greatly improve issues with "not having the right people in the room"
- Institute Committees could have students appointed more strongly meet the emerging needs of the graduate student body
 - Nominations Board could, for example, aim to incorporate diverse viewpoints into CJAC membership
 - PAC is indirectly chosen by Nominations Board (students are solicited, final selection by President Reif)
- More discussion in this vein is needed, but a Working Group meeting with four people is not going to be able to see this future-oriented issue from every viewpoint necessary

Future Work:

Idea for DIS, Conduit Assembly, and other student groups: help populate comprehensive lists of programs and outreach by MIT Administration

- Staff Contacts
- Offices
- Funding
- Events
- Grants and sub-programs within larger grants
- Faculty Champions in Departments

Meeting Summary: Advocacy and Statements

2018-01-16, 10:00am-12:00pm, 50-220

Attendees: Alex Genshaft (webex), Arolyn Conwill, Halston Lim, Jimmy Kaczmarek, Kassi Stein (webex), Lisa Guay, Michael McClellan, Orpheus Chatzivasileiou, Peter Su, Sarah Goodman, Yamini Krishnan (webex; second hour)

This meeting covered three main topics:

- What advocacy on diversity and inclusion means
- How to define the GSC's positions on diversity and inclusion
- How to express the GSC's positions on diversity and inclusion

Advocacy can take many forms, including:

- Writing statements (possible audiences include other students, the administration, policymakers, the public, etc.)
- Hosting our own events or endorsing other events
- Holding meetings with other stakeholders
- Creating ways for individuals to voice their opinions or raise concerns and for individuals to connect with each other

Here are some general comments on advocacy that came up:

- We should have an overarching strategy for the GSC's advocacy efforts (both in terms of our strategy for addressing diversity and inclusion and in terms of ensuring that different pieces of the GSC are operating synergistically).
- Three questions: Can the GSC say something? Should the GSC say something? What should the GSC say?
- The audience is a major factor in determining the best method and content for advocacy efforts.

In general, the GSC should articulate its stance on diversity and inclusion in two parts:

- Vision of diversity and inclusion: This would outline the GSC's values relating to diversity and inclusion.
 - For historical perspective, the GSC passed the following language in 2006:
"Diversity characterizes a community. It is not a state or end goal. Cultivating a diverse community includes promoting tolerance and respect, recognizing and embracing the interdependence of individuals and groups, and actively challenging divisive and discriminatory threats. A more diverse MIT community is better able to achieve MIT's mission of advancing knowledge and educating students to best serve the nation and the world." (However, the working group does not have an opinion on whether or not this particular language would be an appropriate expression of current values.)
- Platform on diversity and inclusion: This would itemize positions the GSC takes on diversity and inclusion.

- Side note: Some positions relevant to diversity and inclusion are already part of the GSC's policy platform, which is managed by the External Affairs Board. Any potential overlap will need to be addressed at future working group meetings.
- Additional comments: These could be separate documents, or the vision portion could be a preamble to the platform portion. Regardless, the language would be drafted by whatever part of the GSC specializes in diversity and inclusion (currently DIS), and then approved by General Council through a Council resolution.

Reasons that having these document(s) would be valuable include:

- Writing a vision of diversity and inclusion is important because it articulates core values and guiding principles, and can serve as a starting point for conversations. Writing a platform on diversity and inclusion is important because it defines more actionable advocacy projects.
- Credibility: Having the GSC's positions backed by a formal platform development process (that consults with stakeholders across campus) and backed by a Council vote will lend strength and credibility to the stances taken by the GSC on behalf of the student body.
- Accountability: Having a formal process for determining the GSC's positions (rather than making decisions case-by-case) provides graduate students with a means of influencing the process, either to express their support for a change or to express their dissent.
- Responsiveness: Having a formal process will also help the GSC anticipate and plan ahead so that we can respond quickly and effectively to issues that arise.
- Expertise: Sustained efforts to maintain, update, and act on these document(s) will encourage and develop the GSC's expertise in these areas.
- Effectiveness: Ad hoc treatment of advocacy topics is neither appropriate nor effective, and the GSC should in general move toward a more strategic and institutionalized approach.

Good practices for defining and prioritizing what is expressed in these documents include:

- Consulting with many stakeholders to make sure the GSC takes informed and representative positions
 - Underlying structures like DIS's C-reps and DIS's conduits and developing stronger relationships with affinity groups on campus can help ensure this happens
 - Publicizing drafts to the student body at large during the preliminary stages and during the final stages, and informing constituents how to engage with the process
- A periodic review process that re-evaluates and updates the content of the vision and platform (i.e. put a resolution through Council once per year).
- Concerns: One concern that came up regarding a platform is that the perspective of students involved in diversity and inclusion and the perspective of Council (or the student body) may differ. Is there tension between taking forward-thinking positions and still representing the graduate student body? Ideas put forth for how to alleviate this tension

include: helping to inform Council / the student body of the rationale or story behind proposed platform items, building a strong coalition in support of the proposed language (including groups/individuals outside GSC), and encouraging a culture where some dissent is okay.

In terms of expressing the GSC's positions and opinions on diversity and inclusion topics, what type of decision making process should be used to interpret a hypothetical vision statement and platform?

- A rigorous process for determining how to express GSC positions is important to many people (both for diversity and inclusion, and for all other topics the GSC expresses positions on), and the reasons cited mirror the reasons for which a written vision/platform would be helpful (see above).
 - Ultimately every part of the GSC must answer to Council, and any decision making process in GSC should reflect this. Some ways to do this include: having Council define or endorse positions or priorities, having council elect leaders/members of a body that it delegates decision-making to, establishing processes that allow Council to weigh in at multiple points, ...
 - With that said, it isn't practical for Council to directly carry out all activities of the GSC and it is valuable to develop specialized experience in specific areas so that the GSC operates effectively and efficiently. A vision/platform won't be actionable unless there is an underlying structure to support it.
- Existing models:
 - External Affairs Board analogy: EAB has a multi-layered process for taking positions on behalf of the GSC (see GSC Bylaws), which includes:
 - Development of platform document(s) which must be approved by Council
 - EAB is specifically authorized to communicate positions from the platform document(s) to external organizations
 - EAB membership is defined in the GSC Bylaws and intentionally balances the influence of various stakeholders (Council, ExComm, the Board itself)
 - Actions of the Board (such as approving statements) can be put under review, which means that ExComm or Council can decide if that action can go forward
 - Diversity and Inclusion Subcommittee of HCA:
 - Membership model based on Constituency representatives along with At-large positions
 - Department conduits and links to student/institute groups provide additional means to connect with diverse perspectives
 - Some recent statements originating from DIS have gone through the EAB approval process, although this is likely not the optimal system
- Outstanding questions:

- What body should be tasked with drafting statements or other expressions of GSC positions on D&I? What body should have the power to approve these statements/expressions?
- How can we ensure that the membership of this body has deep expertise in D&I and that all stakeholders can weigh in on cross-cutting issues that impact other parts of the GSC's work? How can we balance between specified membership (which supports a rigorous process) and open membership (which is more inclusive)?
- What are the pros/cons of a multi-tiered decision-making process that potentially involves a few different parts of GSC? Is there merit in having a centralized group that sees all statements the GSC makes?
- Who arbitrates if there are differences in interpretations of a D&I platform?
- What are possible failure modes of the different models? How can we minimize risk of failure?

The discussion in this meeting touched on the following topics that will likely come up at future working group meetings:

- Coordinating with other parts of GSC on advocacy (like External Affairs Board)
- How to build productive relationships with other student groups
- How to amplify student voices on campus

Meta-issues: GSC statement-writing in general (in particular having a similar level of rigor for all versions of statement-writing in GSC), ...

Meeting Summary: Communication and Community

2018-01-31, 10:00am-12:00pm, 50-220

Attendees: Michael McClellan, Arolyn Conwill, Sarah Goodman (left after first hour), Lisa Guay, Daniel Curtis, Peter Su, Ty Austin (on phone after ~10:30)

This meeting covered two main topics:

- Identify most communication methods the GSC uses to reach graduate students
- Discuss limitations of current lines of communication from GSC to students, and from students to GSC

The GSC has a few major communications channels that are regularly used:

- Anno, the weekly email to most enrolled grad students, which relays community-submitted event/initiative postings via Mailchimp
 - Students are added to the Anno list automatically once a year, at the beginning of Fall semester, but must add themselves at other points in the year at gsc.mit.edu/anno
 - Visiting students are not added to the list despite the clear need to relay information to all members of our community
- GSC Website, which contains important links for students to see GSC activity (resolutions, Bylaws, funding/reimbursements)
 - Separate Ski Trip and Orientation websites are maintained separate from the main GSC website, each partially built from scratch each year; is that the most effective way to communicate these events?
- GSC General Council meetings, in which council representatives and Executive Committee members gather to discuss issues on a monthly basis
 - Attendance other than Council Reps is typically low, and there is the expectation that Reps will communicate important information back to their constituents (which does not always happen)
- DIS Conduit Assembly, in which students engaged in departmental diversity and inclusion efforts gathered to discuss challenges and best practices
 - The first meeting was a success, and this venue could prove to be an effective way of getting students across the Institute to come up with targeted ideas that could be applied in many different departments/contexts
- The Grad-Admins list, though this is very high-traffic and relies on good relationships with the admins on the list for information to be forwarded on (though some departments have their admin forward everything, which can dilute the power of messaging to those departments)
- Social media channels (Facebook, Instagram, Twitter), often used to promote events
 - Messages need to be short and timely to be effective
 - Potential to have rotating contributors, such as GSC Committees/Subcommittees, who sign off at the end of each message
 - Giveaways (such as Grad Gala tickets) could help boost follows/engagement

- Current miscellaneous/diffuse methods of communication
 - Announcements at non-GCM GSC meetings
 - Word of mouth
 - Monthly newsletter
 - Paper posters
 - Infinite Display boards
- Emerging methods of communication
 - Podcasts and recorded interviews of other grad student leaders or people on campus central to important issues
 - Grad student column in the Tech (or other grad student newsletter)
 - Regular contributions (such as a column that rotates between GSC committees) and one-off issue-based contributions
 - MIT Confessions and other meme-heavy online forums

How can we develop a social media strategy?

- Add content to GSC platforms through some crowd-sourcing and polling
 - May require stabilizing/boosting social media channels first
 - Student groups could help us grow the platform in areas of particular interest

How does the GSC communicate with individual students and student groups?

- Many diffuse channels, such as cold emails, connecting through Council Reps, responding to very occasional surveys
- Typically *ad hoc* when issues arise or when feedback on a particular topic is needed
- **Current student leaders of cultural/affinity groups** express desire for more face-to-face interactions with GSC leadership, not just email contact at the beginning of the leadership year
 - It's not practical for GSC President to have many one-on-one meetings every month with student leaders - too much time and logistics
 - Open discussions scheduled ahead of time could help meet some of these needs
 - International Council by ISO is a good example of this in action
 - A pilot program could involve identifying a particular issue and then we hosting a few meetings to gauge interest in that type of forum

Are there any staff resources who could help advance GSC communication?

- Graduate Community Fellow positions are, year to year, sometimes drastically underutilized
 - There could be opportunities for students to develop communication skills, but is this idea significantly different than the current "Creative Media Manager" position for which the GSC already has a GCF?

Info for GSC to Provide

- Look into stats for anno - open rate, click rate for links

- Clean up anno list
- Website traffic
- Why do we have to make new grad gala, orientation, ski trip website?
- Same URL for these sites each year, but point to new site. Why is this?
 - Also check on the implications for Google search optimization. Can people easily find the right website each year?
- Assessment of how to support/continue DIS communication channels that have been developed this year (such as Conduit Assembly)

Meeting Notes: Relationships within the GSC

2018-02-02, 1:00pm-3:00pm, GSC Office 50-220

Attendees: Michael McClellan, Arolyn Conwill, Ty Austin, Sarah Goodman, Lisa Guay, Daniel Curtis, Nicholas Triantafillou, Alex Genshaft (on his way); Also: Malvika Verma (submitted brief comments before meeting)

This meeting covered the following topics:

- Ways the GSC can handle cross-cutting issues in general
- What roles various parts of the GSC play in diversity and inclusion
- What mechanisms can potentially facilitate collaboration and alignment across the GSC

“Cross-cutting issue”: any topic that relates to more than one part of the GSC, any project that involves people from different affiliations within the GSC

- Example 1: Professional development involves ARC and the Muddy, not to mention multiple Institute offices (Alumni Association, etc.)
- Example 2: DIS and External Affairs Board collaborations on statements; works well because DIS contributes on community implications and EAB contributes on policy implications
- Example 3: Housing advocacy this year has involved HCA (and dorms) and EAB Local Affairs and Officers
- Example 4: Family policy has had an ad-hoc working group for the past couple years that includes HCA, GWAMIT, and Officers.
- Example 5: Orientation involves everyone to some extent

Brainstorm of structural mechanisms to handle cross-cutting issues:

- Ex-officio positions: when someone holds a position by virtue of their office (ex. HCA Co-Chairs and GSC President are ex-officio members of External Affairs Board; many other examples)
 - Similar model: when someone has the option to take an ex-officio position or to appoint someone else into a position (ex. GSC President or her/his designate sits on the Muddy Board)
- Groups formed to focus on specific issues
 - Working groups (informal): many ad-hoc examples, typically have less structure
 - Task forces (formal): approved by Council, typically have specified timelines and membership and deliverables
- Communication at leadership level:
 - ExComm meetings: monthly meetings, cover updates and major topics; Also Officer meetings: weekly
 - Possible to have more frequent ExComm meetings?
 - Officer liaisons: each Committee/Board has an Officer liaison, who attends meetings and is a listener on the Chair email list
 - ExComm retreat: annual collective priority-setting, but tends to be a time crunch

- Lateral communication:
 - Informal communication between individual students working on different projects
 - Liaisons: specifying an individual to communicate between two groups (i.e. between Committees or Subcommittees)
- Communication to a broad audience:
 - Presentations at GCMs: overview of what everyone is up to
 - GSC Newsletter
- Delegation: different entities working on overlapping issues come together and decide who has ownership over which parts
- Representative bodies: bring representatives of various constituencies together to
- Helpful tools:
 - Email: to avoid death by meetings
 - Social events: informal connections between people (ex. post-GCM socials at the Muddy)

Roles of different parts of the GSC in diversity and inclusion:

1. Specialists (currently DIS):
 - a. House deep expertise/awareness
 - b. Engage in community advocacy
 - c. Raise issues with GSC
 - d. Serve as a resource to other parts of GSC
 - e. Communicate with the student body
 - i. With student group leaders of constituencies
 - ii. With department student governments
2. Other Committees/Boards (whose core mission isn't specifically D&I):
 - a. Loop in specialists when relevant issues come up
 - b. Actively seek feedback and collaboration with specialists
 - i. Maintain ownership but take into account feedback from consultations
3. Leadership (ExComm, Officers):
 - a. Find out what MIT's Administration is doing/thinking
 - b. Make connections between different parts of the GSC
 - i. Stay aware and make aware
 - ii. May delegate some interactions
 - c. Communicate
 - i. Emphasize values like D&I
 - ii. Set a good example for student groups
 - iii. Maintain communication channels with student groups leaders
 - d. Advocate
 - i. Manage GSC advocacy efforts
 - ii. Solicit diverse opinions
 - iii. Amplify student voices
4. General Council:
 - a. Provides broad, representative feedback

- b. Shed light on the “state of the Institute”
- c. Share best practices

List of possible structural (see also Appendix 1):

- Liaison models between Specialists and Committees
 - Models:
 - Committee liaison(/ex-officio) to Specialists
 - Specialist liaison(/ex-officio) to Committees
 - Or do this on an ad-hoc basis
 - Pros/Cons to models:
 - A more flexible system could be nice, but then again having specific posts that need to be filled can elevate their priority
 - Many feel that this should be decided on a case-by-case basis
- ExComm member or liaison from Specialists
 - Roles: provide info to ExComm, receive info from ExComm, follow up on relevant projects, possible voting on ExComm
- Liaisons for communication: Identify an individual on each Committee (and from Specialists) to liaise with the GSC Secretary/P&P to improve GSC communications
 - (This idea was very popular)
- Relationship between Council and Specialists
 - Recruitment (conduits)
 - Connection to student governments (conduits)
- At-large members on Council
 - (Would require amendment to GSC Constitution)

Additional thoughts:

- Institutional failure if spot not filled OR schedule something every year in perpetuity; accountability needs to be somewhere (but more than one option for where)

Meta-questions:

- Siloing within the GSC: How visible is the work of one committee to another committee? If visibility/awareness is limited, is this a problem?
- Representation on General Council: use and number of at-large seats on Council
- Other ideas: ASA reform; Department student government engagement with GSC; System for committee liaisons to each other; Training on how to run an effective meeting

Appendix I: Whiteboard photo

ROLES/RESPONSIBILITIES

DIS/Specialist

- Awareness
- Community Advocacy
 - ↳ representation: communicate to
- Raise issues w/ GSC
 - ↳ Some as a resource/consultant to other parts of GSC
 - ↳ Communicate w/ Student body
 - ↳ work w/ existing structures
 - ↳ talk w/ student group leaders
- Loop in specialists when relevant things come up
- Actively seek feedback + collaboration w/ specialists
 - ↳ ownership + consultation

Communicates:

- ↳ specialist liaison to communication office
- ↳ specialist liaison to community members
- ↳ specialist liaison to other parts of GSC
- ↳ liaison: GSC & student body
 - ↳ advocacy: specialist & student body
 - ↳ recruitment + communication

GSC Leadership ↗ Office ExComm

- Find out what Administration is up to
- Make connections b/w diff. parts of GSC
 - ↳ stay aware + make aware
 - ↳ delegate interactions
- Communication - talk w/ student groups b/w
 - ↳ emphasize values like inclusion
 - ↳ set a good example
- Advocacy - manage GSC advocacy
 - ↳ solicit direct opinion
 - ↳ amplify student voices

Council/Generalist ↗ council membership structure

- Broad representative feedback
 - ↳ What does student body think?
- State of the institute
- Share best practice,

Meeting Summary: Relationships with Student Groups (Part I)

2018-01-17, 11:00am-1:00pm, 50-220

Attendees: Arolyn Conwill, Halston Lim, Kassi Stein (webex), Lisa Guay, Michael McClellan, Sarah Goodman (after first 30 minutes), Yamini Krishnan (online, following minutes), Erik Tillman, Molly Bird, Claire Duvall

This meeting covered two main topics:

- How do student groups form, get “officially” recognized, and recruit members?
- How can the GSC best support student groups without overstepping or duplicating student group efforts?

The meeting was originally going to touch the following topic, which was not discussed due to fruitful discussion on how the GSC can solicit and receive broad feedback from student groups:

- What resources (funding and non-monetary support) can the GSC and ASA provide to student groups?

Student groups at MIT can take many forms, including (some of these categories are overlapping in some cases):

- Grassroots organizing around specific events or topics
 - Typically temporary, can extend into longer-term groups
- Organizations or student governments within academic departments
 - Can be general, focused on social events, focused on diversity & inclusion topics (i.e. Women in Physics or EAPS WiXII/Women in Course XII)
- Officially-sanctioned student groups approved by the Association of Student Activities (ASA)
 - Given certain rights, such as room reservation and ability to spend money out of an Institute Cost Object
 - Certain responsibilities, such as agreeing to and enforcing non-discrimination and anti-hazing policies
- Groups directly supported or organized by Institute Offices (OGE, DSL, ISO, ICEO, Chaplain...)

Not every student group ends up seeking (or receiving) ASA recognition, which is necessary to receive funding from the GSC Funding Board (or UA Finboard), to make room reservations with CAC (Campus Activities Complex), and more. What are the barriers to seeking or receiving ASA Recognition?

- Many department-centered student groups find that the ASA benefits are not worth the hassle of going through the approval process, especially if the group is adequately supported by the department administration.
- Until recently, an ASA moratorium on new student group recognition led to frustration by student group leaders who hoped to receive ASA benefits

- ASA requires student groups to be open to all students, necessitating removal of “graduate” or “graduate student” from group names and governing documents
 - Many older groups are non-compliant but have been “grandfathered” in and will not lose ASA recognition despite being relatively graduate-focused

Recruitment is a challenge for any student groups, but appears to be especially difficult for many cultural and affinity groups. What are the most common recruitment techniques, and how well do they work?

- MIT Administration has access to demographics of students, but due to FERPA restrictions, cannot share certain information with student group leaders
 - GSC can, for example, receive a list of all enrolled graduate students for addition to the Anno list and very-low-traffic gsc-all@mit.edu list
 - Messaging to URM students is spotty due to issues with releasing lists to student organizations
 - Many students receive information from O(D)GE (“The Institute” instead of student groups themselves) on joining ACME, The Academy of Courageous Minority Engineers, during Orientation
 - Invitation to GW@MIT-sponsored Orientation Women’s Welcome Lunch is aided by O(D)GE in order to reach all incoming graduate women
- The ASA Midway, a “recruitment fair” for student groups, is not seen as valuable for graduate student groups due to the vast majority of groups being focused on undergraduate students
- Department-centered organizations have less difficulty engaging students (recruitment into leadership positions may still be difficult) due to support from the academic programs and department administrators

The Diversity Conduit Assembly, which brings together leaders on diversity and inclusion initiatives from academic departments, is achieving different results than the more general GSC General Council. How can the two groups have their best practices applied to the other?

- Conduit Assembly felt like a welcoming space where people in small groups shared personal experiences
 - Can the Open Floor section of the General Council Meetings be an explicit time/place for Council Reps to share challenges their departments are facing and receive some real-time suggestions and feedback?
- General Council Meetings bring together the entire Executive Committee plus all Representatives, allowing for communication *directly* to the leaders who can initiate change-sparking conversations in the following month
 - Need for a direct line of communication between Conduit Assembly (and other Diversity and Inclusion Initiatives) and GSC Officers/Executive Committee

The GSC seeks to serve as a “gathering point” for student groups to exchange information and best practices, not as a creator of fully-functioning student groups. How can the GSC best support student groups without inappropriately overstepping its bounds?

- DIS Constituency Reps (C-Reps) represent five groups: Women, URM, LGBTQ+, International, and Religious Life.
 - To whom are these C-Reps accountable?
 - Women: close relationship with GW@MIT, providing a C-Rep
 - URM: Constellation of cultural and affinity groups, but (at the moment) no centralized “council” of URM-focused groups to provide a C-Rep
 - LGBTQ+: LGBT Grad group supported by the Rainbow Lounge (plus a few other smaller groups), but not organized enough at the moment to provide a C-Rep
 - International: Constellation of cultural groups, plus groups organized by the International Students Office, but no C-Rep nominated by International Council or similar organization
 - Religious Life: Current conversations with the Chaplain to coordinate regular meetings of all religion-focused student groups, but no C-Rep nominated by any organized group
 - Most enduring partners may be Institute Offices, who may be able to link to current leadership of various student groups in any given year
 - ICEO, Chaplain, OME, OGE, Rainbow Lounge, DSL, ISO
- Working with ASA, especially into the future where efforts to have a consistent GSC-ASA graduate student liaison will be redoubled
 - Especially helpful for finding emails for student group leaders, plus knowing which student groups are actives at any given point

GSC leaders (especially the President) are often called upon to provide the “opinions of the graduate students” on various topics. How can enduring bilateral communication between GSC leaders and student group be promoted?

- In the past, this communication has largely been informal...the GSC President reaches out to a few people they know, or students with issues reach out to a friend on the Executive Committee
 - This *ad hoc* method does not work for every situation, especially when “the GSC” (as a faceless monolith) feels inaccessible to individual students
- C-Reps have started gathering emails for leaders of student groups related to their constituencies
 - This is especially helpful if Moira or Mailman “lists” are used (e.g. gsc-president@mit.edu rather than Sarah’s personal email address)
 - These email lists could be contacted when specific issues pertaining to a constituency are discussed
 - Requests should be infrequent enough that these emails aren’t filtered out by student group leaders
 - Potential statements written by DIS could be sent as drafts to pertinent constituency lists for feedback

GSC leaders often hear from students or student groups who are experiencing a crisis that could have been avoided or mitigated had earlier action been taken. How can the GSC amplify voices of student group leaders who may have trouble reaching administrators or Institute Offices?

- Reverse of the issue listed above, where GSC has trouble reaching out to proactively get feedback from student groups
 - C-Rep lists could also be used, whereby a student group raises an issue to their C-Rep, then passed on up to Diversity and Inclusion Chair, ExComm, Officers...
- Proactive work on these issues means getting people focused on Diversity and Inclusion in the room when the yearly priorities of the GSC are being determined (typically the Executive Committee transition retreat)
 - This could be achieved by, in some reorganization of the Diversity and Inclusion Subcommittee, a structure that leads to a **dedicated Diversity and Inclusion member of the Executive Committee**
 - Chair of a Standing Committee/Board
 - Addition to ExComm by Bylaws II.G.1:
 - “The voting membership of the Executive Committee shall consist of the officers of the Council, non-Officer chairpersons of standing committees, **and other persons appointed (and removable)** by the Council.”
 - Practically, as Chair of an “Executive Subcommittee” of ExComm?
- Asking cultural/affinity group leaders to serve on committees, task forces, working groups, etc. is not necessarily a sustainable method
 - Especially for URM students, many get asked to be on virtually every committee possible once they are “identified” by Institute Offices or the GSC
- Provide a space for student group leaders to speak directly to GSC leaders, especially those involved in Diversity and Inclusion
 - Convene student group leaders on a **yearly or semesterly** basis to get a pulse of the communities that are represented
 - This could be facilitated through the C-reps, or fall under the responsibility of a Diversity and Inclusion Chair/officer/leader

This was “Part I” of discussing relationships with student groups. “Part II” of this meeting will occur at some point in the near future with student group leaders invited (potentially in February once Spring Semester has started)

- This meeting was focused on identifying issues to discuss with student group leaders

The discussion in this meeting touched on the following topics that will likely come up at future working group meetings:

- Communication with Institute Offices and Administrators
- Communication with the graduate student body on GSC initiatives
- Internal GSC structures to best support Diversity and Inclusion


APPENDIX D



Graduate Student Council
of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology

GSC TASK FORCE ON DIVERSITY

REPORT OF FINDINGS RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION



MARCH 1, 2006

GSC TASK FORCE ON DIVERSITY

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Diversity characterizes a community. It is not a state or end goal. Cultivating a diverse community includes promoting tolerance and respect, recognizing and embracing the interdependence of individuals and groups, and actively challenging divisive and discriminatory threats. A more diverse MIT community is better able to achieve MIT's mission of advancing knowledge and educating students to best serve the nation and the world.

~GSC Statement of Diversity~

ARTICULATING DIVERSITY AT MIT:

The GSC Task Force on Diversity was charged by the General Council in October 2005 to evaluate the current status of diversity at the graduate student level, define diversity, investigate resources that exist at MIT, gather feedback from students, conduct research on our peer institutions, and develop recommendations for action. This executive summary provides a brief overview of our principal recommendations.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION:

The GSC Task Force on Diversity recommends the follow actions:

- ❖ The GSC should form a permanent standing committee for diversity
- ❖ The Administration and the Faculty should Increase the scope of current Institute diversity initiatives at the faculty level and create a central office to coordinate MIT's efforts on diversity
- ❖ The Schools and Departments should focus financial and human resources on recruitment of traditionally underrepresented graduate students, on promoting K-12 outreach, and on developing programs to promote a better understanding of the diversity at MIT
- ❖ The MIT Corporation should develop an Institute Statement on Diversity and create a visiting committee on diversity to monitor MIT's progress on the student, faculty, and staff level

The following pages provide an overview of the charge to the Task Force, a draft of the GSC Statement on Diversity, a historical timeline of past GSC diversity initiatives, findings which include feedback obtained from graduate students, an overview of the current diversity of the graduate student body and a review of efforts at our peer institutions, and finally a set of recommendations for action.

The appendices include a copy of the original GSC Resolution creating the GSC Task Force on Diversity, a section which discusses the integral nature of diversity in fulfilling MIT's mission, a section on diversity statements and initiatives at peer institutions, a section which provides examples from the scholarly literature to support our recommendations, and finally a section which provides a list of potential resources in the scholarly literature which discuss the issue of diversity in organizations.

GSC TASK FORCE ON DIVERSITY

REPORT OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION

The Graduate Student Council (GSC) Task Force on Diversity (TFoD) was first proposed by legislation submitted to the General Council in August 2005. On October 5, 2005 the General Council approved a bill which created the Task Force on Diversity and charged it with five tasks¹:

1. **Evaluate:** Evaluate the purposes, outcomes and effectiveness of the Graduate Student Council Diversity Initiative of 2001
2. **Define:** Formulate an official GSC statement on principles with respect to the definition and promotion of diversity in the graduate student community
3. **Investigate Resources:** Develop a directory of Institute administrative, departmental, and student organizations working to promote or facilitate diversity in the graduate student community
4. **Gather Feedback:** Survey, through interviews, questionnaires, and focus groups, departmental and student group responses to the Institute's diversity commitment and policies thereof, with specific attention to the identification of concerns and best practices
5. **Conduct Research:** Selectively survey student-led or student-engaged diversity responses at the Institute's peer graduate schools around the country, with specific attention to the identification of best practices
6. **Develop Recommendations:** Prepare and deliver a final report on *ad hoc* Committee of 2005 research activities for GSC, to be presented at a GCM no later than March 2006, such report to include recommendations for a GSC diversity policy framework to include goals, program structure and outline, implementation timeline, budget recommendations, and standards for evaluation and effectiveness.

This report provides an overview of the progress that has been made since the GSC Task Force on Diversity was assembled in October 2005. The report has four sections:

- ❖ Section one will provide the statement of diversity articulated by the Task Force
- ❖ Section two will provide a brief history of prior GSC Initiatives relating to the issue of diversity
- ❖ Section three will discuss findings from student feedback, an overview of the current status of diversity at the graduate student level, and research on peer institutions
- ❖ Section four provides recommendations for action for the Graduate Student Council, Faculty and Administration, Schools and Departments, and the MIT Corporation

A list of committee members and appendices are included at the end of the report.

¹ See appendix A for a copy of the legislation which created the GSC Task Force on Diversity

SECTION I: DEFINING DIVERSITY AT MIT

A. BACKGROUND: MIT'S APPROACHES TO & VIEWS OF DIVERSITY

MIT has no school-wide diversity statement, initiative, or entity responsible for cultivating the diverse community MIT obviously values. Some related statements, policies, groups, and initiatives include (but are in no way limited to):

Statements & Policies

- MIT Mission
web.mit.edu/facts/mission.shtml
- MIT Nondiscrimination Statement
web.mit.edu/referencepubs/nondiscrimination/
- MIT Policies and Procedures, 9.0: Relations and Responsibilities Within the MIT Community (especially, 9.1: Personal Conduct and Responsibilities Towards Students and Employees, 9.4: Policy on Racist Behavior, and 9.5: Policy on Harassment)
web.mit.edu/policies/9.0.html

Committees & Initiatives

- MIT School of Engineering Diversity Initiative
web.mit.edu/engineering/diversity/
- Staff Affirmative Action, Diversity, and Equal Employment Opportunity Management Team
web.mit.edu/hr/aa/
- MIT Committee on Community
web.mit.edu/community/index.html
- Committee on Campus Race Relations
web.mit.edu/ccrr/
- Council on Faculty Diversity
web.mit.edu/workfamily/committees_sub.html
- Council on Staff Diversity
web.mit.edu/workfamily/committees_sub.html
- Committee on the Retention of Minority Faculty (no website as yet)
- Minority Faculty Recruitment Committee (no website as yet)

In many ways, these varied and related efforts, diverse in their own way, are an apt reflection of MIT's "bottom-up" style of management. This state of affairs does not reflect any lack of concern towards diversity by MIT as a whole. Diversity is explicitly an integral part of MIT's mission, which includes "MIT is dedicated to providing its students with an education that combines rigorous academic study and the excitement of discovery with the support and intellectual stimulation of a diverse campus community. We seek to develop in each member of the MIT community the ability and passion to work wisely, creatively, and effectively for the betterment of humankind."

Still, there is no apparent unifying vision or statement regarding diversity at MIT. Perhaps the document that comes the closest in representing a school-wide statement of MIT's philosophy towards diversity is found within the Brief of *Amici Curiae*, authored by MIT and joined by DuPont, IBM, Stanford University, the National Academy of Sciences, the National Academy of Engineering and the National Action Council for Minorities in Engineering (NACME), in support of the University of Michigan's position on race-conscious admissions in the Supreme Court case, *Grutter v. Bollinger*.

The *Amici Curiae* provides a long argument for the importance of diversity in educating students in science and technology, beginning with a statement that, "diversity (broadly defined and including racial and ethnic diversity) is in fact absolutely essential to the advancement of science and engineering – in part for the same reasons that it is important for higher education generally, but also for a host of other reasons peculiarly related to these fields, and to their critical world role."

Within the *Amici Curiae*, is a suggestion of how MIT defines diversity: "...a diverse student body – broadly defined to include consideration of race, national origin, and gender as well as other demographic characteristics such as geographic background and socioeconomic disadvantage..." (pg. 10). From this statement, it appears that MIT's primary conceptualization of diversity focuses on the demographic composition of a group of people.

Based on the performance of MIT's diversity-related efforts during its recent history, and from the perspective of our graduate student task-force, MIT's current perspective on diversity is both incomplete and insufficient, and its current decentralized and accountability-free approach towards cultivating diversity renders MIT incapable of fully achieving its mission.

B. WORKING DEFINITION OF DIVERSITY

GSC Task Force on Diversity Definition:

While we concur with the view expressed in the *Amici Curiae* that "diversity" is best understood as a characteristic of a community, we reject its limitation to demographic characteristics. Our Task Force has constructed the following working definition of diversity for the purposes of our report:

Diversity characterizes a community. It is not a state or end goal. Cultivating a diverse community includes promoting tolerance and respect, recognizing and embracing the interdependence of individuals and groups, and actively challenging divisive and discriminatory threats. A more diverse MIT community is better able to achieve MIT's mission of advancing knowledge and educating students to best serve the nation and the world.²

Do all differences matter equally?

"Does the university have to be a statistical micro-replica of the US census?"

"Diversity for me entails ... students and (especially) faculty, which represent current local and national demographics."

"I would expect MIT's population to reflect that of the nation. If 10% of the population plays trumpet, I would expect 10% (plus or minus) of the MIT population to play trumpet."

~Quotes from three different MIT graduate students~

In rejecting diversity's exclusive association with demographic diversity, it is important to provide some context and constraint on MIT's responsibilities regarding diversity. Broad definitions of diversity have taken on two incompatible perspectives. One, that "representativeness" is an important concept in achieving diversity; and two, that any and all identity groups have equal standing; that "trumpet player" diversity should not be prioritized as less important than underrepresented ethno-racial group diversity. These are incompatible, because it is impossible to have a perfectly representative subset when the referent superset includes all the multi-dimensional variations of humanity that make us all unique. An impossible goal is no goal at all.

Our perspective is that MIT's diversity efforts must pay **particular attention** to two sets of diversity dimensions:

1. Diversity based on the groups identified and protected by the nondiscrimination policies of MIT and the applicable governance entities (e.g., local, state and national government, accreditation boards).
2. Diversity based on the groups commonly subject to discrimination by the society in which MIT is located.

Diversity efforts are importantly and intractably related to discrimination present in society. The fundamental issue is that MIT, like any organization, is located within a society still plagued by discrimination and status inequalities in many forms. There are countless ways to group as well as differentiate sets of individual humans. Some forms of difference have come to be used by our society in the construction of major status differences (e.g., race, gender, socio-economic class), while other forms

² Appendix B, explores the implications of this definition in the context of MIT's mission.

of difference have only minor, or inconsistent associations with status (e.g., eye color, hobby, political affiliation).

Certainly, diversity along many dimensions is important. However, particular attention is necessary for those aspects of difference related to societal discrimination, and unnecessary for other dimensions. Why is “particular attention” unnecessary for differences not associated with discrimination (e.g., trumpet playing)? Quite simply, if there is no societal discrimination along those dimensions of difference, then representational differences are either the result of random processes or associated voluntary choices (e.g., people very interested in pursuing poetry as a career are less likely to select an engineering school for college).

For those dimensions of difference that do coincide with differences in status, society commonly constructs stereotypes of competence and ability that generate self-fulfilling dynamics. Even high-potential individuals from these discriminated groups face numerous obstacles relative to their more privileged counterparts in securing society’s “objective” markers of quality and achievement (e.g., test scores, persuasive recommendations). These obstacles may accrue over an individual’s life, or across generations in families. The result is that these high-potential individuals may be overlooked, their potential left unrealized, and all of society left the poorer.

By default, and via processes that have been shown to be largely unconscious and unintentional (Banaji & Greenwald, 1995; Baron & Banaji, 2006; Bertrand & Mullainathan, 2004), the credentials and contributions of members of discriminated groups are discounted and overlooked. Only through active and intentional efforts can these unintended biases be countered. Organizations that opt not to engage in the extra effort needed to effectively cultivate diversity will necessarily be lacking in diversity, the benefits of diversity, or quite likely, both. This option is not available to MIT if it is to actively pursue its mission.

What is an under-represented minority?

Many diversity-related efforts make reference to “underrepresented minorities.” The meaning of this term varies with context. Within the field of engineering, women are underrepresented, although not a minority in the general population. For most of MIT, students of Asian descent are not considered an underrepresented minority, but within the Department of Urban Studies and Planning, they are. The representation of certain groups in a field or department can be an important consideration in efforts to cultivate a diverse community, especially regarding groups subject to discrimination in society, with the acknowledgement that the meaning can vary across departments and fields.

SECTION II: OVERVIEW OF PRIOR GSC INITIATIVES

The Graduate Student Council has been actively involved in the issue of diversity for over a decade. It has played a key role in the development and implementation of major initiatives in this arena. This section provides a brief overview of the GSC's involvement with diversity initiatives at the Institute over the past decade.

1. ***1994 – Campus Committee on Race Relations (CCRR)***

CCRR was created in 1994 as a result of a racial incident that polarized the campus in 1993. Its members come from all parts of the MIT community-students, faculty, and staff. The GSC has designated representatives who serve as part of this committee which seeks to stimulate and coordinate a systematic action agenda for improving race relations within the MIT community.

For more information: <http://web.mit.edu/ccrr/index.html>

2. ***1998 – The GSC Diversity Resolution***

In 1998, the GSC and Black Graduate Students Association (BGSA) developed and passed a joint-resolution recognizing the need for promoting diversity in the graduate student body. This resolution urged the Graduate Students Office and Departments to work together to review admissions procedures with a focus on recruiting and accepting more women and underrepresented minority students.

3. ***1999 – Adding Gender Identity to the Non-Discrimination Clause***

As a part of a resolution on Non-Discrimination on the Basis of Gender Identity, the GSC urged MIT to add gender identity to the Institutes non-discrimination policy.

4. ***2001 – International Mentoring Program***

The GSC helps develop and implement the International Mentoring Program. This mentorship program helps new incoming graduate students transition to graduate student life at MIT. Incoming international students are paired with current graduate student according to MIT department and country of origin.

5. ***2002 – Discussion of Diversity at Corporation Joint Advisory Committee (CJAC)***

The GSC presented a list of issues surrounding diversity at the graduate student level to CJAC which included data on programs from peer institutions. A diversity subcommittee is formed at the level of the GSC with the primary goal of investigating ways to increase the number of underrepresented minority groups and addressing the following questions:

- Why didn't more minorities apply to MIT?
- Why did those who were admitted choose not to attend?
- Why did some minority students leave before earning their planned degree?

The final report of findings was delivered to CJAC in 2003.

6. ***2003 – MIT Child Care Scholarships***

The GSC Housing and Community Affairs Family subcommittee presents a report to the MIT administration on issues of family housing and child care capacity. The report compared MIT to peer institutions and resulted in an increased awareness of the problems that graduate students with families face. This report led in part to the creation of MIT Child Care Scholarships for graduate students and post doctoral fellows.

See the report of the Family subcommittee: <http://web.mit.edu/gsc/www/studentlife/family/Family-Dec2003.pdf>

For more information about the scholarships program: <http://hrweb.mit.edu/worklife/scholarship.html>

7. 2004 – *Childbirth Accommodation Policy*

The Childbirth Accommodation Policy grew out of work conducted by the GSC's Academic, Research, and Careers committee. The policy is intended to enable childbirth and subsequent return to classes and research in as seamless a manner as possible. The GSC also begun discussions among students and administrators regarding the urgency of finding cheaper childcare solutions, and has begun investigating alternative options including cooperative childcare models.

8. 2004 – *CONVERGE – Minority Graduate Preview Weekend*

CONVERGE was offered for the first time in 2004, and began as a grass roots collaboration between MIT graduate students in the GSC and BGSA as well as members of the MIT administration. The goal is to invite a cohort of outstanding underrepresented undergraduates to the MIT campus, for a fall (pre-admission) graduate preview weekend.

This collection of GSC initiatives relating to the issue of diversity is by no means all inclusive; however it provides a foundation for further discussion. Specifically, a more comprehensive overview of GSC, Departmental, and Institute-wide initiatives relating to issues of diversity with the graduate student population is needed to have a complete grasp of the nature, the scope, and the impact of these programs.

SECTION III: FINDINGS

The findings section is the heart of the report and includes feedback from graduate students on a set of questions relating to diversity, an overview of the diversity of the graduate student body at MIT, and a review of the efforts of our peer institutions on diversity.

A. STUDENT FEEDBACK

The GSC Task Force on Diversity posted a four-question survey on the GSC website and invited graduate students to respond. The Task Force advertised the survey through GSC Representatives, Graduate department administrators and with a projector in the Infinite Corridor. The survey was available on the Graduate Student Council website between November 2005 and February 2006.

In this section, we have selected a representative sample of the total 71 responses for each question and written a brief summary of all responses.³

1. What does diversity mean to you?

The definition of diversity was an important starting point for respondents' comments and framed the way they responded to diversity at MIT in general. Many respondents believe that diversity among students means having a mix of students from various countries, racial and ethnic backgrounds and a balance of men and women. Other individuals mentioned metrics of diversity that they felt were often forgotten or were especially important at MIT including sexual orientation and gender identity, physical ability, political beliefs, public vs. private educational background, and religion. Most people felt that diversity of opinion and life experience was very important, and that the traditional metrics of diversity (race, gender) were good or bad proxies for that. Several respondents believe that diversity is a "politically-correct" buzzword that creates divisiveness.

- *Diversity among students means the "standard" stuff -- race, class (which MIT needs to work on), age (which MIT needs to work on too), gender/gender identity, national origin, physical ability, religion/non-religion -- but also diversity of experience. It means a range of life experiences, work experiences, backgrounds beyond academia, and ideas about what they'll do with their degrees. (**School of Architecture and Planning**)*
- *Diversity for me entails a variety of race, gender, ethnicity, and international students and (especially) faculty, which represents current local and national demographics. This representative feature of campus diversity is key as it prepares students for their future participation and leadership in the United States and the world. Just as important as symbolic demographic measures of diversity, like race and gender, though arguably more difficult to measure and apportion, is a deeper cultural diversity which involves a diversity of viewpoints and ideas. I believe that metrics such as skin color, gender, and nationality are important starting points, a means but not an ends, for creating a representative campus. (**School of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences**)*
- *It is a mere buzzword intended to create an excitement in socio-political circles and therefore is not clearly definable. If it has any practical meaning at all, it might be that of creating an environment whereby various opinions are allowed to exist. It is unfortunately commonly used only to refer to ethnic composition, gender-issues and other buzzword inundated topics. (**School of Engineering**)*

³ Responses by school were divided as follows: Engineering-33, Science-11, Sloan-7, SOAP-7, HASS-6, HST-3, "Other" or Not given-4

2. Based on your definition of diversity, please comment on whether you agree with the following statements and why:

- **It is important for MIT to be diverse.**
- **It is important for my graduate program to be diverse.**

The vast majority of respondents believe that diversity has some value for the Institute and their own department. The most common reasons why they felt it was important included:

- (1) diverse opinions allow students to look at problems from different perspectives and bring new solutions
- (2) the rest of the nation and world are diverse and it is important to be comfortable working in such an environment
- (3) a broader mix of students increases the connections for MIT to the real world
- (4) diversity improves the social environment

A few respondents said that it was not useful at all, particularly if it disrupts a merit-based admissions process.

- *Yes! Basic statistics shows that you need a randomly diverse sample of data in order for the central limit theorem to work. That is, if you get a bunch of rich white christian straight guys from Denver in room to solve a problem VS. a diverse set of random people, the former group will likely suffer from errors in their thinking due to selection bias. The latter group will be able to draw on their differences to find unique approaches and solutions, and compliment individual weaknesses with different strengths. (**School of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences**)*
- *No. It is only important that the best students come to MIT. Select students based on their merits not their race. When a student is admitted that is not as good as another student solely because of their race, it diminishes MIT and makes us less competitive. (**School of Engineering**)*
- *Science is wonderful in such a way that there isn't necessarily one correct method to solve any given problem. The campus should be diverse--it adds many number of unexpected joys both in our work and in our social lives. The graduate program should be diverse since it's easy to feel awkward due to the lack of it. Any minority can attest to the fact that there are moments when the differences are overly apparent. While differences are good--if you're the only one that is different in any sense of the word--a certain amount of discomfort is likely to occur. (**School of Science**)*

3. How well is diversity addressed in your department/program? What opportunities and challenges exist for furthering diversity?

We received responses from each school and several departments, with great variety of responses to this question.

School of Architecture and Planning: The respondents from the Architecture department generally felt that the program had made efforts to improve diversity and while there is good gender balance among faculty, there is less cultural, racial or ethnic diversity. Planning students felt that the department should recognize the importance of having a student body that reflects the people that they are likely to serve and students wish that managing diversity was taught as a core skill.

School of Engineering: Due to the large number of engineering students, there was great variety to the responses. This school had the highest proportion of respondents noting that their program was not diverse at all, and several respondents discussed the lack of women in their departments (particularly Electrical Engineering and Computer Science). Other students lamented the lack of integration between international and U.S. students.

School of Science: Many students noted the high number of international students, though limited racial diversity among American students. Respondents also mentioned the gender balance among female students, but the lack of balance among the faculty.

School of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences: There was variety with regard to how respondents felt that race and gender diversity are addressed but that diversity opinion was also important. Two students mentioned that there are no openly gay students in their departments.

Sloan School of Management: Many students felt that the program is internationally diverse but has less diversity of American students. Students also mentioned the importance of organizations and events to support students from minority or international backgrounds.

Health, Science and Technology Program: Some students would like to see more gender and racial diversity in the program. Recruitment matters, but retention of good students from diverse backgrounds is just as important.

- *Much is said about diversity in our program, but several challenges exist. First, women are severely underrepresented. It may be that some combination of factors outside of MIT's control, perhaps including biologically or culturally influenced interests, conspires to keep women away from EECS. If so, there may be other ways to involve women from outside the department in departmental research activities, and vice versa, to get some of the benefits of diversity. Second, few people recognize the family status of students as a diversity challenge. Not only do committing to a partner and having children expose people to an impressive array of new experiences, they also can isolate people, by making it more difficult to participate in research activities (and community-building events) that are often organized by and optimized for people with fewer family commitments. (**School of Engineering**)*
- *The domestic ethnic diversity is limited to a few groups, with the African-American group having poor turnout. Additionally, only selected regions of the US are well represented. We could stress more efforts in the middle of the country. (**Management**)*
- *There seems to be very little racial diversity among students, and very little racial or gender diversity among faculty. Probably the most effective way to change the diversity in my field (Earth Sciences) is to do outreach in classrooms at the high school or elementary school levels. When someone is applying to grad school, it is a little late to say "Hey, you should have become an Earth Scientist" (**School of Science**)*
- *WE ARE ALREADY DIVERSE!!!!!! (**School of Engineering**)*

4. How well is MIT developing diversity? What opportunities and challenges exist for furthering diversity at the Institute-level?

We received the widest range of responses to this question, with complaints, praise and suggestions for the Institute at large.

- *I have found MIT to be better than most places, but there is a distinct undertone of tokenism. There is also quite a bit of both explicit and implicit stereotyping, around ethnic and cultural issues, particularly on the part of some senior faculty members. With respect to the academic curriculum, I'm pretty shocked that we are teaching the physical design and planning of cities altogether without explicit reference to issues of diversity. Of the twelve faculty members in my research unit who come to mind, only one has mentioned issues of race in city design in classroom settings*

without being prompted by student questions, and that one does so in a somewhat offensive manner. I believe this lack of focus on issues of diversity weakens my educational experience at MIT. (**School of Architecture and Planning**)

- Coming from a public university where I daily experienced opposition to my taking certain technical classes due to my physical disability, I have been incredibly relieved to find that such opposition rarely if ever occurs at MIT. I am pleased to say that instead I have gotten encouragement and cooperation at all levels of staff, faculty, and students within the MIT community, and it has gone way beyond feeling like just an institution, and instead really made me feel as if I was part of a community. Five stars for effort. (**School of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences**)
- I come from the part of the country that everyone here ignores or belittles: the heartland of America. "Diversity" (i.e. variety in appearance and conformity of thought) has affected me by teaching me to keep my big mouth shut lest I be called a fascist. Back home I was thought of as liberal to moderate. Here, people say that my politics are several degrees rightward from Atilla the Hun. I think that's nonsense. But this place is a damn echo chamber full of Chomsky zombies, so I just keep quiet. I like women, I like black people, I like Hispanic people, I like Jewish people, I like Asian-Americans, I like foreigners, and I even have discovered here that I like gay people just fine. I am a friend to all people, all of whom are children of God and worthy of my respect. What I don't like is the way everyone here thinks it's a thought crime to consider George Bush better than Hitler or Satan. (**School of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences**)
- Being exposed to the diversity here has made me more open minded in my thinking about the world and the society we've created in it. I am a better person and a better engineer for it. (**School of Engineering**)
- If MIT wants to do nice social things, in addition to producing good research and educating scientists and engineers, I'd suggest that our money and efforts would be better spent in trying to actually fix the problems that lead to the phenomenon of underrepresented minorities. For all the complicated and contrived arguments about the 'need' for diversity, it doesn't honestly make life better for anybody but the very few minorities who are given a boost. And it doesn't do much to make those minority groups better represented in future applicant pools. But if we set out to actually increase the number of minority students who don't need a boost to begin with, that is actually accomplishing something. So, perhaps we should focus on ways to improve primary and secondary education for poor students. That's more frustrating and less satisfying than being able to immediately pat ourselves on the back for increasing diversity, but ultimately we need to solve problems, not mess with statistics. (**School of Engineering**)

B. GRADUATE STUDENT DIVERSITY BY THE NUMBERS⁴

In May 2003, the MIT faculty passed a resolution calling for the administration to increase the number of underrepresented minority graduate students by a factor of three in the next decade. This begs the question – how have we done in the past five years?

From the data presented in table 1, below, the number of African Americans enrolled in graduate school at MIT has remained constant, actually decreasing from a high in 2001 of 124 to 114 in 2005. If we examine the overall percentage of African Americans in the graduate population at MIT, on average that has been 1.9% for the period 2001-2005.

For Hispanics, there has been slow but steady growth in enrollment numbers from 119 in 2001 to 176 in 2005. On average, the overall percentage of Hispanics in the graduate population at MIT has been 2.5% over the past five years, but it is has increased from 2.0% in 2001 to 2.9% in 2005.

⁴ The original version of this piece is an article that appeared in the Graduate Student News in the December 2005/January 2006 issue. See appendix C for a copy of the report.

For women, the number has fluctuated around 28-29% of the overall graduate student population for the past five years.

TABLE 1: GRADUATE STUDENT DIVERSITY – BY THE NUMBERS

Fall Term	2001		2002		2003		2004		2005	
	Graduate	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men
International	1685	559	1697	586	1664	578	1611	567	1635	577
Black	80	46	67	34	76	37	77	41	74	40
Native American	8	3	4	4	13	3	13	7	7	10
Asian	388	203	411	243	400	255	403	283	410	297
Hispanic	80	39	88	39	105	48	118	53	130	46
White	1518	635	1623	670	1714	710	1666	692	1589	653
Race/Ethn Unkn	533	207	493	180	458	167	460	193	510	162
Total	4292	1692	4383	1756	4430	1798	4348	1836	4355	1785
Total Grad	5984		6139		6228		6184		6140	

These numbers shed some light on the challenge facing the Institute if it is to meet its goal of increasing the level of graduate student diversity by three-fold in the next decade.

In the final section, comparisons will be drawn between MIT and its peer institutions.

C. COMPARISON TO PEER INSTITUTIONS

This section provides an overview of the status of our peer institutions on the issue of diversity. Specifically, we examined whether our peer institutions had the following items:

1. A campus wide statement of diversity (from either the Board of Trustees, the President, or the Provost)
2. A senior-level administrator charged with the responsibility of coordinating diversity initiatives for the university
3. An office with responsibility for university diversity initiatives at the student, faculty, and staff level
4. An oversight council or committee empowered to monitoring progress on diversity initiatives and goals

For the purpose of this report, we defined our peer institutions as the set of Ivy-plus schools: Brown, CalTech, Columbia, Cornell, Dartmouth, Harvard, Princeton, Stanford, University of Chicago, University of Pennsylvania, and Yale as well as Berkeley and GeorgiaTech. Table 2, below provides a comparison of MIT to its peer institutions.

The evaluations presented in table 2 are based on information available through university websites and are not comprehensive evaluations of current diversity programs and initiatives. Although it is difficult to standardize initiatives across schools, the following table was developed to provide a perspective on where MIT stands in comparison to its peer universities.⁵

⁵ See appendix C for a comprehensive overview of diversity statements and initiatives from these thirteen universities.

TABLE 2: OVERVIEW OF PEER INSTITUTIONS

<i>University</i>	<i>Campus-wide Statement</i>	<i>Administrator</i>	<i>Office</i>	<i>Oversight</i>
<i>MIT</i>	✗	✗	✗	✗
<i>Brown</i>	✓	✓	✓	✓
<i>CalTech</i>	✓	✗	✗	✓
<i>Columbia</i>	✓	✓	✓	✓
<i>Cornell</i>	✓	✗	✗	✗
<i>Dartmouth</i>	✗	✓	✓	✗
<i>Harvard</i>	✗	✗	✗	✗
<i>Princeton</i>	✓	✗	✗	✗
<i>Stanford</i>	✓	✗	✓	✓
<i>U Chicago</i>	✓	✗	✗	✓
<i>U Penn</i>	✓	✓	✓	✗
<i>Yale</i>	✓	✓	✓	✗
<i>Berkeley</i>	✗	✓	✓	✗
<i>GeorgiaTech</i>	✗	✓	✓	✓

Source: University Websites – See appendix C for additional information and links

SECTION IV: RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on feedback from graduate students, a review of the scholarly literature on diversity in organizations, and research into peer institutions, the Task Force has developed a list of action items for four groups. Appendix D has additional rationale from the literature to support select recommendations.

A. Graduate Student Council

- ***Create a permanent standing committee*** - The graduate student council should form a permanent standing committee which would be vested with the full power and authority of a standing committee of the GSC. It should be charged to:
 - Investigate prior diversity initiatives at MIT in depth and developing a working clearinghouse of the current programs and initiatives
 - Evaluate the current GSC and Institute initiatives and provide an analysis of the pulse of the graduate student community on the issue of diversity on an annual basis
 - Coordinate the GSC's Diversity Initiatives and Programming
 - Serve as a central resource for graduate students, faculty, and administrators on the issue of diversity for the GSC
 - Advocate on behalf of graduate students on Institute committees and through various mechanisms
 - Collaborate with the administration and departments on developing and promoting recruitment initiatives at the graduate level such as MSRP and CONVERGE

B. Administration and Faculty

- ***Increase the scope of current Institute initiatives at the faculty level*** - The MIT Administration and Faculty should increase the scope of current faculty diversity initiatives and committees to include graduate students. Specifically:
 - The Minority Faculty Recruitment Committee should be broadened to include minority graduate student recruitment. Many of the issues associated with minority faculty recruitment are problems that need to also be addressed at the level of graduate students
- ***Create a central office headed by a vice president*** - The MIT Administration should create a central office charged with coordinating diversity initiatives across schools, in departments, and at the undergraduate, graduate, and faculty level similar to our peer institutions. This office should develop and distribute best practices in recruiting, retention, and success for students, faculty, and staff. This office should be headed by a senior faculty member appointed jointly by the President and the Provost

C. Schools and Departments

- ***Recruitment*** – the five schools should hire a full time recruiter that focuses on underrepresented students at the graduate level. This individual should collaborate and coordinate with the School Deans, the individual departments and faculty, as well as the GSC and the Graduate Students Office
- ***Outreach*** – Departments should be encouraged to increase their involvement in outreach in K-12 in the greater Boston area. Outreach programs to traditionally underrepresented students in the local schools will help to improve the educational experience of these youth and in the long run help to increase the applicant pool of underrepresented students interested in science, engineering, and technology
- ***Programming*** – the schools and departments should allocate funds for department and non-department based graduate student groups who develop and hold programs focused on increasing awareness of diversity (similar to the support provided by the Dean of Student Life and the Dean of Graduate Students through the ARCADE (assisting recurring cultural and diversity events) grants.

D. MIT Corporation

- ***Statement of Diversity*** - The MIT Corporation should work with the Senior Administration and Faculty to develop an Institute wide statement on MIT's commitment to diversity at all levels – students, faculty, and staff.
- ***Form a Visiting Committee on Diversity*** - The MIT Corporation should form a committee which will work with and advise the MIT Administration on its diversity initiatives and which will provide updates to the MIT Corporation on a regular basis.

TASK FORCE ON DIVERSITY – MEMBERSHIP

Sean Bradshaw
Aeronautics and Astronautics

Elizabeth Margarette Clay
Urban Studies and Planning

Peter James Dennedy-Frank
Earth, Atmospheric, and Planetary Sciences

Hector H. Hernandez
Chemistry

Nakeischea Loi Smith
Urban Studies and Planning

Brian Rubineau
Sloan School of Management

Emilie F. Slaby
Program in Science Writing

John R. Velasco
Political Science

Cindy Cin-Wei Wu
Urban Studies and Planning

CONTACT US WITH QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS AT:

GSC-DIVERSITY@MIT.EDU

APPENDIX

A. LEGISLATION CREATING THE GSC TASK FORCE ON DIVERSITY

<p>Officers</p> <p>Emilie Slaby gsc-president@mit.edu</p> <p>Sylvain Bruni gsc-vice-president@mit.edu</p> <p>Andrew Brooks gsc-secretary@mit.edu</p> <p>Ore Adeyemi gsc-treasurer@mit.edu</p> <p>Committees</p> <p>Academics, Research, & Careers Erik Larsen Carrie Vandendorf gsc-arc@mit.edu</p> <p>Activities Anna Custo Shahriar Khushrushahi gsc-ac@mit.edu</p> <p>Association of Student Activities Jen Lobo gsc-asa@mit.edu</p> <p>Funding Board Ore Adeyemi gsc-treasurer@mit.edu</p> <p>Housing & Community Affairs Andrea Schmidt Eric Weese gsc-hca@mit.edu</p> <p>Muddy Charles Pub Cory Kidd gsc-muddy@mit.edu</p> <p>Nominations Sylvain Bruni gsc-vice-president@mit.edu</p> <p>Orientation Gerardo Barroeta Shan Wu gsc-oc@mit.edu</p> <p>Publications & Publicity Andrew Brooks gsc-pp@mit.edu</p> <p>Graduate Student News Brenden Epps Paul Nerenberg gsc-editor@mit.edu</p> <p>Staff Nancy Kelly Emily Snyder gsc-admin@mit.edu</p> <p>77 Massachusetts Avenue 50-220 Cambridge, MA 02139-4307 Phone: 617-253-2195 Fax: 617-258-9274 http://psc.mit.edu</p>	 <p style="text-align: center;">MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY GRADUATE STUDENT COUNCIL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee on Graduate Student Council Diversity Initiatives • Sponsored by Hector H Hernandez (Chemistry), Albert S Wei (DUSP), P. James Dennedy-Frank (EAPS), Brian Rubineau (Sloan) • Submitted August 3, 2005, Amended October 3, 2005; Ratified October 5, 2005 by white ballot. <p>Whereas, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (the “Institute”) has affirmed its commitment to diversity and expressed the goal of increasing the enrollment at the Institute of under-represented groups;</p> <p>Whereas, the Institute’s framework to effectively implement its expressed commitment to diversity is limited because of administrative decentralization: graduate student recruiting, admissions, and retention is managed at the departmental level;</p> <p>Whereas, there is presently no framework for evaluating the effectiveness of the Institute’s expressed commitment to diversity in ongoing graduate student life;</p> <p>Whereas, the Graduate Student Council (“GSC”) initiated the GSC Diversity Initiative in 2001 at the suggestion of the Corporation Joint Advisory Committee on Institute Wide Affairs (“CJAC”);</p> <p>Whereas, GSC supports the commitment of the Institute to diversity and desires to facilitate its implementation;</p> <p>Resolved, the President of the GSC convenes an <i>ad hoc</i> Committee on Graduate Student Council Diversity Initiatives (the “<i>ad hoc</i> Committee of 2005”), charged as follows (the “charge”):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Evaluation: Evaluate the purposes, outcomes and effectiveness of the Graduate Student Council Diversity Initiative of 2001 and report back at the November, 2005 General Council Meeting (“GCM”); 2. Definition: Formulate a draft official GSC statement on principles with respect to the definition and promotion of diversity in the graduate student community, for debate and action by the GSC at the December, 2005 GCM; 3. Clearinghouse: Develop a directory of Institute administrative, departmental and student organizations working to promote or facilitate diversity in the graduate student community;
--	--

Officers

Emilie Slaby
gsc-president@mit.edu

Sylvain Bruni
gsc-vice-president@mit.edu

Andrew Brooks
gsc-secretary@mit.edu

Ore Adeyemi
gsc-treasurer@mit.edu

Committees

Academics, Research, & Careers

Erik Larsen
Carrie Vandeford
gsc-arc@mit.edu

Activities
Anna Custo
Shahriar Khushrushahi
gsc-ac@mit.edu

Association of Student Activities
Jen Lobo
gsc-asaa@mit.edu

Funding Board
Ore Adeyemi
gsc-treasurer@mit.edu

Housing & Community Affairs
Andrea Schmidt
Eric Weese
gsc-hca@mit.edu

Muddy Charles Pub
Cory Kidd
gsc-muddy@mit.edu

Nominations
Sylvain Bruni
gsc-vice-president@mit.edu

Orientation
Gerardo Barroeta
Shan Wu
gsc-oc@mit.edu

Publications & Publicity
Andrew Brooks
gsc-pp@mit.edu

Graduate Student News
Brenden Epps
Paul Netenberg
ggn-editor@mit.edu

Staff
Nancy Kelly
Emily Snyder
gsc-admin@mit.edu

77 Massachusetts Avenue
50-220
Cambridge, MA 02139-4307
Phone: 617-253-2195
Fax: 617-258-9274
<http://psc.mit.edu>



MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
GRADUATE STUDENT COUNCIL

4. Institutional Research:

Survey, through interviews, surveys and focus groups, departmental and student group responses to the Institute's diversity commitment and policies thereof, with specific attention to the identification of concerns and best practices;

5. External Research:

Selectively survey student-led or student-engaged diversity responses at the Institute's peer graduate schools around the country, with specific attention to the identification of best practices; and

6. Report:

Prepare and deliver a final report on *ad hoc* Committee of 2005 research activities for GSC, to be presented at a GCM no later than March 2006, such report to include recommendations for a GSC diversity policy framework to include goals, program structure and outline, implementation timeline, budget recommendations, and standards for evaluation and effectiveness.

It is so moved:

1. To charge the President of the GSC to convene the *ad hoc* Committee of 2005 with the forgoing charge, such committee to be formed from not more than [12] graduate students including GSC Representatives and Officers and, subject to the vetting of the GSC Nominations Committee, a representative group of Institute graduate students who are not GSC members;
2. To appropriate such funds from the reserves of the GSC as required for the operation of the *ad hoc* Committee of 2005, up to \$800.00; and
3. Establishes a term for the *ad hoc* Committee of 2005 to complete the forgoing charge of five calendar months, commencing on even date with this resolution.

B. RECONCEPTUALIZING DIVERSITY AT MIT: LET OUR MISSION BE OUR GUIDE

MIT's Mission Statement begins:

"The mission of MIT is to advance knowledge and educate students in science, technology, and other areas of scholarship that will best serve the nation and the world in the 21st century."

As the working definition of diversity from the GSC Task Force on Diversity indicates, and indeed, as MIT argued in its *Amici Curiae*, a diverse community is fundamental to the successful achievement of this mission. Using MIT's mission as guide, we illustrate the diversity-related opportunities remaining for MIT to better fulfill its mission.

Advance knowledge...

Are the 'experts' all white? Are they all men? Are they all affluent? Are they all straight? If so, we have a problem. (Krieger, 1990)

Traditional "diversity" component(s)

Requiring creativity and innovation, "advancing knowledge" is an effort known to be improved by working within a diverse group (Nemeth, 1986; Antonio *et. al.*, 2004).

Opportunities

First, research from the psychological, sociological, and organizational literatures have demonstrated a number of requirements for the realization of the creative and innovative potential of diverse groups:

- *Broader diversity:* Creativity and innovation benefit from more dimensions of diversity than demographic categories alone (Nemeth, 1986; Williams & O'Reilly, 1997; Jackson *et. al.*, 2003).
- *Diversity perspective:* If the purpose of diversity is not made clear via a clear and high-level statement from the community's leadership, the community may take on one of the counter-productive but well-intentioned diversity perspectives that can serve to undermine the potential benefits of diversity (Ely & Thomas, 2001).
- *Management of the types of conflict:* information conflict is helpful, but process conflict is harmful. Diversity can promote many types of conflict. Informed and careful management is needed to reap diversity's benefits (Jehn *et. al.*, 1999).

Second, the type of knowledge MIT seeks to advance is often more than its research output. MIT intentionally tries to lead by example, in outreach to and engagement with MIT's surrounding communities. Often the knowledge output is a demonstration of what organizations in general, and universities in particular are capable of accomplishing when performing at their best. MIT's current effort in re-designing its Environment, Health & Safety operations to serve as a national model is one case in point; MIT's reaction to the study on discrimination against female faculty is another.

MIT recently announced an Institute-wide effort to help inform the nation and the world's energy crisis, and observers will note on whether and how MIT is able to implement its recommended changes internally. With regard to diversity, MIT needs to recognize and embrace the fact that the productivity of our alumni and community in general is its own lesson to the world. Although MIT is located within a society characterized by radical demographic inequality, including inequality in opportunity, MIT has the opportunity (and we would claim, obligation) to demonstrate to society the nonsense and harm in associating a person's potential with their demographic category. It is all too well known that myths of constraints on the technical ability of women pervade all echelons of society and even academia. Similar myths extend to individuals of color. Surely a worthy and valuable goal for the Institute is to advance knowledge resulting in more efficient use of human potential than the tragic waste of the same currently endemic in our discriminatory society.

Educate students...

"To me, [diversity] means primarily that there are no unnecessary barriers, especially financial barriers, preventing qualified people of less privileged background from becoming MIT students, and performing to the height of their abilities as MIT students. ... Corrective action is required for diversity. In my view, supporting the less privileged students who WANT to come here and DO come here is more important than recruiting them to come"
~an MIT graduate student~

Traditional "diversity" component(s)

With the advent of MIT's Open Courseware (OCW) initiative, the Institute acknowledges that educating students is more than mere transfer of information and knowledge. Indeed, if MIT did not believe there was value in the learning environment of the MIT community beyond that of the content within its courses, then OCW would literally entail MIT "giving away the store." In reality, MIT continues to attract extraordinary classes of students, who in turn pay one of the nation's highest tuitions, largely for MIT's learning environment. If the learning environment is MIT's main attraction, then its cultivation is vital to MIT's survival. MIT's mission statement refers to one of the goals of diversity in MIT's learning environment as providing "support and intellectual stimulation" to students.

A second educational goal of diversity within MIT's learning environment is revealed again by the *Amici Curiae*, which states, "racial and ethnic diversity in higher education significantly contributes to students' ability to live and work together, and to communicate across racial boundaries – skills of great importance in our increasingly heterogeneous world." (*Amici Curiae*, p. 10).

Opportunities

From the student comments on diversity, there is near-unanimous agreement that interactions with others from diverse perspectives, opinions, and backgrounds are valuable elements of a quality education. There is disagreement and confusion about the relationship between perspective / idea diversity and demographic diversity. If there is any topic on which MIT needs improvement it is this confusion about diversity.

Meritocracy problematics: Many students envision the goal of demographic diversity as being in opposition to the goal of excellence in MIT's learning environment. This perspective is worse than unproductive, as social psychological research on stigma and stereotype threat has shown (Steele *et. al.*, 2002; Shih, Pittinsky & Ambady, 1999), this view is harmful to the learning environment for students of the stigmatized group(s).

Intellectual stimulation can be one-way: In another example of diversity potentially benefiting the already privileged groups at the cost of the under-privileged, research has shown that whites and males benefit from greater teamwork when they are in the minority, but the reverse is not the case for non-whites and females when they are in the minority (as is common) (Williams, O'Reilly & Barsade, 1999).

Failures in support: Several graduate student respondents echoed the sentiment in the quote above regarding supporting current students as a more important diversity goal than recruitment. Another stark example was from a student who wrote, "[M]y department addresses diversity mainly during the admissions process. Ethnic diversity issues are left to the student body to support." The issue of supporting the diversity climate within the community arises time and again. The creation of separate committees on minority faculty recruitment AND retention is one testament to the distinctive importance of the diversity climate at MIT. Undergraduate Nicholas Pearce (2007) recently presented to both the Corporation Joint Advisory Committee (CJAC) and the Committee on Student Life (CSL) his research on the minority pipeline at MIT. One important finding was the lack of attention to the alienating social climate experienced by minority students and faculty at MIT. There is often an emphasis on attracting a "critical mass" of members of a given minority group (a key point in the *Grutter* arguments). But a critical mass alone is insufficient. Although the critical mass is needed for the "support" component of a diverse learning community, that support may be in the form of a group of similar individuals surviving a hostile environment together – anxious as a group to leave, and dependent on each other to make it through. Granted, the environment would be even worse for "tokens" – they would not be likely to make it through, but this example of the "critical mass" is far from the self-sustaining ideal often invoked with the concept. Yet without particular attention towards the social climate at MIT, the critical-mass-as-support-group is a likely outcome.

Lessons on the non-correspondence of demographic and perspective diversity: MIT-trained economist Glenn Loury has a set response to the complaint that demographic diversity is not a good proxy for diversity of experience or perspective. He points to the common perception that there is such a presumed association, and that the lack of correspondence cannot be learned in a demographically homogeneous classroom.

Educate all regarding the nonsense and harm entailed by discrimination: As an institution, MIT, and indeed all prestigious universities, are aware of and have accepted the scientific evidence belying claims that standardized tests can provide unbiased predictions of academic success. These myths, however, persist among not only students, but faculty. The expression of these myths directly undermines the learning environment for discriminated groups through stigmatization and stereotype threat. In addition, the more homogeneous environment idealized in the discriminatory view is more intellectually impoverished and less creative than the diverse environment that view decries.

Educating how to disagree without disparaging: A productive academic environment is all about conflict. Conflict, disagreement, argument are essential components of progress and “advancing knowledge.” While no topic should be spared or held sacred, no dispute should turn disrespectful, and no disputant should be disparaged. The line between respectful disagreement and disrespectful disagreement is not always bright or clear. In addition to offering the tools and resources to resolve cases of uncertainty, MIT needs to be more explicit in its definitions of respectful conduct, and the differences between disagreement and discrimination. Disagreements regarding deeply-held beliefs can feel like personal attacks, and the potential for religious or ideological discrimination is real. It is important to be able to distinguish the two situations in an open, respectful and consistent manner. No one in an environment of academic freedom has the right not to face disagreement – such a state would be harmful to academic progress. But everyone at MIT has the right to be treated with respect. And MIT is responsible for providing the resources to ensure a respectful academic environment can be maintained.

..serve the nation and the world in the 21st century - Traditional “diversity” component(s)

Students trained in a diverse learning environment will be better suited to work in and contribute to a workforce that is more diverse both via globalization and domestic demographic trends.

Opportunities

“the problem of the Twentieth Century is the problem of the color-line” (W.E.B. DuBois)

As discussed above in the “advance knowledge...” section, an active and focused effort to promote diversity at MIT can situate MIT both as a leader in a societal trend toward growing equality and organizational role-model. Unfortunately, this opportunity remains an ambitious one even for the 21st century.

Invisible and less-visible discriminated minorities: Consistent with our position that particular attention be paid to diversity regarding discriminated groups, there are many dimensions of societal discrimination in addition to race and gender. Physical ability, family status, gender identity, sexual orientation, and more have demonstrably similar dynamics of stigmatization and stereotyping, as well as new challenges because of distinctive dynamics such as “passing,” or “coming out” (Clair *et. al.*, 2005). Diversity approaches focusing on community, equity, and respect are believed to have salutary effects across many dimensions of diversity and especially for stigmatized groups. Organizations are challenged to deal with such differences in a manner that is simultaneously comprehensive, respectful, and philosophically consistent. As MIT becomes an organizational leader in its systematic engagement with diversity, it will necessarily be a role-model to other universities and organizations for its approach to including the multiple dimensions of difference.

C. RESEARCH ON PEER INSTITUTIONS

Table 1 is in no way intended to be a comprehensive overview of the programs and initiatives concerning diversity at our peer institutions, rather it serves as a base to enrich the discussion of diversity initiatives at MIT and to inform our recommendation in section four. In the cases where it was possible, the report highlights institutions efforts in graduate student diversity.

1. University of California, Berkeley – Graduate Diversity Program Office

The Graduate Diversity Program Office of Outreach and Retention is a resource for educationally and financially disadvantaged students and underrepresented students throughout their academic careers at Berkeley. Graduate Diversity Program outreach includes traveling to various universities and colleges throughout the country, conducting informational workshops on applying to graduate school, and providing individual advising to prospective students. Services include admissions assistance, academic support, mentoring, advising and counseling, and outreach.

More information: http://www.grad.berkeley.edu/diversity/diversity_outreach.shtml

2. Brown University – Office of Institutional Diversity

Brown's statement of diversity (excerpted):

Diversity is the foundation of the academic enterprise. Exposure to a broad range of perspectives, views and outlooks is key to fostering both breadth and depth in intellectual knowledge.

Diversity policies and programs at Brown are designed to: (1) redress historical patterns of exclusion and (2) foster opportunities to embrace the greatest mix of ideas, opinions, and beliefs so important to the achievement of academic excellence.

More information: (<http://www.brown.edu/Administration/diversity/>)

3. California Institute of Technology

CalTech's statement of diversity (excerpted):

By accepting a world-class group of students, Caltech assumes the enormous responsibility of their education. Part of that responsibility is providing an environment that recognizes and reflects the diversity of people who make up American society.

Caltech, then, must be responsive to the needs of a diverse community and reach out to include people of diverse ethnic, racial, economic and gender groups. We also understand that unless we can more effectively welcome and incorporate women and minority scholars, we will not be providing training for the full pool of potential talent.

Some of Caltech's strategies were:

- Sending representatives to national academic conferences and handing out interest cards for prospective students to fill out.
- Contacting students who declined to attend Caltech as undergraduates
- Encouraging students who had started the application process to complete it
- Deploying emissaries on special trips to Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) and other institutions
- Offering better fellowship and assistantship offers
- Caltech participates in EMERGE, Empowering Minority Engineers to Reach for Graduate Education and QEM, Quality Education for Minorities, both alliances with other universities committed to increasing minority graduate rates in science, engineering and mathematics

More information: http://diversity.caltech.edu/diversity_statements.html

4. Columbia University – Vice Provost for Diversity Initiatives

Columbia's statement of diversity (excerpted):

Columbia is dedicated to increasing diversity in its workforce, its student body, and its educational programs. Achieving continued academic excellence and creating a vibrant university community require nothing less.

Building a diverse university community is not the work of a moment. It requires sustained commitment, concerted effort, and the attention of us all.

More information: <http://www.columbia.edu/cu/vpdi/index.html>

5. Cornell University

Cornell's statement of diversity (excerpted):

Cornell's mission is to foster personal discovery and growth, nurture scholarship and creativity across a broad range of common knowledge, and affirm the value to individuals and society of the cultivation of the human mind and spirit. Our legacy is reflected in the diverse composition of our community, the breadth of our curriculum, the strength of our public service, and the depth of our commitment to freedom, equity, and reason. Each member of the Cornell community has a responsibility to honor this legacy and to support a more diverse and inclusive campus in which to work, study, teach, research, and serve.

Cornell stands for civil discourse, reasoned thought, sustained discussion, and constructive engagement without degrading, abusing, harassing, or silencing others. Cornell is committed to act responsibly and forthrightly to maintain an environment that opens doors, opens hearts, and opens minds.

More information: <http://www.cornell.edu/diversity/>

6. Dartmouth College – Office of Institutional Diversity and Equity

IDE works in partnership with offices and individuals across the institution to provide resources that promote access, respect, inclusiveness, and community in all of Dartmouth's working and learning environment.

The Office of Institutional Diversity & Equity is focused on supporting, assisting, and enhancing Dartmouth's commitment to learning and pluralism. We hope our planning and programs help to maintain and build an environment that accepts and welcomes difference.

While race and sex figure prominently into the offices understanding of diversity, we are also interested in examining and fostering dialogue on other aspects of individual and social identity (e.g., age, class, disability, ethnicity, gender, gender identity, language, national origin, religion, sexual orientation, and veteran's status).

More information: <http://www.dartmouth.edu/~ide/>

7. Georgia Institute of Technology – Office of Diversity Management

With a minority population of 34%, Georgia Tech is one of the most diverse universities in the world. Georgia Tech has identified diversity management as one of the highest institutional priorities. An inclusive and comprehensive approach has been taken by establishing a diversity leadership network and incorporating diversity into strategic planning efforts. Georgia Tech's diversity structure includes an institute steering committee, campus diversity council and diversity forum. The Campus Diversity Management Structure was established in 2000.

More information: <http://www.gtdiversity.gatech.edu/>

8. Harvard University

Provides no web-accessible statement on diversity and also has no clear office of diversity.

9. Princeton University – Diversity Working Group

This effort is focused more on staff diversity. The research brought up nothing specifically related to graduate student diversity, although they had a few websites that listed student groups for women/minorities.

Princeton's statement of diversity (excerpted):

Princeton University is a community devoted to learning. We actively seek students, faculty and staff members of exceptional ability and promise who share in our commitment to excellence in teaching and scholarship, and who will bring a diversity of viewpoints and cultures. By incorporating a broad range of human experiences and a rich variety of human perspectives, we enlarge our capacity for learning, enrich the quality and texture of campus life, and better prepare for life and leadership in a pluralistic society.

Although we acknowledge the difficulties inherent in creating a community of individuals who are different from each other, we remain unwavering in our commitment to both diversity and community in a context of academic excellence. We seek to enable all members of this community to pursue their educational, scholarly and career interests in an environment that recognizes both the distinctiveness of each person's experience and the common humanity that unites us all, and permits us to take full educational advantage of the variety of talents, backgrounds, and perspectives of those who live and work here.

More information: <http://www.princeton.edu/diversity/>

10. Stanford University

Stanford's statement of diversity (excerpted):

At the graduate level, Stanford believes that a student body that is both highly qualified and diverse in terms of culture, class, race, gender, ethnicity, work and life experiences is essential to the education process. The University is therefore committed to a substantial representation of students who would bring such diversity to the graduate student body - including African Americans, Mexican Americans, Native Americans, Puerto Ricans, and others whose backgrounds can provide additional dimensions to University programs. The University likewise strongly encourages departments in which there are few women graduate students to make a serious effort to increase their presence and participation.

Of special importance to institutions such as our own, a lack of diversity in Ph.D. programs nationwide means that the professoriate of the future will continue to be unrepresentative of the population it teaches and thus lacking in role models who can teach and encourage by the example of their own success. To achieve such success means that the individuals chosen for admission to our doctoral programs must continue to be, as they have been in the past, superbly qualified and capable of attaining the highest level of academic excellence.

More information: <http://graddiversity.stanford.edu/>

11. University of Chicago

UChicago's statement of diversity (excerpted):

The composition of our student body, undergraduate and graduate, deeply influences the educational experience that they receive at Chicago, as was argued in the amicus brief cosigned by the University and other leading institutions in the cases brought against the University of Michigan. The educational benefits of student diversity include the discovery that there is a broad range of viewpoints and experiences within any given minority community—as well as learning that certain imagined differences at times turn out to be only skin deep

The University of Chicago has a responsibility as a member of a tiny group of the most elite institutions of higher education to extend our opportunities beyond the wealthy majority. Today, the underrepresented include not only Blacks and Latinos, but also all Americans with incomes below the median

More information: <http://omsa.uchicago.edu/>

12. Univ. of Pennsylvania – Office of Affirmative Action and Equal Opportunity Programs

UPenn's statement of diversity (excerpted):

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

More information: <http://www.upenn.edu/affirm-action/>

13. Yale University – Office of Diversity & Equal Opportunity

The Office for Diversity and Equal Opportunity is committed to building a supportive graduate school community whereby students of color, women and other underrepresented students are actively recruited to the graduate school and encouraged in their professional, social and intellectual goals and pursuits.

The Office operates collaboratively with departments and programs to proactively recruit and support the needs of underrepresented students as they pursue graduate study at Yale. In addition, a full-time administrative assistant and Graduate Fellows help develop and implement recruitment and retention programs.

An Advisory Committee, appointed by the Dean, meets regularly to offer additional support and vision for the Offices programmatic efforts. The Office provides support at many levels to students of color and women as they prepare for, begin and complete the graduate education process at Yale.

Recruitment initiatives developed by the Office for Diversity has been three-pronged and include:

- 1) Coordination of institution and geographical region-specific recruitment trips and attendance at graduate fairs and conferences attended by large numbers of diverse students interested in graduate study
- 2) The development of partnerships with institutions who serve large numbers of diverse students in order to nurture and encourage the best and the brightest students from these institutions to consider applying to Yale for graduate school
- 3) Involvement in national consortium efforts that allow for collaboration with other institutions interested in increasing the numbers of diverse students who pursue graduate study

More information: <http://www.yale.edu/graduateschool/diversity/index.html>

D. MOVING FORWARD WITH DIVERSITY EFFORTS AT MIT

This appendix details our synthesis of the literature on diversity in organizations and serves to illustrate the rationale behind our recommendations to MIT's Administration and Faculty.

Diversity perspective: Vision and Leadership from the Top

Research on organizational diversity and performance has shown that one of the key determinants of whether the diversity of an institution engenders discovery or discord is the institution's **diversity perspective**. The school's diversity perspective, the reasoning why diversity is important to MIT, and the justifications used for diversity-related efforts, can be more important than how the pursuit is conducted.

Two organizations with similar levels of numeric diversity can have drastically different returns to that diversity in terms of organizational benefits depending on their diversity perspectives. Some perspectives on diversity tend to produce feelings of injustice and resentment for some, and alienation and self-doubt for others. These unwelcome outcomes can worsen even as diversity ostensibly improves from a pure numbers perspective (Jayne *et. al.*, 2004)

What Perspective?

The problematic, but well-intentioned ones

Some of the unhelpful, or even harmful, diversity perspectives are some of the common ones, for example (not exhaustive):

- that pursuing diversity is necessary for reasons of morality and social justice, or
- that diversity within MIT is necessary to prepare students for and reflect the diverse workforce.

Why they are Problematic

The problem with these well-intentioned views is their effects on the community when acting upon them. Redressing social injustice requires an unavoidably explicit differentiation along the lines of the "unfairly under-privileged," and its necessary complement, the "unfairly over-privileged." This differentiation activates an us-versus-them dynamic along with a two-wrongs-make-a-right message resulting in one group being likely to feel stigmatized, and the other being likely to feel blamed and/or victimized.

The second perspective, that diversity is needed to expose students to and prepare them for diversity in the workforce, sets up false and harmful expectations. Under this perspective, it becomes the responsibility of under-represented minority and other "diversity" students to expose themselves and their differences to the over-represented majority students. If these "diversity" students do not show themselves to have distinct and novel viewpoints or opinions, their purpose is questioned. If these "diversity" students focus on their own education, including seeking out the benefits of social support networks - commonly composed of similar others (something also done by the "non-diversity" students, and accomplished with considerably greater ease) - they are seen as self-segregating and undoing the purpose of diversity. Clearly, making a minority group responsible for the education of the majority is an undue burden, when completing an MIT education is already sufficiently difficult, especially with the added difficulty of finding social support resources that are so readily and transparently available for the majority. Equal mixing for equal exposure is not just an unrealistic goal that neglects the reality of the social dynamics underlying effective learning processes, but it is a goal that is also harmful.

The integration and learning perspective.

The perspective that has been shown to be associated with realizing the organizational benefits of diversity is the "integrated and learning perspective" (Ely & Thomas, 2001; Foldy, 2004). Applied to MIT, this perspective entails:

- That diversity within MIT provides unique opportunities to improve its research and education functions in ways that would otherwise remain hidden and unavailable, and
- That all members of the MIT community are working towards a common good (Chatman *et. al.*, 1998).

This perspective promotes a sense of equity and common good within the community, reduces the likelihood of backlash, or feelings of victimization among the traditionally-privileged groups, and increases the likelihood that the benefits of a diverse community will be realized.

For this perspective to take hold within an organization, it must be thoroughly embraced and clearly espoused from the highest levels of the organization. **It must come from the top!** Given the reality of MIT's culture, pronouncements from the top are not necessarily associated with general acceptance. This fact does not eliminate the need for a firm and unambiguous high-level stance on diversity. The point is that such a statement serves as a resource for the rest of the Institute to draw upon (Thomas & Ely, 1996). Departments or units choosing to do so are more likely to realize the benefits of diversity, and in turn serve as peer-models for other departments and units within the Institute. The high-level statement provides an Institute-wide legitimacy that increases the likelihood that a successful experience in a department such as DUSP may lead to adoption in a department such as Mathematics.

Accountability & Oversight

In addition to a top-level commitment regarding the justifications and reasons for promoting diversity, no diversity effort is likely to succeed without external accountability and oversight (Jackson *et. al.*, 2003). There must be an entity working to cultivate a healthy and productive climate for diversity across the MIT community. There must also be a second entity holding the first accountable for progress. This accountability must include semi-public progress reports and updates including achievements, obstacles, and lessons learned.

Emphasis on Community, Respect, and Equity

"I think community is far more important than diversity." (an MIT graduate student)

"Diversity" can be Harmful

In the current socio-political climate, the word "diversity" sets the table for controversy and conflict. Witness the following quotes from several of our graduate student respondents:

- *"Diversity is an excuse to purge modern-day untouchables: white, Christian, straight, politically conservative males."*
- *"I feel segregated and neglected because apparently I'm not a 'minority.'"*

Although this report is making extensive use of and reference to "diversity," actual diversity efforts at MIT need not be so labeled, and perhaps would be more effective if they were not. Because of the negative emotions and lose-lose connotations "diversity" can conjure for many groups, efforts beginning with that word create large and unnecessary obstacles for themselves (Heilman & Haynes, 2005).

Communal Approaches for Particularistic Goals

Experience from industry has shown that the most successful and enduring diversity interventions do not focus on targeting specific sub-groups, but on systemic improvements to organizational equity, justice, fairness, respect, and transparency. Power, status and difference are enacted in multiple ways and along multiple dimensions of difference in all human societies. Focus on a single dimension sets up the us-versus-them dynamic mentioned before, and allows status and power inequality to adapt, transform, and re-emerge with little if any disruption to the unequal distribution of privilege. Systemic efforts can promote equity along with enduring change, without incurring the backlash or victimization responses common to other interventions (cf. Fried *et. al.*, 1996, where Johns Hopkins University instituted a faculty-wide formalized mentoring program to address unequal female advancement, and achieved phenomenal results).

A focus on equity, respect, and community is more likely to find broad support, while increasing the chance of enduring changes. Further, particularistic interventions do not have a strong track record for success. The effects they tend to generate, if any, are likely to decay with time until the organization is back where it started. This perceived dynamic was repeated in our discussions with Institute faculty and staff – a particular initiative would focus on increasing the "numbers" for a particular group in a particular amount of time. The numbers would increase, only to drop again over time until the engagement of the next diversity initiative.

E. ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

This appendix summarizes a selection from the substantial scholarly literature on diversity in organizations, noting in **bold** particularly useful "How-To" articles and the recurring points that both organizational culture and leadership/vision regarding diversity are key determinants of diversity's success in organizations.

Antonio, A. L., M. J. Chang, et al. (2004). "Effects of Racial Diversity on Complex Thinking in College Students." Psychological Science **15**(8): 507-510.

An experiment varying the racial (Black, White) and opinion composition in small-group discussions was conducted with college students ($N = 357$) at three universities to test for effects on the perceived novelty of group members' contributions to discussion and on participants' integrative complexity. Results showed that racial and opinion minorities were both perceived as contributing to novelty. Generally positive effects on integrative complexity were found when the groups had racial and opinion-minority members and when members reported having racially diverse friends and classmates. The findings are discussed in the context of social psychological theories of minority influence and social policy implications for affirmative action. The research supports claims about the educational significance of race in higher education, as well as the complexity of the interaction of racial diversity with contextual and individual factors.

Banaji, M. R. and A. G. Greenwald (1995). "Implicit gender stereotyping in judgments of fame." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology **68**(2): 181-198.

Implicit (unconscious) gender stereotyping in fame judgments was tested with an adaptation of a procedure developed by L. L. Jacoby, C. M. Kelley, J. Brown, and J. Jasechko (1989). In Experiments 1-4, participants pronounced 72 names of famous and nonfamous men and women, and 24 or 48 hr later made fame judgments in response to the 72 familiar and 72 unfamiliar famous and nonfamous names. These first experiments, in which signal detection analysis was used to assess implicit stereotypes, demonstrate that the gender bias (greater assignment of fame to male than female names) was located in the use of a lower criterion (B) for judging fame of familiar male than female names. Experiments 3 and 4 also showed that explicit expressions of sexism or stereotypes were uncorrelated with the observed implicit gender bias in fame judgments.

Baron, A. S. and M. R. Banaji (2006). "The Development of Implicit Attitudes: Evidence of Race Evaluations from Ages 6 and 10 and Adulthood." Psychological Science **17**(1): 53-58.

To understand the origin and development of implicit attitudes, we measured race attitudes in White American 6-year-olds, 10-year-olds, and adults by first developing a child-oriented version of the Implicit Association Test (Child IAT). Remarkably, implicit pro-White/anti-Black bias was evident even in the youngest group, with self-reported attitudes revealing bias in the same direction. In 10-year-olds and adults, the same magnitude of implicit race bias was observed, although self-reported race attitudes became substantially less biased in older children and vanished entirely in adults, who self-reported equally favorable attitudes toward Whites and Blacks. These data are the first to show an asymmetry in the development of implicit and explicit race attitudes, with explicit attitudes becoming more egalitarian and implicit attitudes remaining stable and favoring the in-group across development. We offer a tentative suggestion that mean levels of implicit and explicit attitudes diverge around age 10.

Bertrand, M. and S. Mullainathan (2004). "Are Emily and Greg more employable than Lakisha and Jamal? A field experiment on labor market discrimination." American Economic Review **94**(4): 991-1013.

We study race in the labor market by sending fictitious resumes to help-wanted ads in Boston and Chicago newspapers. To manipulate perceived race, resumes are randomly assigned African-American- or White-sounding names. White names receive 50 percent more callbacks for interviews. Callbacks are also more responsive to resume quality for White names than for African-American ones. The racial gap is uniform across occupation, industry, and employer size. We also find little evidence that employers are inferring social class from the names. Differential treatment by race still appears to still be prominent in the U.S. labor market.

Chatman, J. A., J. T. Polzer, et al. (1998). Being different yet feeling similar: The influence of demographic composition and organizational culture on work processes and outcomes. Administrative Science Quarterly. Ithaca: 749-780 32 pages.

Drawing from self-categorization theory, hypotheses on the effects of an organization's demographic composition and cultural emphasis on work processes and outcomes are tested. With the use of an

organizational simulation, it is found that the extent to which an organization emphasized individualistic or collectivistic values interacted with demographic composition to influence social interaction, conflict, productivity, and perceptions of creativity among 258 MBA students. The findings suggest that the purported benefits of demographic diversity are more likely to emerge in organizations that, through their culture, make organizational membership salient and encourage people to categorize one another as having the organization's interests in common, rather than those that emphasize individualism and distinctiveness among members.

Clair, J. A., J. E. Beatty, et al. (2005). "Out of sight but not out of mind: Managing **invisible social identities** in the workplace." *Academy of Management Review* **30**(1): 78-95.

Invisible social identities influence social interaction in distinct ways and create unique dynamics in terms of identity management. We integrate research from the sexuality, illness, and racial diversity literature, as well as the stigma, disclosure, and identity literature, to create a generalized model of invisible identity management. We focus specifically on revealing and passing strategies of identity management and conclude by discussing the implications of invisible differences for diversity research.

Ely, R. J. and D. A. Thomas (2001). "Cultural diversity at work: The effects of diversity perspectives on work group processes and outcomes." *Administrative Science Quarterly* **46**(2): 229-273.

This paper develops theory about the conditions under which cultural diversity enhances or detracts from work group functioning. From qualitative research in three culturally diverse organizations, we identified three different perspectives on workforce diversity: the integration-and-learning perspective, the access-and-legitimacy perspective, and the discrimination-and-fairness perspective. **The perspective on diversity a work group held influenced how people expressed and managed tensions related to diversity**, whether those who had been traditionally underrepresented in the organization felt respected and valued by their colleagues, and how people interpreted the meaning of their racial identity at work. These, in turn, had implications for how well the work group and its members functioned. All three perspectives on diversity had been successful in motivating managers to diversify their staffs, but **only the integration-and-learning perspective provided the rationale and guidance needed to achieve sustained benefits from diversity. [NB: Leadership, Vision & Organizational Culture are KEY.]** By identifying the conditions that intervene between the demographic composition of a work group and its functioning, our research helps to explain mixed results on the relationship between cultural diversity and work group outcomes.

Ely, R. J. (2004). "A field study of group diversity, participation in diversity education programs, and performance." *Journal of Organizational Behavior* **25**(6): 755-780.

This study examined the impact of four dimensions of diversity-tenure, age, sex, and race-on performance in 486 retail bank branches and assessed whether employee participation in the firm's diversity education programs influenced these relationships. Data came from archives of the demographic composition of branches, an employee attitude-satisfaction poll, and branch performance assessed as part of the bank's bonus incentive plan. Race and sex diversity were unrelated to performance. The direct effects of tenure and age diversity were largely negative, but were moderated by quality of team processes, suggesting that cooperation and teamwork may suppress potentially task-enhancing differences associated with these aspects of diversity. **Diversity education programs had minimal impact on performance. [NB: Traditional approaches often do not work.]** The results of this study suggest that there is a complex relationship between age and tenure diversity and performance and that, even in firms with characteristics that should be conducive to performance benefits from diversity, other conditions must be in place to foster such effects.

Foldy, E. G. (2004). "Learning from diversity: A theoretical exploration." *Public Administration Review* **64**(5): 529-538.

Public-sector organizations tend to be more racially and ethnically diverse than private-sector organizations, leading to the challenge of enhancing heterogeneous work group effectiveness. Recent work suggests that a group's "diversity perspective," or set of beliefs about the role of cultural diversity, moderates diverse group performance. One perspective, the integration and learning perspective, argues that heterogeneous groups function better when they believe that cultural identities can be tapped as sources of new ideas and experiences about work. However, simply holding the integration and learning perspective may not be sufficient. Research on general group learning has shown that it requires particular behaviors and cognitive frames. This article integrates recent work on diversity perspectives with long-standing research on team learning to propose a conceptual model of learning in culturally diverse groups. It suggests that **both the integration and learning perspective and more generic learning frames and skills must be**

present. [NB: Pair Vision with learning behavior for success.]

Fried, L. P., C. A. Francomano, et al. (1996). "Career development for women in academic medicine: Multiple interventions in a department of medicine." Journal of the American Medical Association, **276**(11): 898-905.

OBJECTIVE: To determine the gender-based career obstacles for women in an academic department of medicine and to report the interventions to correct such obstacles (resulting from the evaluation) and the results of these interventions. **DESIGN:** Intervention study, before-after trial, with assessment of faculty concerns and perceived change through structured, self-administered questionnaires. **SETTING:** The Department of Medicine, The Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD. **PARTICIPANTS:** Full-time faculty. **INTERVENTIONS:** Multifaceted intervention from 1990 through 1995 to correct gender-based career obstacles reported by women faculty, including problem identification, leadership, and education of faculty, and interventions to improve faculty development, mentoring, and rewards and to reduce isolation and structural career impediments. **MAIN OUTCOME MEASURES:** Retention and promotion of deserving women faculty, salary equity, quality of mentoring, decreased isolation from information and colleagues, integration of women faculty into the scientific community, and decreased manifestations of gender bias. **RESULTS:** Junior women were retained and promoted, reversing previous experience, with a 550% increase in the number of women at the associate professor rank over 5 years (from 4 in 1990 to 26 in 1995). Interim 3-year follow-up showed a 183% increase in the proportion of women faculty who expected they would still be in academic medicine in 10 years (from 23% [7/30] in 1990 to 65% [30/46] in 1993). One half to two thirds of women faculty reported improvements in timeliness of promotions, manifestations of gender bias, access to information needed for faculty development, isolation, and salary equity. Men also reported improvements in these areas. **CONCLUSIONS:** The outcomes reported here indicate that it is possible to make substantive improvements in the development of women's careers, that an institutional strategy to this end can be successful in retaining women in academic medicine, and that such interventions are likely to benefit all faculty. Long-term interventions appear essential.

Heilman, M. E. and M. C. Haynes (2005). Combating Organizational Discrimination: Some Unintended Consequences. Discrimination at work: The psychological and organizational bases. R. L. Dipboye and A. Colella (eds.). Mahwah, N.J., Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers: 353-378.

Heilman and Haynes provide evidence that affirmative action policies may be extremely detrimental to individuals who should benefit from them by undermining perceptions of competence for perceived beneficiaries of such policies. They assert that this is a general tendency—all people display this bias regardless of their own personal characteristics (e.g., sex and ethnicity). They emphasize that they do not believe that affirmative action is bad, just that it has unanticipated negative consequences. (Summary by Rosanna E. Guadagno, in: Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy, **5**:295.)

Hobman, E. V., P. Bordia, et al. (2004). "Perceived dissimilarity and work group involvement - The moderating effects of group openness to diversity." Group & Organization Management **29**(5): 560-587.

Perceived dissimilarity and its association with work group involvement were examined in this study. Additionally, perceived group openness to diversity was examined as a moderator of this relationship. A longitudinal study was conducted with nurses in four departments of a public hospital. Results revealed that visible dissimilarity was negatively associated with work group involvement at both times, and informational dissimilarity was negatively associated with work group involvement at Time 1. Openness to diversity interacted with visible and informational dissimilarity in the prediction of work group involvement at both times. This interaction pattern showed that there was a negative relationship between dissimilarity and work group involvement when individuals perceived low group openness to diversity, whereas there was no relationship when individuals perceived high group openness to diversity. **Results highlight the importance of managing perceptions of difference and introducing norms that encourage the active involvement of group members. [NB: Organizational culture is KEY.]**

Jackson, S. E., A. Joshi, et al. (2003). "Recent research on team and organizational diversity: SWOT analysis and implications." Journal of Management **29**(6): 801-830.

Sixty-three studies published in the years 1997-2002 are reviewed to assess the effects of Workplace diversity on teams and organizations. Four major questions are considered: Which personal attributes have diversity researchers studied in recent years? What has been learned about the consequences of diversity for teams and organizations? What has been learned about the role of context in shaping the effects of diversity? How has research addressed the multi-level complexities inherent in the phenomenon of diversity? For each question, we consider the strengths and weaknesses of recent diversity research, point out opportunities for new research, and identify threats to continued advancement. The review concludes by considering practical implications of the accumulated evidence. Quote: "**active diversity management**

will be required in order for organizations to realize the potential benefits locked up within their diverse work forces." [NB: Leadership and vision is KEY.]

Jackson, S. E. and A. Joshi (2004). "Diversity in social context: a multi-attribute, multilevel analysis of team diversity and sales performance." Journal of Organizational Behavior 25(6): 675-702.

Prior research on demographic diversity in work teams has yielded mixed results, with the effects of team diversity ranging from positive to neutral to negative. This article shows that an improved understanding of the relationship between team diversity and team performance can be reached by considering the combined effects of team diversity and demographic social context. We hypothesized that three aspects of the social context would moderate the effects of demographic diversity on performance: the combination of diversity dimensions within a team, the demographic characteristics of the team manager, and the demography of the work unit. In a study of 365 sales teams distributed across 42 sales districts in a large U.S. company, we found support for the general proposition that the demographic social context moderates relationships between team diversity and team performance. We discuss the practical implications of these results as well as the research implications for future studies of team diversity.

Janssens, M. and P. Zanoni (2005). "Many diversities for many services: Theorizing diversity (management) in service companies." Human Relations 58(3): 311-340.

Contrary to current definitions of diversity as a set of a priori socio-demographic characteristics, this study re-conceptualizes diversity as an organizational product. Through the analysis of qualitative data from four service organizations, we show that organization-specific understandings of diversity are based on the way employees' socio-demographic differences affect the organization of work, either contributing to it or hampering it. Such understandings of diversity, in turn, shape organization-specific approaches to diversity management. From our empirical results, we further inductively derive two dimensions of service processes that appear to play a central role in shaping diversity (management) in service organizations: customers' proximity versus invisibility and diversity-customized versus profession-customized service. We conclude the article on a more critical note, reflecting on how specific constellations of work/understanding of diversity/diversity management enable and/or constrain employees' agency, including the possibility to challenge existing power relations.

Jayne, M. E. A. and R. L. Dipboye (2004). "Leveraging diversity to improve business performance: Research findings and recommendations for organizations." Human Resource Management 43(4): 409-424.

[NB: A WONDERFUL HOW-TO FOR ORGS] Research findings from industrial and organizational psychology and other disciplines cast doubt on the simple assertion that a diverse workforce inevitably improves business performance. Instead, research and theory suggest several conditions necessary to manage diversity, initiatives successfully and reap organizational benefits. This article reviews empirical research and theory on the relationship between workforce diversity and organizational performance and outlines practical steps HR practitioners can take to manage diversity initiatives successfully and enhance the positive outcomes. Quote: "The probability of **success is likely to depend on situational factors such as the organizational culture, [NB: Organizational culture is KEY.]** strategies, and environment, as well as the people in the organization and their jobs."

Jehn, K. A., G. B. Northcraft, et al. (1999). "Why differences make a difference: A field study of diversity, conflict, and performance in workgroups." Administrative Science Quarterly 44: 741-763 23 pages.

A multi-method field study of 92 workgroups explored the influence of three types of workgroup diversity (social category diversity, value diversity and informational diversity) and two moderators (task type and task interdependence) on workgroup outcomes. Informational diversity positively influenced group performance, mediated by task conflict. Value and social category diversity, task complexity and task interdependence all moderated this effect. Social category diversity positively influenced group member morale. Value diversity decreased satisfaction, intent to remain and commitment to the group; relationship conflict mediated the effects of value diversity.

Kidder, D. L., M. J. Lankau, et al. (2004). "Backlash toward diversity initiatives: Examining the impact of diversity program justification, personal and group outcomes." International Journal of Conflict Management 15(1): 77-102.

This study used a scenario design to examine whether there are different reactions among whites based on how a diversity program is justified by an organization. A reactive justification (affirmative action) was proposed to result in greater backlash than a competitive advantage justification (diversity management).

In addition, this study examined the effects of personal and group outcomes on backlash and explored two individual difference variables, gender and orientation toward other ethnic groups, as potential moderators of the proposed relationships. Backlash was operationalized in four ways: an affect-based measure (negative emotions), two cognitive-based measures (attitude toward the diversity program, perceptions of unfairness of promotion procedures), and a behavioral-intentions-based measure (organizational commitment). Results indicated that the **diversity management justification was associated with more favorable support of the diversity initiative, [NB: Leadership & Vision is KEY.]** and that unfavorable personal and group outcomes adversely affected backlash reactions. There was no empirical support for the influence of the moderator variables on the proposed relationships, however, a effect for gender was found Implications of the study's findings and future research directions are discussed.

Kochan, T., K. Bezrukova, et al. (2003). "The effects of diversity on business performance: Report of the diversity research network." Human Resource Management **42**(1): 3-21.

This article summarizes the results and conclusions reached in studies of the relationships between race and gender diversity and business performance carried out in four large firms by a research consortium known as. the Diversity Research Net-work. These researchers were asked by the BOLD Initiative to conduct this research to test arguments regarding the "business case" for diversity. Few positive or negative direct effects of diversity on performance were observed. Instead a number of different aspects of the organizational context and some group processes moderated diversity-performance relationships. This suggests a more nuanced view of the "business case" for or diversity may be appropriate.

Krieger, N. (1990). "On becoming a public health professional: reflections on democracy, leadership, and accountability." J Public Health Policy **11**(4): 412-9.

Li, J. T. and D. C. Hambrick (2005). "Factional groups: A new vantage on demographic faultlines, conflict, and disintegration in work teams." Academy of Management Journal **48**(5): 794-813.

We develop the concept of factional groups, or those in which members are representatives from a small number of (often just two) social entities. Such groups include many merger integration teams, bilateral task forces, and joint venture teams. We extend theory about group demography by arguing that factional groups possess preexisting faultlines that require a new conception of demographic dissimilarity. We propose that large demographic faultlines between factions engender task conflict, emotional conflict, and behavioral disintegration-which in turn lead to poor performance. We tested our model using data from 71 joint venture management groups. Data gathered in two waves strongly supported our propositions.

Linnehan, F., A. M. Konrad, et al. (2003). "Behavioral goals for a diverse organization: The effects of attitudes, social norms, and racial identity for Asian Americans and Whites." Journal of Applied Social Psychology **33**(7): 1331-1359.

This research identified 5 behaviors that may enhance the effectiveness of a diverse organization and used Fishbein and Ajzen's (1975) theory of reasoned action to identify predictors of these behaviors. Results from samples of White and Asian undergraduate students from 2 universities generally supported the Fishbein and Ajzen model. Attitudes and subjective norms were significant predictors of behavioral intentions when gender, race, and social desirability bias were controlled. Racial identity also had a significant, positive effect on attitudes toward diversity-related behaviors among the Asian American students, but no significant effect among Whites. These results supported our reasoning that members of historically excluded racial groups with strong racial identities will be most likely to welcome organizational attempts to become more pluralistic because pluralism means that their valued identities will be respected rather than repressed.

O'Reilly, C. A., III, K. Y. Williams, et al., Eds. Group demography and innovation: Does diversity help?, US: Elsevier Science / JAI Press.

(from the chapter) Reviews the demographic diversity on group conflict and innovation and points out some of the complexities involved in unpacking the effects of diversity in tenure, age, sex, and race-ethnicity on the work force. A study is presented that tested the relations between work group diversity, group conflict and both creativity and implementation. 189 manufacturing and retailing employees (representing management, product development, personnel, finance, and marketing) completed a survey regarding the previously mentioned factors. Results show that the ability of groups to differentiate between task and relationship conflict is influenced by the levels of conflict and diversity in the groups. The effects of tenure diversity are consistent with social categorization theory leading to increased conflict levels and poorer implementation ability, while the effects of race-ethnic diversity are dependent on the composition of the groups. No relationship was found between conflict and the groups' creativity norms.

Polzer, J. T., L. P. Milton, et al. (2002). "Capitalizing on diversity: Interpersonal congruence in small work groups." Administrative Science Quarterly **47**(2): 296-324.

We examine interpersonal congruence, the degree to which group members see others in the group as others see themselves, as a moderator of the relationship between diversity and group effectiveness. A longitudinal study of 83 work groups revealed that diversity tended to improve creative task performance in groups with high interpersonal congruence, whereas diversity undermined the performance of groups with low interpersonal congruence. This interaction effect also emerged on measures of social integration, group identification, and relationship conflict. By eliciting self-verifying appraisals, members of some groups achieved enough interpersonal congruence during their first ten minutes of interaction to benefit their group outcomes four months later. In contrast to theories of social categorization, the interpersonal congruence approach suggests that group members can achieve harmonious and effective work processes by expressing rather than suppressing the characteristics that make them unique.

Rau, B. L. and M. M. Hyland (2003). "Corporate teamwork and diversity statements in college recruitment brochures: Effects on attraction." Journal of Applied Social Psychology **33**(12): 2465-2492.

Organizations are increasingly emphasizing group work or teamwork as a source of competitive advantage in a diverse workforce. It has been suggested that such organizations must target their recruitment efforts at applicants who are both diverse and amenable to working in teams. Data were collected from 181 undergraduates at a large northeastern university who viewed a recruitment brochure of a fictitious firm in which statements about teamwork and diversity were manipulated. Results indicate that applicants' teamwork attitude moderated the relationship between teamwork statements and applicant attraction to the organization. **Minority and gender status moderated the relationship between diversity statements and applicant attraction. [NB: different groups will react differently to "diversity" messages]**

These results provide evidence that organizations can target specific applicant characteristics with appropriate statements in recruitment brochures.

Rogers, M. R. and L. E. Molina (2006). "Exemplary Efforts in Psychology to Recruit and Retain Graduate Students of Color." American Psychologist **61**(2): 143-156.

Many psychology departments are striving for a greater representation of students of color within their graduate preparation programs with the aim of producing a more diverse pool of psychological service providers, scientists, and educators. To help improve the minority pipeline in psychology, the authors identify and describe recruitment and retention strategies used at 11 departments and programs considered to be making exemplary efforts to attract and retain minority students of color. The strategies most consistently used included engaging current minority faculty and students in recruitment activities, offering attractive financial aid packages, having faculty members make personal contacts with prospective students, creating linkages with historical institutions of color, having (or approached having) a critical mass of faculty and students of color, offering a diversity issues course, and engaging students in diversity issues research. Despite the similarities, the programs and departments were each distinctive and innovative in their overall approaches to student recruitment and retention. Highlighting the strategies used at successful institutions may help others develop plans for improving the minority pipeline within their own departments and programs.

Spataro, S. E. (2005). "Diversity in context: How organizational culture shapes reactions to workers with disabilities and others who are demographically different." Behavioral Sciences & the Law **23**(1): 21-38.

Successfully integrating workers with disabilities into their organizations is both a challenge and an opportunity facing managers today. Despite laws and business practices prohibiting discrimination against those with disabilities, people with disabilities are consistently underutilized in organizations. This article applies theories of demographic diversity in organizations to assert that a richer understanding of organizational cultures and their implications for workers with disabilities may shed light on the question of how and why workers with disabilities may be excluded from mainstream work experiences and career progression. The article briefly reviews business arguments that support integration of workers with disabilities into organizations based on their contribution to the overall diversity within the organization, and reviews complications in the research on diversity to date that leave important questions of the potential gains or detriments from increasing this diversity unanswered. The article then goes on to introduce

organizational culture as an underinvestigated but likely potent tool in explaining how and when workers who are demographically different, in general, and with disabilities, specifically, may be successfully integrated into an organization's work force. [NB: Organizational Culture is KEY.]

The article introduces three types of organizational culture: culture of differentiation, culture of unity, and culture of integration. Each is explained in terms of its content and its implications for managing diversity. A discussion of the implications of culture as a primary tool for managing the integration of workers with

disabilities concludes the paper.

Swann, W. B., J. T. Polzer, et al. (2004). "Finding value in diversity: Verification of personal and social self-views in diverse groups." Academy of Management Review **29**(1): 9-27.

We propose a model of group processes that accords a key role to the verification of people's self-views (thoughts and feelings about the self). This approach partially incorporates past work on self-categorization (under the rubric of verification of social self-views) and introduces a new set of processes (the verification of personal self-views) to the groups literature. Conceptual analysis and recent empirical evidence suggest the self-verification framework offers a novel perspective on finding value in diversity.

Thomas, D. A. and R. J. Ely (1996). "Making differences matter: A new paradigm for managing diversity." Harvard Business Review **74**(5): 79-&.

[NB: A WONDERFUL HOW-TO FOR ORGS]

van Knippenberg, D., C. K. W. De Dreu, et al. (2004). "Work group diversity and group performance: An integrative model and research agenda." Journal of Applied Psychology **89**(6): 1008-1022.

Research on the relationship between work group diversity and performance has yielded inconsistent results. To address this problem, the authors propose the categorization-elaboration model (CEM), which reconceptualizes and integrates information/decision making and social categorization perspectives on work-group diversity and performance.. The CEM incorporates mediator and moderator variables that typically have been ignored in diversity research and incorporates the view that information/decision making and social categorization processes interact such that intergroup biases flowing from social categorization disrupt the elaboration (in-depth processing) of task-relevant information and perspectives. In addition, the authors propose that **attempts to link the positive and negative effects of diversity to specific types of diversity should be abandoned in favor of the assumption that all dimensions of diversity may have positive as well as negative effects.** The ways in which these propositions may set the agenda for future research in diversity are discussed.

Vasquez, M. J. T. and J. M. Jones (2006). "Increasing the Number of Psychologists of Color: Public Policy Issues for Affirmative Diversity." American Psychologist **61**(2): 132-142.

This article identifies the key issues involved in the debate about affirmative action. The June 2003 Supreme Court decisions allowing consideration of race to ensure that there is a "critical mass" of African American, Latino/Latina, and Native American applicants to higher education are addressed. Social psychologists have identified key myths and provided clarifications about the need for and consequences of strategies used to promote equal opportunity for persons of color and women. A brief history of affirmative action and of the problems it was designed to solve is provided. The accomplishments, benefits, and compelling interest of diversity and affirmative action are described, as well as the concerns and counterpoints. The lack of a substantial applicant pool in psychology hinders progress toward diversity. Alternative strategies for remedying this lack beyond affirmative admissions policies in psychology are briefly discussed.

Williams, K.Y. & C. A. O'Reilly (1997) "Demography and Diversity in Organizations: A Review of 40 Years of Research." In B. Staw and R. Sutton (eds.) Research in Organizational Behavior, **21**:77-140. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Findings (Summary from Mark Mortensen's OrgTheoryWeb)

I. Tenure Diversity In general, there is strong evidence that diversity in tenure is associated with lower levels of social integration, poorer communication, and higher turnover in groups. Those who are least like the majority of the group (newcomers or old-timers) are also those most likely to be isolated and excluded. The effects of tenure diversity on performance are generally explained as indirect effects, operating through group process variables such as communication, conflict, or social integration. However, several researchers have also reported direct effects of tenure diversity on performance after controlling for group process. In contrast to the consistent effects of tenure diversity on affective outcomes, the effects of diversity in tenure on group cognitive performance are mixed at best.

II. Background Diversity Functional background may serve as a proxy for the information, knowledge, skills and expertise that individuals bring to a group. The research suggests that the diversity of information functionally dissimilar individuals bring to the group improves performance in terms of creativity, but not necessarily implementation. For example, functionally diverse groups are slower and have lower cohesion than homogeneous groups. The overall evidence strongly suggests that functional diversity is likely to stimulate task conflict and improve performance.

III. Age Diversity Overall, the research on age diversity suggests that groups with higher variations in their age composition may have slightly lower levels of effective group process than more homogeneous

groups. The expectation, drawn from an information and decision making theory, that age differences within a group may index differences in perspective and values that are useful for cognitive performance is not supported by the literature. Instead, the literature suggests that age diversity is associated with increased turnover and withdrawal, especially of those individuals who are most different.

IV. Sex Diversity The results of research on gender diversity suggest that the proportion of men and women present in the sample may be an important predictor of the results. In general, gender diversity has negative effects on groups, especially on males. It is associated with higher turnover rates, especially among those who are most different. The studies also reveal that women and men respond differently, and may have different experiences as a minority. Men display lower levels of satisfaction and commitment when they are in the minority, while women appear less likely to have a negative psychological reaction. This is despite the fact that men in female-dominated groups are more likely to be accepted, less likely to be treated with hostility, and less likely to be stereotyped.

V. Racial and Ethnic Diversity Research on the impact of race-ethnic diversity remains inconclusive. There is some evidence from field studies that ethnic diversity can promote creativity and improve decision making. Contrary to information/decision theory predictions, these results occur independent of group process variables. Pessimists, using similarity/attraction and social categorization theories, note that ethnic diversity can, unless successfully managed, have negative effects on group process. Consistent findings show that individuals who are different from the majority race in an organization are more likely to leave, to be less satisfied and psychologically committed to the organization, and to receive lower performance evaluations. Overall, the evidence for ethnic diversity seems more consistent with predictions of similarity/attraction and social categorization theories than with information and decision making.

Williams, K.Y., O'Reilly, C.A., & Barsade, S. (1999). The impact of relational demography on teamwork: When majorities are in the minority. Research Paper No. 1551. Research Paper Series, Stanford University.

Diversity and teamwork are two themes that characterize the writing about the future of organizations. We explore the effects of age, tenure, sex, and race/ethnicity on teamwork. Consistent with the predictions of similarity/attraction and social categorization theory, the results show that individuals who are more different from the group report less teamwork. However, there are important differences in sex and race/ethnicity in this pattern that are not predicted by either similarity/attraction or social categorization theory. For example **whites, but not minorities, report more teamwork when in more ethnically diverse groups and men in female-dominated groups also report higher levels of teamwork.** Careful analyses of subgroups suggest that the often-reported negative effects of diversity on teamwork depends importantly on the composition of the group and that being a "minority" may be as much a function of the group's context as one's demographic characteristics.

Wooten, L. P. and E. H. James (2004). "When firms fail to learn - The perpetuation of discrimination in the Workplace." Journal of Management Inquiry 13(1): 23-33.

Scholarly and anecdotal evidence suggests that despite an increasing tolerance for diversity among many Americans, workplace discrimination is on the rise. This article addresses the role that learning, or more specifically barriers to learning, plays in the perpetuation of discrimination. The authors use several organizationally based learning theories to illustrate ways in which firms may fail to learn how to manage diversity challenges effectively, such as a discrimination lawsuit. They conclude the article with two relatively successful learning situations involving the Georgia Power Corporation and the Denny's restaurant chain, both of which have faced discrimination lawsuits in recent years. They use this discussion to highlight reactive versus reflective learning strategies and how each may lead to successful discrimination lawsuit resolution. **[NB: Pair Vision with learning behavior for success.]**

APPENDIX E

Officers

Eric Weese
gsc-president@mit.edu

Shan Wu
gsc-vice-president@mit.edu

Obrad Scepanovic
gsc-secretary@mit.edu

Jehanzeb Noor
gsc-treasurer@mit.edu

Committees**Academics, Research, & Careers**

Biraja Kanungo
gsc-arc@mit.edu

Activities

Eva Kassens
Shahriar Khushrushahi
gsc-ac@mit.edu

Association of Student Activities

Jen Lobo
gsc-asaa@mit.edu

Funding Board

Jehanzeb Noor
gsc-treasurer@mit.edu

Housing & Community Affairs

Gerald Dalley
Leeland Ekstrom
gsc-hca@mit.edu

Muddy Charles Pub

David Danielson
gsc-mudd-chair@mit.edu

Nominations

Shan Wu
gsc-vice-president@mit.edu

Orientation

Johnna Powell
Lynne Waldman
gsc-oc@mit.edu

Publications & Publicity

Obrad Scepanovic
gsc-pp@mit.edu

Graduate Student News

Daniel Truque
gsn-editor@mit.edu

Webmaster

Nici Ames
gsc-webmaster@mit.edu

Staff

Nancy Kelly
Emily Snyder
gsc-admin@mit.edu

77 Massachusetts Avenue
50-220
Cambridge, MA 02139-4307
Phone: 617-253-2195
Fax: 617-258-9274



MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
GRADUATE STUDENT COUNCIL

General Council Meeting
June 7th, 2006

53gsc1.2
Diversity Committee

(VOTING AT THIS MEETING)

Sponsor: Brian Rubineau / Eric Weese

Whereas, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (the "Institute") has affirmed its commitment to diversity and expressed the goal of increasing the enrollment and retention at the Institute of under-represented groups;

Whereas, the Institute's framework to effectively implement its expressed commitment to diversity is limited because of administrative decentralization: graduate student recruiting, admissions, and retention are managed at the departmental level;

Whereas, the 2005-2006 Graduate Student Council ("GSC") initiated the Task Force on Diversity ("TFoD") in October 2005 to evaluate GSC and Institute diversity initiatives, define diversity, research external diversity responses at the Institute's peer graduate schools and produce a report in March 2006;

Whereas, the GSC Task Force on Diversity has completed and submitted a report on graduate student diversity that includes recommendations for improving the effectiveness of the Institute's and GSC's expressed commitment to diversity in ongoing graduate student life;

Whereas, the GSC TFoD has presented its report and the GSC body discussed the TFoD report recommendations at the March 2006 GCM and the primary recommendation of the TFoD was to create a standing committee on diversity;

Whereas, committees of the Graduate Student Council work to address student needs are the primary avenues by which the GSC accomplishes the majority of its mission;

Resolved, the GSC supports the President's action to create an Ad Hoc Graduate Student Council Committee on Diversity, charged as follows (the "charge"):

1. Evaluation:

Evaluate the current GSC and Institute initiatives and provide an analysis of the pulse of the graduate student community on the issue of diversity on an annual basis;

2. Program Coordination:

Coordinate the GSC's diversity initiatives and programming and work with other GSC or Institute committees on events of joint interest;

Officers

Eric Weese
gsc-president@mit.edu

Shan Wu
gsc-vice-president@mit.edu

Obrad Scepanovic
gsc-secretary@mit.edu

Jehanzeb Noor
gsc-treasurer@mit.edu

Committees**Academics, Research, & Careers**

Biraja Kanungo
gsc-arc@mit.edu

Activities

Eva Kassens
Shahriar Khushrushahi
gsc-ac@mit.edu

Association of Student Activities

Jen Lobo
gsc-asaa@mit.edu

Funding Board

Jehanzeb Noor
gsc-treasurer@mit.edu

Housing & Community Affairs

Gerald Dalley
Leeland Ekstrom
gsc-hca@mit.edu

Muddy Charles Pub

David Danielson
gsc-mudd-chair@mit.edu

Nominations

Shan Wu
gsc-vice-president@mit.edu

Orientation

Johnna Powell
Lynne Waldman
gsc-oc@mit.edu

Publications & Publicity

Obrad Scepanovic
gsc-pp@mit.edu

Graduate Student News

Daniel Truque
gsn-editor@mit.edu

Webmaster

Nici Ames
gsc-webmaster@mit.edu

Staff

Nancy Kelly
Emily Snyder
gsc-admin@mit.edu

77 Massachusetts Avenue
50-220
Cambridge, MA 02139-4307
Phone: 617-253-2195
Fax: 617-258-9274



MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
GRADUATE STUDENT COUNCIL

3. Information Clearinghouse:

Investigate prior diversity initiatives at MIT and develop a directory of Institute administrative, departmental and student organizations working to promote or facilitate diversity in the graduate student community;

4. Advocacy:

Advocate on behalf of graduate students on Institute committees and through various mechanisms;

5. Liaise with the Institute:

Serve as a central resource for graduate students, faculty, and administrators on the issue of diversity for the GSC and work with the administration and departments on developing and promoting recruitment initiatives at the graduate level.

It is so moved:

1. For the GSC to vote to support the President's creation of an Ad Hoc Graduate Student Council Committee on Diversity to commence work at the beginning of the 2006-2007 academic year.

2. The Ad-hoc committee shall be evaluated based on the stated plans and goals and the GSC shall hold a vote at the February 2007 GCM on the creation of a permanent standing GSC Committee on Diversity.

GSC Ad Hoc Committee on Diversity

Action Plan

First Year (2006-2007)

- ❖ Recruit core set of participants for Committee meetings from among existing and new GSC reps and broader graduate student community
- ❖ Work with the GSO plan the Welcome Dinner for minority students
- ❖ Begin Annual “Graduate Student Diversity Network” agenda-setting meeting with all relevant stakeholders so that groups can cooperate effectively for common goals
- ❖ Increase role with CONVERGE through active participation in planning the weekend and spending time with visiting students
- ❖ Support department-level diversity initiatives through advocacy and research
- ❖ Meet standing GSC committee standards:
 - Have two chairs
 - Hold regular meetings
 - Attend Executive Committee meetings
 - Create webpage content to add to GSC page
- ❖ Building productive liaisons and co-sponsor events with:
 - Student groups: LBGT groups, Latino Cultural Center and other Latino Groups, BGSA and other African-American Groups, Graduate Student Women and other women's groups and many others
 - Dean of Graduate Students Office
 - Departments and Schools
- ❖ Host “Diverse Boston” events to discuss Boston’s past, present and future for people of color

First Year Committee Goals

1. Host events that energize students, prospective students and faculty about reaching long-term diversity goals
2. Build cooperative relationships with offices and student groups that support and promote graduate student diversity on campus
3. Demonstrate support for the committee at various levels of the Institute

Second Year and Beyond

- ❖ Continue to lead Annual “Graduate Student Diversity Network” agenda-setting meeting w/ all relevant stakeholders so that groups can cooperate effectively for common goals
- ❖ Build relationships with More Boston-area high schools to encourage academic excellence and interest in college and graduate studies
- ❖ Support department-level diversity initiatives through advocacy and research
- ❖ Increase role with MSRP and CONVERGE
- ❖ Work with Minority Faculty Recruitment Committee and the Committee on the Retention of Minority Faculty

May 12, 2006

- ❖ Sponsor other events as requested and initiated by GSC constituents and Diversity Committee members

Long-term Committee Goals

1. Improve quality of life for all MIT graduate students, particularly those from diverse backgrounds
2. Work with other MIT stakeholders to increase recruitment and retention of underrepresented students, consistent with MIT's stated goals to triple the number of underrepresented minority students between 2003 and 2013
3. Promote a positive and engaging social environment for student from diverse backgrounds with on-campus and Boston-area events

Budget (August 2006-February 2007)

Monthly Committee Meetings (10)	10 people per meeting	\$500.00
Graduate Student Diversity Network meeting	40 people (food)	\$200.00
Cosponsor Diversity related events with other student groups		\$150.00
Diverse Boston event (Networking and panel discussion; co-sponsor)	50 people (refreshments); flyers	\$250.00
Total		\$1100.00

The remaining action items are either currently being funded by outside sources, or will not need additional funding.

Officers

Eric Weese
gsc-president@mit.edu

Shan Wu
gsc-vice-president@mit.edu

Obrad Scepanovic
gsc-secretary@mit.edu

Jehanzeb Noor
gsc-treasurer@mit.edu

Committees

Academics, Research, & Careers

Biraja Kanungo
Shiyun Ruan
gsc-arc@mit.edu

Activities

Eva Kassens
Shahriar Khushrushahi
gsc-ac@mit.edu

Association of Student

Activities
Jen Lobo
gsc-as@mit.edu

Diversity

Elizabeth Clay
Nakeischea Loi Smith
gsc-diversity@mit.edu

Funding Board
Jehanzeb Noor
gsc-treasurer@mit.edu

Housing & Community Affairs

Gerald Dalley
Leeland Ekstrom
gsc-hca@mit.edu

Muddy Charles Pub
David Danielson
gsc-muddy-chair@mit.edu

Nominations
Shan Wu
gsc-vice-president@mit.edu

Orientation
Johnna Powell
Lynne Waldman
gsc-oc@mit.edu

Publications & Publicity

Obrad Scepanovic
gsc-pp@mit.edu

Graduate Student News
Oaz Nir
Daniel Truque
gsn-editor@mit.edu

Webmaster
Nic Ames
gsc-webmaster@mit.edu

Staff
Nancy Kelly
Emily Snyder
gsc-admin@mit.edu

77 Massachusetts Avenue
50-220
Cambridge, MA 02139-4307
Phone: 617-253-2195
Fax: 617-258-9274
<http://gsc.mit.edu>



MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
GRADUATE STUDENT COUNCIL

General Council Meeting
March 7th, 2007

53gsc.8.2
Diversity Committee

(VOTING AT THIS MEETING)

Sponsors: Elizabeth Clay, Nakeischea Loi Smith

Whereas, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (the "Institute") has affirmed its commitment to diversity and expressed the goal of increasing the enrollment and retention at the Institute of under-represented groups; and

Whereas, the Institute's framework to effectively implement its expressed commitment to diversity is limited regarding graduate students because of administrative decentralization: graduate student recruiting, admissions, and retention are managed almost exclusively at the departmental level; and

Whereas, the 2005-2006 Graduate Student Council ("GSC") initiated the Task Force on Diversity ("TFoD") in October 2005 to evaluate GSC and Institute diversity initiatives and produce a report in March 2006 which recommended the creation of a GSC standing committee on diversity; and

Whereas, upon the recommendation of the 2005-2006 GSC, the Diversity Committee began operating in 2006-2007 academic year as an "ad hoc" committee for a trial period to evaluate interest in the committee and sufficient areas for work GSC standing committee on diversity; and

Whereas the "ad hoc" Diversity Committee found significant areas of need for Institute-wide discussion toward creating and inclusive atmosphere and advocacy on behalf of graduate students within the departments and administration on issues of diversity beyond the scope of what could be achieved by an ad hoc committee in one year; and

Whereas, standing committees of the Graduate Student Council work continuously to address student needs are the primary avenues by which the GSC accomplishes the majority of its mission;

Be it resolved, by the Graduate Student Council:

That the attached text be appended to Section D of Article II of the Bylaws ("Committees").

11. Diversity Committee

The Diversity Committee is a standing committee concerned with the cultivation, evaluation and advocacy of a diverse community at MIT in the interest of graduate students. Membership of the Diversity Committee shall be open to all those interested in these issues and activities, including representatives from the Institute's academic departments, graduate living groups, as well as relevant Institute Committees. The Diversity Committee shall handle relations with Institute officials, academic departments, and committees in their areas of responsibility regarding the issue of diversity; coordinate the activities of the GSC, representatives, and graduate student groups in these areas; make recommendations to the Council for funding in these areas; and make recommendations for nominations to relevant Institute Committees. Activities may include but are not limited to attention to efforts around recruitment and retention of a diverse graduate student population; evaluation of ongoing progress in these areas; and promoting communication within the MIT community regarding the issue of fostering an inclusive community.

In addition to attention to the protected categories named in MIT's non-discrimination policy, the Diversity Committee allows for a broader understanding of diversity as in the GSC Task Force on Diversity's (TFoD) Statement on Diversity, included below.

Statement on Diversity from the TFoD:

Diversity characterizes a community. It is not a state or end goal. Cultivating a diverse community includes promoting tolerance and respect, recognizing and embracing the interdependence of individuals and groups, and actively challenging divisive and discriminatory threats. A more diverse MIT community is better able to achieve MIT's mission of advancing knowledge and educating students to best serve the nation and the world.

Notes:

- GSO is the Graduate Student Office, the predecessor to ODGE, which is now OGE
- 53.gsc1.2 describes formation of the Diversity Committee (Ad-Hoc), formed at the beginning of the 2006-2007 GSC leadership year
- 53.gsc.8.2 was a resolution to amend the bylaws to make the Diversity Committee permanent
- Sylvain was 2005-2006 GSC President (and acting VP? VP and Acting President? Something is unclear in the history, and there is no VP listed for that year in our documentation)

From the February 2007 (Introduction) GCM

Deliberation: 53gsc.8.2 – Diversity Committee.

- Nakeishea describes the history and the resolution through a presentation. Open for questions.
- A member of Committee expresses support for the events and collaborations.
- Another member expresses importance to have a GSC committee to liaise with various Institute committees. America 101 is new initiative that could be done during Orientation.
- Barun raises concerns about diversity being hard to define, issue with focus on particular type of students vs other, differences between general grad student sentiment versus GSC diversity committee sentiment.
- Liz vouches for inclusiveness of the committee for people of all types, not any particular constituency:
 - Barun didn't mean it as a criticism but something to consider in defining the committee.
- Sylvain asks what in GSC structure prevents all the proposed work from being done?
 - Liz answers, if subcommittee then not a priority, diversity is getting much attention in the Institute so committee is needed.
- Sylvain says diversity is a buzz word the Institute is using, he's not convinced that Institute position is really doing anything, doesn't want the GSC to follow some trend.
- Dave Levy says diversity is important and supports the committee.
- A committee member expresses support for diversity committee in being there and liaising.
- Leeland asks to know what has been done, scope of students that have been reached out to, compares to scope of HCA.
- A committee member comments on inclusiveness.
- Johnna expresses concerns about favoritism and how care should be taken in defining committee.
 - Liz says it wouldn't happen, an issue with any committee like AC, diversity shouldn't be an exception.

From the March 2007 (Voting) GCM

Voting: 53gsc.8.2 – Diversity Committee.

- Brian explains purpose of committee, importance of graduate student voice being heard in decision-making.
 - Graduate students need to get chance to participate, be involved.
 - Not a great climate at MIT to talk about diversity.
 - Focus is on community.
 - Not trying to make MIT a representative sample of the States or the world.
 - There are many groups already making their voices heard.
 - Need to make sure that there is a coordinated graduate student voice.
 - Solutions are not about targeting individuals. Need solutions that help everyone.
 - Stigmatized groups are the first that manifest evidence of harmful environment - example: chemistry (refs program). Refs helps everyone.
 - Resolution is about making standing committee to demonstrate GSC's commitment to diversity - accountable, responsive. More effective than subcommittee or other structure.
 - Subcommittees not discussed in resolution due to GSC constitution.
- A rep asks about difference between subcommittee and committee.
 - Eric says that committee is in constitution, difficult to change relative to subcommittee.
- A rep asks about two people running the committee: is that diverse?
- Brian says idea is to build community: events, institutional changes, etc.
 - GSO fellowships for research on diversity climate at MIT.
 - Not trying to repeat what BGSA or other student groups are doing.
 - HCA has two co-chairs, and goal is that one is off-campus and one is on-campus. Goal, but not a requirement. Two faces is ok, managing with five people is problematic.
 - We'll have recommendations regarding subcommittees. Not subcommittee on race, on gender, etc. Instead, subcommittees on liaison with senior administrators, etc. (functions). Can't be written into constitution.
- A rep asks if there is there a definition of diversity beyond being "anti-discrimination".
 - Brian says can look over "diversity statements" from various schools. perhaps think of it as something like "knowledge" - i.e. something we can strive for more perhaps never really attain.
 - Rep follows up: but if you can't define it, then how can you be held accountable?
 - Brian says can measure by results, for example additions to MIT's non-Discrimination policy. Need to be flexible about what the most important issues are, and address those at any given time: for example, the climate changed after 9/11.
- A rep asks how value is added to the grad student body if diversity committee is established.
 - Brian says that it's a choice - do graduate students think it's valuable for diversity to have a voice, with the backing of people and funds? If it's not important for graduate students to be part of the process at MIT, then so be it.

- It's good that standing committees are hard to form, because then they represent a real commitment.
- Daniel asks how the budget was determined.
 - Brian says in the actual formation of committees, there is no requirement to write in events.
 - Elizabeth says ad hoc committee was given \$1200 up front, then more funding was requested.
- **Barun says this is a vote on whether you think this committee is beneficial to the structure of the GSC.**
 - Rep: This may hurt the cause of diversity, because it should be common to all other committees, so to make it separate could backfire (just as you wouldn't make a committee for "keeping students involved" as this should be a global goal).
 - Brian agrees GSC has accomplished much on diversity in the past. Indeed not about whether you support diversity at MIT - the question is whether you support a committee within the GSC to address the issue.
- Someone replies that lots was accomplished without the committee - Converge, for example.
- A rep asks whether there are specific instances that have come up on campus where the GSC did not adequately address diversity, where this committee might have helped?
 - Brian says there were cases of departments using women and minority students as recruiters for graduate programs, whereas this should be the role of a dedicated staff person.
- A rep asks if the ad hoc committee can continue if the resolution fails.
 - Brian says after the task force, an ad hoc committee was formed for a year, so now is time to make a decision – another year of ad hoc would be setting it up to fail.
 - Elizabeth says making this a permanent committee will help develop more dedicated leadership and integrating more with GSC and MIT as whole.
- A student addresses the question as to students suffering because of lack of diversity committee: after 9/11, there was a great effort - 3 town hall forums, lots of work with MIT Muslim students association. GSC realized this was important and carried it out, without the need for diversity committee (questioner was Chair of ARC then). Other students traveled to Georgia for some action.
 - Brian says absence of evidence is not evidence of absence.
 - There are still issues that diversity committee could address - for example, to push for Associate Provost for Faculty Equity.
 - Graduate students are the most under-served groups at MIT in terms of Diversity, and serve to gain from a dedicated committee.
 - Elizabeth says that the program of trips to GA was dropped; Diversity Committee could have perpetuated this program.
- Sylvain says that as vice president last year, he was unable to garner support for the MLK dinner. The GSC is a group of people; need people to be interested. afraid that

this will reflect even worse on GSC and MIT, if unmotivated people chair this committee, and is ineffective.

- Elizabeth says this is a reasonable point, and leadership development is an important part of what we've done this year.
- Brian says also, the year Sylvain was president, we had an interested group of students, and the GSC passed legislation to put into place the task force that created the ad hoc committee.
- Daniel says that he heard that Professor Sherley spoke at one of their meetings.
- Brian says that in fact, Sherley didn't want anything to do with the administration, but he actually did agree to a public Q&A session with the Diversity Committee.
- Daniel says he feels this was very controversial, and the other side was not presented.
- Brian says it was only a Q&A and anyone could ask questions, including administration.
- A rep asks if there is any provision in the GSC bylaws for conditional committees.
 - Eric says not currently, but anything is possible.
- A student says professor Sherley Q&A was a great example of how the GSC Diversity Committee was able to bring about a dialogue that no one else was able to put into place (in particular, the administration). This was a success. The only thing admin did was talks on tenure process.
- Tim says that it's impossible to keep accountability for diversity within all the committees. We need a separate committee to take on diversity if we want to make serious efforts.
- A student says that looking historically, GSC has been good about taking action on big issues like Sherley. Perhaps it would have happened even without Diversity Committee.
 - Brian says that it seems unlikely.
 - Daniel says that Q&A wasn't necessary. He was sitting there from 9-12 everyday. I think that the Div Committee doing the Q&A is like the GSC taking sides. Wasn't discussed with the rest of the council.
 - Elizabeth says it was good that Daniel went up to talk to him, but others didn't. Also, a community discussion is different than a bunch of one-on-one discussions.
 - A GSO employee says she has not seen any strong evidence against this committee. MIT is not a perfect, multicultural place. There are limits to what can be accomplished without a standing committee. Budgetary limitations, continuity problems.
 - Sylvain says there are no limitations, budgetary or otherwise. Also, GSO employees should not be here. Also, in response to Tim (ASA rep) saying that accountability within other committees is hard - this is possible, Sylvain says. Ask in open floor what is being done.
- Barun says that no one ever claimed MIT is perfect, certainly not the GSC. The GSC is structured in a way to avoid special interest groups. That's why we have general committees on activities, etc.
 - What if we get committees on international students, on families, on "brown people," etc.

- Elizabeth says that in fact, Diversity Committee is a committee for all students at MIT - it is not a special interests group.
- Brian says this is vote on whether the GSC wants to make a structural commitment to address issues of Diversity. Should we do something different and make a standing committee? That's the vote. It's not whether you support / don't support diversity or anything like that.
- A student says important issue is sensitivity. Wants to have resources to go to if there are problems with discrimination, advisor issues, etc. Grad students need a single resource - a place to go, a single committee with structure. Also, the diversity committee will be in charge of avoiding the influence of special interest groups. Our discussion here proves that we need it.
- A GSO employee says he will speak as a graduate alum and not as assistant dean. When he was chair of black grad students association, it would have nice to have had a forum to speak about issues which are not just specific to us but concern minorities in general.
- Ming asks about amendments.

Motion for secret ballot: 29 yes, 6 no. Passes.

VOTING (by secret ballot): 21 yes, 23 no, 7 abstentions. Fails.

APPENDIX F

Officers

gsc-officers@mit.edu

President

Sarah Goodman

Executive Committee

gsc-president@mit.edu

Vice-President

Lisa Guay

Nominations Board

gsc-vp@mit.edu

Secretary

Orpheus Chatzivasileiou

Publications &**Publicity Board**

gsc-secretary@mit.edu

Treasurer

Krithika Ramchander

Funding Board

gsc-treasurer@mit.edu

Committees

gsc-excomm@mit.edu

Academics, Research, & Careers (ARC)

Patrick O' Shea

Richard Zhang

gsc-arc@mit.edu

Activities (AC)

Karthik Akkiraju

Yijin Wei

gsc-ac@mit.edu

Assoc. of Student Activities (ASA)

Kelsey Becker

gsc-asa@mit.edu

External Affairs (EAB)

Peter Su

gsc-eab@mit.edu

Housing & Community Affairs (HCA)

Malvika Verma

Nicholas Triantafillou

gsc-hea@mit.edu

Muddy Charles Pub

Alex Genshaft

gsc-muddy-

chair@mit.edu

Orientation (OC)

Akshata Krishnamurthy

German Parada

gsc-oc@mit.edu

Staff**Administrative**

Lauren McLean

Elizabeth (Betsy) Granese

gsc-admin@mit.edu

GSC Office

77 Massachusetts Avenue

Room 50-220

Cambridge, MA 02139

Phone: 617-253-2195

<http://gsc.mit.edu>



Graduate Student Council

of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Resolution to Appoint the Diversity and Inclusion Subcommittee Chair to the Executive Committee

Author: Future of Diversity and Inclusion Working Group

Whereas the Graduate Student Council of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT GSC) serves to represent the graduate students on all matters pertaining to their general welfare; and

Whereas due to the temporary and ad hoc nature of past GSC initiatives, the GSC has experienced difficulty effectively promoting diversity and inclusion in the graduate student body and the Institute at large; and

Whereas the Future of Diversity and Inclusion Working Group (FDIWG), convened in December 2017, has identified recommendations to build and sustain diversity and inclusion initiatives within the GSC; and

Whereas the deliberations of the FDIWG indicate that having a full voting member of the GSC Executive Committee who coordinates and advises diversity and inclusion initiatives of the GSC will (a) increase breadth of representation in decision-making processes, (b) create a more direct link among GSC entities working on diversity and inclusion, and (c) ensure that GSC continues to foster inclusion and equity on campus; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, the Graduate Student Council exercises its power under Bylaws II.G.1 to appoint the Chair of the Diversity and Inclusion Subcommittee (DIS) as a full member of the GSC Executive Committee; and

Resolved, elections for the Chair of the Diversity and Inclusion Subcommittee will be governed by the process set forth in Bylaws II.D.1, with any references to "committee" being replaced by "Diversity and Inclusion Subcommittee" in all instances; and

Resolved, the Chair of the Diversity and Inclusion Subcommittee may be removed from their position as Chair of the Subcommittee following the procedure described in Bylaws II.E, with any references to "committee" being replaced by "Diversity and Inclusion Subcommittee" in all instances; and

Resolved, the Council oversight processes described in Bylaws II.F shall apply to the Diversity and Inclusion Subcommittee with any references to "committee" being replaced by "Diversity and Inclusion Subcommittee" in all instances; and

Resolved, the provisions of this Resolution shall also apply to any organization that is a successor to DIS as determined by the Council, with any references to "Diversity and Inclusion Subcommittee" being construed as referring to the successor organization in all instances; and

Officers
gsc-officers@mit.edu

President
Sarah Goodman
Executive Committee
gsc-president@mit.edu

Vice-President
Lisa Guay
Nominations Board
gsc-vp@mit.edu

Secretary
Orpheus Chatzivasileiou
Publications & Publicity Board
gsc-secretary@mit.edu

Treasurer
Krithika Ramchander
Funding Board
gsc-treasurer@mit.edu

Committees
gsc-excomm@mit.edu

Academics, Research, & Careers (ARC)
Patrick O' Shea
Richard Zhang
gsc-arc@mit.edu

Activities (AC)
Karthik Akkiraju
Yijin Wei
gsc-ac@mit.edu

Assoc. of Student Activities (ASA)
Kelsey Becker
gsc-asa@mit.edu

External Affairs (EAB)
Peter Su
gsc-eab@mit.edu

Housing & Community Affairs (HCA)
Malvika Verma
Nicholas Triantafillou
gsc-hea@mit.edu

Muddy Charles Pub
Alex Genshaft
gsc-muddy-chair@mit.edu

Orientation (OC)
Akshata Krishnamurthy
German Parada
gsc-oc@mit.edu

Staff
Administrative
Lauren McLean
Elizabeth (Betsy) Granese
gsc-admin@mit.edu

GSC Office
77 Massachusetts Avenue
Room 50-220
Cambridge, MA 02139
Phone: 617-253-2195
<http://gsc.mit.edu>



Graduate Student Council

of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Resolved, all Committee and Subcommittee operating procedures, including those of the Committee on Housing and Community Affairs and DIS, shall be amended to be consistent with the provisions of this resolution; and

Resolved, this Resolution shall have immediate effect and shall be in force indefinitely until repealed by the Council.