



UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

May 11, 2006

To: Dave Frohnmayer, President

From: UO Diversity Advisory Committee

RE: Recommendations Related to UO Diversity Plan

Dear President Frohnmayer:

Please accept our recommendations for actions and changes to the current comment draft of University of Oregon's Diversity Plan. Our committee appreciates the great care that has gone into the creation of this plan, and we encourage you to move forward with these recommendations in a substantive way.

We realize that with such strong opinions on all sides of the various issues related to campus diversity efforts that the easiest—and perhaps politically safest—path would be to delay taking action. We do not recommend delay. The planning process has gone on since the fall of 2004. While no one could argue that all relevant voices were heard at any particular stage in this process, in total, a broad spectrum of voices on and off campus has been heard in this process. The DAC has effectively completed the task of listening to these voices, aggregating feedback about the merits and weaknesses of the comment draft from these broadly representative voices, and preparing a comprehensive set of recommendations based on this feedback that will, once integrated into the plan, continue to find the common ground among a strong set of diverse viewpoints. We do believe that more listening would indeed be useful. If the campus community moves forward, the next stage of this process (i.e., at the college, school, and unit strategic planning level) is the best place to continue these conversations.

### **Feedback and Review**

We recognize that much feedback has been received about the various iterations of the Diversity Plan over these past two years, and it is clear that this prior feedback has been meaningfully contemplated in the Diversity Plan up to this point. During the current Phase III feedback period, the DAC has engaged in a deliberate and widespread process of seeking and receiving feedback about the current draft. In soliciting feedback, we delivered open invitations to all deans, all department heads, all unit directors, the ASUO and Student Senate, and the Multicultural Center to hear and receive feedback. In addition, the DAC attended a large University undergraduate class to hear student feedback. The DAC attended all sessions requested by these groups. In addition to these scheduled review activities, the DAC held three large Town Hall Discussions to solicit feedback about the plan. In each session, the DAC provided written feedback forms for participants to

OFFICE OF THE VICE PROVOST FOR INSTITUTIONAL EQUITY AND DIVERSITY

1258 University of Oregon, Eugene OR 97403-1258

T (541) 346-3186 F (541) 346-2023 [www.uoregon.edu](http://www.uoregon.edu)

*An equal-opportunity, affirmative-action institution committed to cultural diversity and compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act*

complete. An online version of the feedback form was also created and placed on OIED’s website so that interested persons could send comments directly to the committee in a very convenient manner. In addition to these feedback mechanisms, many committee members heard from campus community through individual emails and in-person meetings. DAC members also met with and received feedback from external community members throughout Oregon including community stakeholders and alumni. In total, we have received and integrated comments from at least 1003 contacts. Below, you will find more specific information about DAC contacts. It should be noted that these numbers are imprecise due to possible overlapping of contacts (e.g., individuals who came to more than one session, individuals who came to a session and later provided written comments) and the fact that some of the written comments were endorsed by multiple persons (in some cases dozens). While a variety of constituencies provided feedback, our sense was that there was significant overrepresentation of voices of faculty and officers of administrations across the feedback.

<u>Activity</u>	<u>Approximate Contacts</u>
Scheduled Sessions:	
Student Affairs	30
Registrar’s Office	25
School of Music Faculty	26
Multicultural Center	12
Student Senate	28
Undergraduate Class	55
Open Town Hall Sessions:	
Session 1	38
Session 2	23
Session 3	76
Written and Online Feedback Forms	50
Individual Emails	20+
Individual Meetings by DAC members	600+

While the recommendations here are intended to aggregate the feedback we have received by capturing the major themes, we also encourage you to reference our notes, received correspondence, and the written and online feedback forms as you endeavor to revise the plan.

### **Recommendations**

In the next section we provide specific details about the feedback that we received along with recommendations from the DAC pertaining to each critical point raised in the feedback. Per our charge, the critical feedback points that we articulate are designed to aggregate the many points of feedback into key issues and themes rather than list the many thousands of individual points raised. Obviously, not every individual point is captured in this process, and we encourage you to review such individual-level feedback at your discretion. Regarding recommendations, DAC members did not formally vote on each recommendation. Rather, we will note: (1) when there were unanimous recommendations for changes based on the feedback, (2) when there were unanimous recommendations to not make changes suggested by the feedback, and (3) when our committee was divided about whether a feedback point should be enacted or not.

### **Basic Premise of Diversity Plan**

Across the feedback, and beyond critiques of specific elements of the plan, we heard some feedback that called into question the very premise of diversity building on campus. This was not a widespread criticism and the vast majority of the feedback, even that which included critical concerns, did not recommend such a course. The major themes articulated about the premise of that plan are as follows:

Feedback Point: In a time of disinvestment in higher education, the prioritization of diversity programming can not be justified.

Feedback Point: The creation of this plan just places more precious resources into an already extensive diversity administrative bureaucracy and can not be justified, particularly because the plan does not position such investments as enhancing academic quality.

DAC Recommendation: We unanimously affirm the need for a campus diversity plan. While a variety of concerns were raised from all sides of the issues, there was strong support for many of the initiatives outlined in the plan. That being said, a majority of DAC members suggest that additional language be added to the plan that more directly connects diversity initiatives with academic quality (see Need For Plan section below), while others suggest that the plan make it clear that academic quality would not be compromised by the specified diversity initiatives.

### **Cultural Competency**

As with the first draft plan, we received much feedback about how cultural competency was framed in the current draft. Not surprisingly, feedback was varied as to the merits of how cultural competency was addressed. Here are some aggregate points:

Feedback Point: Because the term “cultural competency” is so controversial, poorly defined, and/or not an important element of the plan anyway, all references to it should simply be dropped.

Feedback Point: Cultural competency is the core of what we should be advancing in this plan. Failure to use this term as a guiding principle throughout the document weakens the plan tremendously.

DAC Recommendations: There is no question that the term cultural competence continues to be a polarizing concept on this campus. Feedback was varied across different campus constituencies. In the end, we affirm the position taken by the EDWG in framing cultural competency in the current draft and strongly recommend leaving this framing as is. The current approach allows maximum flexibility for colleges, schools, and units to use or not use the term as they see fit. Further, the framing invites the future critical conversations that must be had about the merits and weaknesses of cultural competency as applied to higher education. To address some of the specific concerns raised about this section of the plan and to strengthen these main points, we also recommend the following:

- p. 14, par. 3, ln. 1. Delete words: *The Executive Diversity Workgroup feels that*
- p. 14, par. 3, ln. 2. Replace: *...the units (should) **need to** engage these issues...*
- p. 13, par. 2, ln. 7. Add: *...corporate world, **but is a less used term in other disciplines.***
- p. 13, par. 2, ln. 7. Delete sentence: *For some members of the University community...*

- p. 14, par. 3, ln. 4. Replace: ...*which is (to ensure...)* **to ensure respectful and productive interactions that reflect recognition of the variety of contexts and experiences from which individuals and groups come.**

In addition to these consensus recommendations, some committee members suggested moving the paragraph that explains the freedom to use or not use the term “cultural competency” in the strategic planning (see p. 14, par. 4) to the beginning of this section; others believed the current flow should be retained.

### **Diversity Definition**

Feedback on the definition of diversity centered on which groups were and were not listed. There was no widespread concern about the broad definition, but some thought the exemplar list was too long, and others advocated for including additional terms such as age and veteran status. There were a variety of comments about the saliency of various terms (e.g., race vs. political affiliation). In the case of political affiliation specifically, there was concern about whether this could become an invitation for groups to utilize the diversity plan to promote hate. Based on the host of feedback pertaining to the definition of diversity:

**DAC Recommendations:** The DAC unanimously affirms the broad definition of diversity described in the document. We also recommend:

- A statement should be added that notes that the exemplar list is not organized hierarchically.
- Age should be added as an exemplar.
- “Ability or disability” should be moved forward on the exemplar list for reasons of visibility.
- “Political affiliation or belief” should be retained but referred to simply as “political views”.
- “International origin” referred to on top of P. 2 should be changed to “national origin” for consistency with P. 13 reference.
- On last line of p. 1, replace: ...*differences (of)* **such as** race...
- Despite the saliency in the present national context, the DAC does not recommend adding “veteran status” to the exemplar list.
- References to “economic class” (p. 2, 13) and “social economic class” should be changed to “socioeconomic status”.
- Reference to “religious affiliation or background” (p. 2, 13) should be changed to “religion”.
- Additional language should be added that discuss the differences in: (1) the saliency of specific diversity categories on campus, (2) the sociohistorical contexts of these diversities, (3) histories of discrimination, (4) and the need for interventions that are different for each category rather than a universal approach.

### **“Need for Plan” Section**

The DAC received a variety of feedback pertaining to this section including a recommendation from some that this section be dropped entirely. The DAC also received feedback from individuals who viewed this section as the most important in the plan. There were strong concerns raised about the lack of focus on linking diversity to academic quality in this section. Some also questioned the usefulness of the descriptive data presented. In addition, some thought the more qualitative reference to negative student experiences was not justified; whereas others thought that this section should be stated more strongly.

Feedback Point: The link between diversity and academic quality is not made clearly enough. Diversity efforts should not be seen as a tangent, but as central aspect of academic quality.

Feedback Point: The statistics are not very useful and the data do not support, in all cases, the conclusions drawn from them.

Feedback Point: Reference to a single, non-scientific source of data to support that many UO students of color have negative experiences on campus can not be justified.

Feedback Point: The plan does not reflect the profound and widespread experiences of students, faculty, and staff on campus from underrepresented groups who often do not feel included, respected, or safe.

DAC Recommendations: The DAC recommends that this section should be reorganized into three clear sub-sections: one describing contextual demographic information, one addressing diversity and academic quality, and the third recognizing the voices and experience of UO students. The link between academic quality and diversity efforts (currently addressed obliquely in paragraph 1) should be the primary focus of the Need for a Diversity Plan section. Background information on the University's past diversity efforts (paragraphs 2-15) and the location of the University's current diversity statistics in broader societal context (paragraphs 16-22) are important; however, for purposes here they should function only as a foundation for understanding the need for a diversity plan. We also recommend:

- Language should be added to frame the data more fully. For example:  
*Data pertaining to race/ethnicity from Oregon state databases are included here only to provide a context for understanding University data. The data are incomplete in some ways (e.g., we need more data about the population of Oregon high school graduates who qualify for admission to the University). The data are merely descriptive in nature and provided here as a window into the broader context in which the University exists. These data are not presented as an argument regarding the sufficiency or insufficiency of diversity at the University. They are not presented to imply specific benchmarks or goals towards which the University should necessarily orient its diversity efforts.*
- P. 5, second to last bullet beginning "In general, about 65%..." should include the actual six-year graduation rate for students of color.
- Bullet eight on p. 5 should include actual percentage growth rates for students of color during the increment cited for Oregon K-12 students.
- The availability and/or lack of available data regarding other important aspects of diversity should be noted more strongly.
- The language referring to Julia Lesage's work (p. 6) does not provide sufficient evidence of the magnitude of campus climate issues. More specific language should be included that describes the experiences of students, staff, and faculty members more broadly. The limitations of such qualitative statements should also be noted. For example:

*There is evidence that students of color and other underrepresented students continue to face unique challenges in successfully navigating their University experience. These student voices, captured through both formal and informal*

*channel on campus, are supported by continued frequency of campus incidents as documented in formal complaints through the Office of Affirmative Action, Bias Response Team reports, news stories, and legal actions taken against the University. For example, the Bias Response Team, which provides informal mechanisms to address incidents of bias on campus, fielded 92 complaints during the FY04-05. On our campus, students routinely report that they experience a lack of inclusion, respect, and safety. They testify to inappropriate comments made by University employees and fellow students and endure tense interactions in living, learning, and other public spaces.*

*In assessing this evidence, it is important to note that many of these incidents occur outside of the classroom, and therefore may never come to the attention of some faculty members and unit administrators. The difficulty of quantifying these experiences numerically does not justify ignoring them or rejecting their legitimacy. In recognizing the legitimacy of these voices, we also note that the ongoing experiences of diversity challenges as reported by students themselves reflects a genuine need for us to respond.*

## **Resources**

The DAC has received widespread feedback about the issue of resources. Concerns were raised about current resource allocations for “diversity initiatives” and opinions were varied about whether the University was spending too much or too little on diversity. Across the feedback, there were consistent statements about the need for greater transparency in how resources were being allocated and whether those investments were leading to the desired outcomes.

Feedback Point: There is a need for more transparency in financial resources going to support diversity initiatives through OIED and at each college, school, and unit level.

Feedback Point: There are no statements about the potential costs for any of the initiatives set forth in the document. This must be addressed by the central administration and it must be determined from where new resources would come.

Feedback Point: Funding for new diversity programming and bureaucracy should not be a priority in a time of limited resources and great disinvestments in higher education in Oregon. Diversity should not be the priority-- improving academic excellence and faculty salaries should be.

Feedback Point: Funding diversity is an essential priority in improving academic excellence and improving campus climate. More direct commitments from the administration to fund the plan are necessary. For example, the University could make a new commitment to initiate a capital campaign to fund parts of the plan.

DAC Recommendations: We support the recommendation for greater transparency in describing the resources supporting diversity initiatives on campus. On P. 41, there is already a clear charge for OIED to conduct an analysis of existing diversity efforts,

determine their effectiveness, and prioritize new initiatives so that any available resources can be effectively directed. In addition to this, we recommend that:

- Language should be added to this section that directs the Provost to evaluate the sufficiency and appropriateness of funds for existing programs.
- The President and Provost should respond to questions about the strategic prioritization of diversity initiatives.
- Consider new language that requires inclusion of resource impact statements (e.g., financial investments, staff time, etc.) where the plan addresses strategic planning at the college, school, and unit level (p. 8-9).

While the DAC affirms the importance of transparency, we caution against creating a threshold of disclosure/transparency that places a higher burden for disclosure on diversity programs/initiatives than that for other programs.

### **Accountability/Responsibility for Strategic Plans**

Feedback received on the issue of accountability and administrative oversight was polarized. Some constituencies advocated for greater accountability campus-wide, particularly at the individual level, while others expressed concern that the Provost has been granted too much power to dictate consequences in the plan. Many individuals suggested the need for greater definition of roles and oversight at all levels (i.e. Provost, DAC, OIED). Many of the concerns seemed to relate more generally to a perceived lack of clear information about the normal governance/accountability structure with the University as well as cynicism about the effectiveness of the existing structure.

Feedback Point: There really is no individual accountability. There are no real teeth to the plan. There is no evidence that anything meaningful will happen if deans/unit leaders simply decide to not create strategic plans, fail to submit annual reports, or fail to make measurable progress on stated diversity goals. There needs to be clear consequences and incentives for creating and implementing strategic plans.

Feedback Point: Given the current lack of skills among the deans/unit leaders in addressing diversity, it is problematic to place so much autonomy in that leadership group in creating and implementing meaningful strategic plans.

Feedback Point: The plan does not clearly say what the Provost could/would do for failure to advance on stated diversity goals. The language now seems to empower the Provost to take any action the Provost sees fit.

DAC Recommendations: The DAC affirms the need for clearly established accountability mechanisms as necessary for making sustained progress on the initiatives specified in the plan. As on campus, there was no real consensus in our committee about how this should be further addressed in the plan. We support the focus on transparency of the strategic plans and the appropriate reliance on the existing governance structure: We further recommend:

- The President and Provost should consider providing greater clarity about who will be accountable and how failures and successes would be addressed in terms of meeting stated goals. While we affirm the reference to the existing governance structure in the diversity plan, we believe that this additional information, provided in a supporting memorandum from the President, would help shed light on these issues.

- P. 10, par. 5, ln. 5. Replace: (*The Provost can take whatever action the Provost deems appropriate*) **The Provost will utilize established personnel/governance policies and practices** to reinforce...
- Consider changing the title for this section to “Oversight” rather than “Responsibility.”
- Add language on p. 10 that indicates that OIED will facilitate voluntary interdepartmental workgroups for individuals involved in the strategic planning process to maximize sharing of information and support during the planning and implementation process.

## **Improving Campus Climate**

The DAC received a variety of feedback suggesting that this section be expanded to include a stronger focus on mentoring and student engagement in improving the climate for diversity.

**Feedback Point:** The subsection titled “encouraging student involvement” should be strengthened and expanded. Diversity efforts among students do and should go beyond involvement in the University’s current programming and events. Increasing the sphere of influence of existing groups concerned with diversity is a critical approach to encouraging involvement.

**Feedback Point:** Mentoring and advising students from diverse backgrounds is essential, and this is only given an off-handed mention at the end of this section.

**DAC Recommendations:** The DAC agrees that this section should be refocused and expanded to provide greater guidance about ways to engage students more effectively in improving the campus climate for diversity. First-year students are particularly vulnerable due to frequent high-density living arrangements and limited knowledge about campus resources. Language focusing specifically on freshman outreach should be considered. Additional recommendations are as follows:

- Add language to the end of the Informal Conflict Resolution section (p. 24) such as: *The Bias Response Team and Conflict Resolution Services should ensure that their outreach efforts reach incoming freshman.*
- Add language to the end of the Communications about Procedures section (p. 24) such as: *These should also be posted in high traffic locations such as the student recreation center and the EMU. The written instructions and/or flowchart should also be permanently posted on residence hall bulletin boards.*
- Add language to the Encourage Student Involvement section (p.25). For example: *University offices and programs should continue existing efforts and develop new strategies to encourage the involvement of students from underrepresented groups in diversity programming. OIED, ASUO, and other units should also explore ways to collaborate with students in the design and implementation of programs focused on awareness of and engagement in diversity building measures on campus.<sup>1</sup> The extent to which the student population can be more fully engaged in campus climate efforts will be one determining factor in the traction these efforts are able to gain at the*

---

<sup>1</sup> While the majority of the DAC supported this particular sentence, there was a concern by some members that this sentence could be interpreted as placing a new charge on departments.

*University. Outreach should include but stretch beyond students from underrepresented groups, recognizing and communicating the important role that all students can play in diversity efforts.*

### **Inclusiveness and Building Critical Mass**

The DAC received much feedback about inconsistency between the broad definition of diversity in the plan and the strong focus on intervention strategies that narrowly target race, ethnicity, and gender elsewhere in the plan (particularly in Point 3: Building Critical Mass).

Feedback Point: The plan too narrowly targets intervention in building critical mass on race/ethnicity. Doing so is inconsistent with the broad definition of diversity espoused in the plan. While race/ethnicity are important, consider language that does not minimize need to build critical mass in other areas.

DAC Recommendations: The committee noted that the issue of which diversity targets should be prioritized is a complex one, particularly because by overweighting targets such as race/ethnicity, the inference is that other areas (e.g., sexual orientation, ability and disability) are not as important. More open conversation about these issues is clearly necessary as the work on the Diversity Plan moves forward. The DAC encourages an honest examination of the University's intentions related to building critical mass in areas other than race, ethnicity, and gender. Some DAC members also were concerned that it might be disingenuous to state that future goals will include building critical mass in areas such as sexual orientation and/or disability. In addition, we acknowledge that there are complex issues regarding the attempt to build critical mass in some other areas reflected in the broad definition of diversity (e.g., political views, age, etc.). We recommend:

- Additional language should be added that articulates why critical mass building should be focused on race, ethnicity, and gender (e.g., legal mandates included in affirmative action policies, data that highlights well known disparities in these areas, sociohistorical context) as the appropriate starting place and more directly leaves the door open to the development of critical mass in other areas.
- It should be noted that different categories of diversity have different salencies in the present context, have different histories, and would require different intervention strategies in terms of critical mass building.
- Language should be inserted that makes it clear where there are legal prohibitions against recruiting/hiring candidates based on specific factors (e.g., age, political affiliation, etc.).
- Regardless of such targeted hiring prohibitions, it should be noted that we have a responsibility to make the University accessible and welcoming for all diverse groups. As such, this section should reference the legal mandates for access to the University for individuals with disabilities (e.g., references to Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990).
- Additional language should be added that articulates distinctions between building critical mass in terms of faculty/staff hiring and building critical mass for student enrollment. For example, in hiring faculty and staff, there are specific legal regulations that prohibit employers from asking about certain background factors (e.g., socioeconomic status), which makes building critical mass in those areas difficult at this time. However, when considering critical mass building for students, these same factors (e.g., socioeconomic status) and others (first-generation student status) are critically relevant and important targets.

- P. 30, par. 3, ln. 6. Delete sentence: *Programs such as Ethnic Studies and Women’s and Gender Studies...* This sentence unduly narrows a focus only on a set of very specific programs as attracting underrepresented students and faculty.
- The DAC also recommends that language such as the following be considered for inclusion in the introduction to the Building Critical Mass section on p. 27:  
*Efforts to build critical mass in this section are focused on race, ethnicity, and gender, while fully recognizing the fact that this is inconsistent with the previously stated definition of diversity. There is not currently consensus in the university community regarding strategic priorities in the development of critical mass. The narrowing of focus in this section reflects the clear, immediate, and legally sanctioned need for developing critical mass in these particular groups. The University, however, remains committed to pursuing its long-term vision of equality of opportunity and true pluralism, including creating an environment that is accessible to all individuals from underrepresented groups and reflects the pluralism of Oregon and the larger society.*

### **Proportionality and Building Critical Mass**

The DAC received feedback that called into question the specific focus on building a critical mass of faculty, staff, and students from underrepresented groups. Some indicated that efforts to increase representation of particular groups on campus were simply unjustified. Others expressed concerns that building critical mass would lead to simplistic ideas about proportional representation (e.g., that the University would arbitrarily decide to hire a certain number of faculty from particular underrepresented groups and release faculty who were members of groups that were overrepresented). On a related note, individuals also raised concerns about how words such as “equality,” “equal opportunity” and “equity” were used in the document.

Feedback Point: Critical mass should not be part of the plan. Promoting the need to build critical mass among demographically underrepresented groups would lead to arbitrary decisions about proportionality in hiring and student admissions.

Feedback Point: A simple focus on building critical mass of faculty, staff, and students based on race, ethnicity, and gender, would lower academic quality because they will lead to selections based on criteria other than academic qualification. This could also create a hostile environment for those brought to the University because they would be seen as tokens. The unintended consequences could be severe and would hurt the people you are trying to help.

DAC Recommendations: The DAC affirms the importance of building critical mass at the University. Changes to this section already recommended above (see section directly above) will help to articulate why an initial focus of this plan on race, ethnicity, and gender is important. The DAC further recommends:

- Language should be added, perhaps in Need for Plan section and/or the Building Critical Mass section that makes it clear that while the plan calls for increasing diversity in specific areas, it eschews simple ideas that we aspire to an arbitrary level of proportionality (e.g., that there be X% African American, Latino, Asian, American Indian faculty).
- P. 1, par. 1, ln.1. Replace: *Equality (,) of opportunity and pluralism...*
- P. 27, par 2, ln. 4. Replace: *Point (2) focuses on...*

## **Expanding and Filling the Pipeline**

The DAC received a variety of feedback about this section, all of which supported the critical importance of this section. In fact, a number of faculty members articulated an alternative diversity plan through the feedback and review process that emphasized this as the key priority area for the University (although that plan focused more precisely on socioeconomic status as the most salient diversity factor).

**DAC Recommendations:** The DAC recommends that additional language be included in the beginning of this section that prioritizes pipeline interventions. For example:

*Equality of opportunity is a core value of the University and a guiding principle of the Diversity Plan. We thus recognize the essential importance of outreach to and support of underrepresented and underprivileged groups at the K-12 level. Effective plans to increase pluralism and quality at the University will recognize critical realities: academic preparation, community support, and encouragement towards higher education are not equally distributed throughout the youth population in Oregon. This structural inequality is a core source of the persistence of diversity challenges at the University.*

*Outreach, support, and encouragement of underrepresented and underprivileged students at the K-12 level are not only in keeping with this document's core values, it is a practical necessity. Middle school is a key development level that often sets youngsters towards life course trajectories of success or failure depending on the types of supports and interventions that are employed. Evidence suggests that students often make decisions about whether or not to attend college by 9<sup>th</sup> grade. Efforts to attract and support young students from structurally disadvantaged groups should take this evidence into account when designing pipeline strategies.*

*Active cultivation of the talent and potential in Oregon's K-12 students provides the opportunity for creative collaboration between departments and among faculty, staff, and students. University pipeline programs will be most effective if partnered with local and regional school districts, parents, community agencies, and academic non-profit organizations. Such programs should also strive to include a range of University faculty and students in engaging Oregon's underrepresented and underprivileged K-12 students. Such programs provide University participants with real and tangible diversity experience and training while simultaneously addressing the challenges of diversity at their roots.*

*For practical and principled reasons, filling the pipeline must be a focal point in the University's Diversity efforts.*

## **Conclusions**

The DAC has heard from many constituency groups on and off campus. In aggregating feedback, the DAC attempted to reflect the full continuum of feedback about the comment draft of the Diversity Plan. After processing this large scale feedback, we remain more convinced than ever that this draft has come a long way in finding the common ground amid the context of widespread differences of opinion. As our recommendations are contemplated and considered in the final drafting of the Diversity Plan, we think that this plan can move the University forward in important ways as it seeks to realize goals articulated in the UO Mission Statement. It is likely that as individuals contemplate their support for the forthcoming final draft, they will find elements that they support and other elements that they find troubling. While full consensus is unlikely to be reached about the plan, our goal in formulating these recommendation was to create a document that meaningfully incorporated feedback across varied viewpoints in order to refine the comment draft produced by the EDWG.

Respectfully submitted,

University of Oregon Diversity Advisory Committee