

Final Report of the Charter Committee on Campus Climate

for the December 2007 meeting of the Board of Trustees

Members of the Charter Committee:

Fred Alford

Jason Azevedo '08 (fall 2007)

Peter Blum

Stephanie Chambers (spring 2007)

Lyndsey Dakan '07 (spring 2007)

Carlos Espinosa

Luis Figueroa

Rena Fraden

Dulce Amor Imbo '07 (spring 2007)

Ramon Rosario

Gigi St. Peter

Mary Sandoval (fall 2007)

Stephen Simchak '08

Karla Spurlock-Evans

Cristina Wheeler-Castillo '08 (fall 2007)

Margaret Young

Co-chairs:

Philip Khoury

Cheryl Greenberg

Part I: Introduction

Trinity College is not immune to the bigotry and closed-mindedness that have too often marked life in this country. Despite our rules, our hopes, and our high-minded pronouncements, our community has been marred repeatedly by malicious acts of racism, sexism, homophobia and other forms of hatred. In the winter of 2006, following the posting of racial and homophobic epithets, vandalism and a public display of appalling racist and sexist insensitivity, Trinity students and faculty demanded a re-examination of the campus's policies and silences that may have contributed to an atmosphere where such offensive acts of hostility and intolerance could occur.

Following an all-campus open forum on November 15, 2007, President Jones and the Board of Trustees created a Charter Committee on Campus Climate to take a serious look at these issues. There had been many studies of the problem; this committee was to move beyond study to action. There had been several committees that had offered policy recommendations; this committee was not only to present recommendations but also to propose mechanisms to see that those recommendations are implemented. There had been committees charged with finding revenue-neutral solutions; this committee was charged with proposing recommendations without regard to cost.

The President and Trustees understood that achieving the results they sought required the participation of the entire Trinity community, and a process as transparent and democratic as the policies it would propose. It therefore created a committee consisting of three faculty, three staff, three administrators, three Trustees, and three students, and charged it with envisioning how best to strengthen the sense of community

on our campus, reinforce our sense of responsibility to each other, and help all of us better understand and appreciate new and different perspectives and ways of thinking.

Our committee began its work by collecting and examining the studies others had done before us (see Appendix A for a list of materials consulted). We requested ideas and proposals from the campus community, collected, organized, and discussed each one. The committee then divided into subcommittees to look at what we do at Trinity, where we do it, how we do it, and with whom, and how we communicate our values. The subcommittees interviewed a number of members of the College community to learn more about the forces that shape our community life, and how we might intervene in those processes. We also enlisted the support of the College Affairs Committee in drafting a statement of what we thought we should expect from members of the Trinity community (See Appendix B for Trinity's Statement of Community Principles.) We then combined forces once more and talked through and edited all these data and observations, and crafted a set of overarching goals and specific recommendations. In the final phase, we circulated a draft copy of our report to the entire campus and held three public forums and solicited emails to receive community feedback, which we then incorporated into the final draft. This report represents our best effort to embody, as well as promote, community.

We wrote our report with an eye toward action rather than study, and toward holistic rather than piecemeal approaches. We also propose specific implementation mechanisms, the most central being the creation of a presidential-level oversight committee, for moving our recommendations forward effectively and expeditiously. As a

result we believe that the report's specific recommendations, rooted in an overarching vision of the Trinity we can become, can begin to transform our community.

We also believe that these changes are urgent. Not only are we morally and intellectually compelled to combat those behaviors and ideas antithetical to our mission of training critical thinkers and global citizens, but we are also motivated by a pragmatic concern to sustain long-term institutional vitality. Demographic shifts occurring over the next decade assure that our future applicant pool will be more racially, ethnically, and religiously diverse, will include more students from other nations, and from families who have not previously sent anyone to college. Trinity must respond now. We must be in the forefront with regard to these changes if we wish to remain competitive and provide an effective and meaningful education for our students.

We begin our report with principles, and with a vision already articulated in Trinity's Mission Statement: we seek to "free the mind from parochialism and prejudice." We envision Trinity as a distinctive community of engaged learners and open-minded world citizens. We hope to create a community within Trinity that is not only tolerant of difference but appreciative of the diversity of experience and perspective such differences bring. We hope to create a community in which we all feel responsible for each other, in which we all understand ourselves as personally responsible for fostering a sense of community, intellectual curiosity, and mutual respect. We emphasize that this report does not focus exclusively on students. We understand these as institutional issues that must be addressed in the policies and practices of administration, faculty and staff as well as of students.

We see our curriculum, our social lives, our work, our interactions, and our relationship with the larger community in which we live as interrelated. Therefore, the values of community, openness and responsibility that we seek must be embedded in everything we do. We also believe that transforming this community will take everyone's, not merely the students', best efforts. How can we move closer to achieving this vision? The second part of this report tries to answer this by identifying and explaining six goals, and offering specific recommendations to achieve those goals.

We offer two general comments before we present those goals and recommendations. In our efforts to understand the policies, practices and attitudes that shape campus climate, we came to see two distinct areas in which we operate. The first comprises structural matters such as how we spend money, how we govern ourselves, how we communicate, how we define our core mission and values, and the like. These are matters that can be altered by decisions and decree and it is these which we tried to address in our recommendations. We believe Trinity as an institution has a responsibility and an opportunity to provide what tools we can to build an inclusive and intellectually cosmopolitan community. We can and must make systemic, institutional changes in how we conduct ourselves and the business of the College. Individuals and the choices they make are constrained or liberated by the structures within which they operate.

However, we also understand that institutional change is not in itself enough. The second area we recognized as crucial to the development of community comprises how individuals think, feel, and act. We recognize that these are not easily swayed by or necessarily obedient to the dictates of imposed rules. It would be facile to suggest that structural changes will put an end to intolerance, meanness, or indifference, or that we

should not brace ourselves for new acts of bigotry and ignorance. This has several implications. First, if Trinity is going to change, each one of us must take responsibility for how his or her individual actions enhance or detract from community life. Second, if acts of intolerance, intimidation or coercion do occur, we must be ready to respond effectively to them, both with adequate and effective procedures and with a willingness on the part of each of us to stand up in the face of such acts.

These two areas of structure and attitude are interrelated. Structural changes will influence prevailing attitudes and prevailing attitudes influence individuals, but it will take time and persistence to bring about real and lasting change. Thus we see our report and recommendations as a starting point rather than an end point in this process.

A second observation regards the interrelationship of these proposals. We have described goals and designed specific proposals to enact them. But we are mindful of the fact that when it comes to implementation, many of these proposals are linked. For example, it is no use subsidizing tickets for Hartford events if there is no means of transportation available to get people from here to there. Nor is there any use to call for the refurbishing of arts or social spaces without creating a mechanism for deciding their use. Therefore we envision many of the proposals we offer below being addressed not piecemeal but as a set of coordinated initiatives that bring multiple proposals under one structure.

We don't have an answer to what those initiatives might be, but in our discussions we have seen some trends emerging. We see a broad initiative that would focus on events, another on improving residential and community life. A third would address

means of extending diversity at Trinity, and a fourth communicating our commitment to community. Each would incorporate multiple proposals within it.

An initiative focused on events requires thinking about the best structure for allocating program funds, coordination of groups planning such programs, how to provide transportation if needed, how to best advertise and generate audiences for these programs, and making sure there are enough quality spaces in which that programming can take place. Thinking about improving residential and community life requires coordinating proposals regarding Resident Advisors and Mentors, reconsidering ways to structure residences (both thematically and physically), promoting rules and behavioral expectations that build community and support, exploring control of social and community spaces, and so on. Enhancing our diversity is addressed in proposals regarding bridge, support and retention programs, outreach mechanisms, making sure spaces are available to support diverse groups, examining recruitment and admissions, and making sure support systems and rules are in place to create a welcoming environment. Communicating our commitments involves making sure ideals of responsibility, community, and intellectual openness permeate our curriculum, public relations and recruitment materials, and orientation and other programs.

In other words, the structures required to implement our proposals must be broadly conceived and carefully coordinated. This will require the support and goodwill of all the officers and offices of the College, and a coordinating and assessment body to oversee the process. Therefore, our first and central recommendation is the immediate creation of such a presidential-level oversight group, reflecting Trinity's multiple

constituents, to determine how to create the synergy among the proposals that could help to truly transform the College.

We end this section with a note of cautious optimism. The overwhelming support we received during this process, the number and quality of the suggestions and comments we received, and the goodwill we see on all sides reminds us that the vast majority in our community are committed to the institution and to one another, and are willing to engage in the honest self-examination required to begin the process of personal and institutional transformation. We have much to do but we do not want to underestimate the quality of community we already have at Trinity. Rather, we celebrate it, as a fundamental requirement for moving forward.

In Part II we list six specific goals that we see as crucial, explain why we think so, and list for each goal a set of specific recommendations. While the proposals are not ranked in strict order of priority, generally speaking the higher on the list, the more important we believe the proposal to be. In many cases specific operating details, which are crucial but complex, will have to be worked out after consultation between the new oversight committee and the individual, office, or organization responsible for implementing the proposal.

In the final section of the report we offer two priority lists. The first names those things we can begin to implement in the very short term, that are pressing and require a modest amount of money. The second list offers our sense of the most important recommendations to achieve our stated goals, regardless of the cost, for longer-term planning.

Part II: Goals and Recommendations

1. We need to communicate our commitment to responsibility and community in everything we do, and to hold transgressors responsible for actions that violate our community standards.

If we are serious about wanting to create a community of engaged citizens who care for one another and treat each other with respect, we must be sure we make clear the sorts of behaviors we expect and the sorts of people we hope to attract. We must signal our seriousness of purpose, and also remind ourselves of these commitments at every opportunity. We must make sure that our policies are egalitarian and apply to all of us, rather than promoting hierarchies of expectation or responsibility. We must make sure that every member of our community knows about those policies and those commitments. And we must learn to ask about each new program or decision, “how will this strengthen our community, our sense of mutual responsibility, our commitment to creating a safe space for everyone and to welcoming different perspectives?”

There must be oversight of this process. We are convinced that the only effective way to monitor and assess the efficacy of these initiatives is through the creation of a presidential-level task force whose members have the legitimacy and power to see that it is done. We believe the committee should model our own in its broad representation of our multiple campus constituencies (faculty, high level administrators, staff, students), and in its regular communication with the Trinity community, and with the Trustees through the President. Its breadth of membership will also help establish both credibility and power. We call for the chair of the committee to be a tenured member of the faculty.

That person should have a seat on the Planning and Budget Council to ensure that its proposals receive adequate attention.

This committee should be charged with overseeing the implementation of this report's recommendations. For some proposals specific details of implementation still need to be worked out. Many of them are complex and require organizational leadership, coordination, and support. Once these new programs are in place, the oversight group must ensure that they are adequately maintained and there has been appropriate follow-through. We must also be sure that our new programs are effective, which requires some mechanism for assessment. The new committee must also keep the community informed as to both the progress of the recommendations and the challenges to their fulfillment.

The oversight committee should also address explicitly the question of a single non-discrimination policy that applies to all campus organizations. In the Charter Committee, our discussions returned again and again to questions of inclusion and exclusion, whether real or perceived, in various social organizations on campus. We were unanimous in our desire for a non-discrimination policy for all College-recognized groups, and the necessity for all organizations and programs to consider whether any of their practices and policies might (even inadvertently) signal exclusion. However, we recognized the complexity inherent in creating any such policy. For example, we divided over the question of whether certain performance or tradition-oriented groups, like singing ensembles, should be permitted to exclude members on the basis of sex. Recognizing the nuances involved, and unwilling to pass judgment without fuller engagement with all parties involved, we call for the oversight committee to consider

how best to craft a fair and consistent non-discrimination policy that ensures inclusive practices by all campus organizations.

There are as many ways of accomplishing these goals as there are means of communication. Among those are the following:

- a. The immediate creation of a “President’s Special Council on Diversity and Campus Community” to be drawn from Trinity’s multiple campus constituencies.

This council will assign responsibility for implementing each of these recommendations to the appropriate person or office, monitor new programs and assess their effectiveness, provide a clearinghouse for new ideas and proposals and serve as pool of advisors if specific issues arise. Its chair, a member of the tenured faculty, should also sit on the Planning and Budget Council. The committee must communicate regularly with campus members and with the Trustees through the President.

- b. Strengthen the campus Code of Conduct regarding hate speech, acts of harassment, and the like, and disseminate this information broadly in the community.

These codes must demonstrate the uncompromising stance of the administration against acts of harassment, assault, intolerance, or intimidation, and make it clear that such incidents will be followed up with action.

- c. Rework the Student Integrity Contract and its enforcement, maintaining student control over its processes and making it more central in student life.

Communicate our expectations more clearly in the Contract, and emphasize its relationship to the core mission of the school. Promote more frequent and widespread discussion of the Contract to incorporate greater student buy-in, and encourage greater community responsibility. As part of that reconsideration, examine Trinity’s student judicial processes including the student Honor Council, to make sure that, as a community, we are responding effectively and consistently to incidents of bigotry and intolerance, and communicating effectively with members of the campus community while preserving confidentiality.

- d. Make a single set of rules regarding harassment, assault, and other types of injurious behavior that applies to faculty, staff, administrators, as well as students. Make sure that faculty and staff judicial processes are effective and consistent in their responses to infractions.
- e. The Dean of Students should instruct Campus Safety to expand its Campus Safety Alerts to include crimes committed by students as well as by non-students, while preserving confidentiality.

- f. Add a question regarding community/diversity to Trinity's application to signal the centrality of this issue to our community. (E.g. a question that would ask applicants how they might respond to a specific act of bias).
- g. The newly established President's Council should articulate a clear, consistent and fair non-discrimination policy for all organizations seeking College recognition.
- h. The President should organize and fund campus-wide meetings at least once a semester engaging a theme related to some aspect of community, diversity, or cosmopolitanism.

Because the goal of these meetings is to foster communication and dialogue, each must have top administrators present, and all must include time with an open mike.
- i. The Trustees should hold regular meetings with faculty on issues of concern similar to the student forums already being held at trustee meetings.

2. We need greater economic, racial and ethnic diversity in our student body, faculty and staff.

If we are serious about exposing our students to a diversity of viewpoints, cultures, and ways of living, to equip them to be more engaged and humane global citizens, we must provide as economically, racially, ethnically, religiously, culturally and internationally diverse a community as possible, and we must work to retain this diverse group once they have arrived.

We consider diversity a worthy goal in itself, but we also considered how we do compared with other liberal arts colleges. Trinity is certainly not the worst in regard to diversity, but we aspire to be among the best. Although we have done well in several categories, in others we have actually slipped slightly in recent years. One crucial example has been our failure to recruit and retain African American tenured or tenure-track faculty at the levels we had achieved in the late 1990s. (See Appendix C for more, and more specific, data.) We must protect the progress we have made in recruiting and

retaining students of color and continue to move forward, not just in our relative position vis a vis other schools but in pursuit of the broader vision we hold. Similarly we must reinstate and strengthen programs for increasing diversity among faculty at all ranks.

This goal of increasing diversity among students, faculty, administration and staff will require greater funding so that we can recruit such individuals for our faculty and our student body (and woo them from other schools), and enable those who might not otherwise be able to attend Trinity the opportunity to do so. We make special note of the fact that this includes middle-class students as well. Our limited current financial aid budget skews our student body into well-off full payers and those from lower income brackets, which often creates a false and dispiriting dichotomy among students.

We also believe achieving this goal requires greater attention to other indications of academic merit beyond test scores in our scholarship selection processes. Every study of academic success suggests that indicators such as test scores are not always good predictors across the range of students. Other indicators, such as high grades, achievement and persistence in adverse circumstances, are in many cases better predictors of academic strengths crucial for success in college and beyond.

Finally, we must retain this diversity by providing mentoring and social support for newcomers, academic support to those who need it, and a wide array of opportunities for those who seek greater academic challenges. This includes making sure our existing programs and rules provide a safe and welcoming environment for all, including people of differing sexual orientations or physical abilities.

In light of these considerations we put forward the following recommendations:

- a. More money for financial aid for students of color and first generation, low-income, and middle-class students. Meanwhile, the committee determining

financial aid should revisit its current allocation decisions to make sure we are making the best trade-offs we can in terms of encouraging a diverse student population to attend Trinity.

- b. Look beyond test scores for other evidence of academic excellence and high achievement when recruiting for merit scholarships.
- c. Expand current outreach and community-building programs like Quest and QuestBridge.
- d. Restore funding for the faculty-hiring opportunity program for members of under-represented racial groups and expand it to include the recruitment of such faculty across all ranks.
- e. Establish a more professional and effective process to advance affirmative action for faculty, staff and administrative hires, including creating job responsibilities explicitly dedicated to such activities.
- f. Increase funding and support for student retention programs especially for first generation and other students who may be struggling to find their footing, and for those students seeking new academic challenges.
- g. Establish ongoing mentoring and other support programs for new staff and faculty members.
- h. Continue to improve policies for family leave, anti-harassment, and sex and gender equality to insure that our workplace is welcoming to diverse members and to signal our commitment to providing equal treatment for all.
- i. Increase resources for programming, training, and peer education around issues of sexual assault and harassment, including prevention programs.

3. We need better social and academic spaces that would foster a wider diversity of communities and facilitate active engagement between and among different Trinity constituencies.

We can neither provide social alternatives nor can we encourage students to create their own social activities without spaces in which those activities can occur. Simply calling on the community to make closer links among residential, social and academic life is insufficient if we do not provide physical places where such links can be made. Yet Trinity has no student center, and community spaces both in dormitories and in social or academic buildings have increasingly been given over to other functions. Nor are our

classrooms well-equipped for a variety of education programs and styles. And too much of our academic life is physically separate from student social space.

We must restore social spaces to students, make them attractive and versatile, and allow students to take charge of their use. This both broadens the scope of possible social opportunities and provides community-building opportunities as such usage decisions are made collectively. And we believe we should integrate academic, residential and social life to the extent possible, to blur the distinctions between living and learning. Living in a liberal arts college is integrally related to learning and the way we use space should foster rather than inhibit such linkages. Therefore we call for the creation of academic spaces within social, residential and cultural buildings, and include those spaces on the list of available classrooms for teaching. (Here we envision spaces like Summit Suites, which offers faculty offices, classroom, lounge and student residential spaces combined or in proximity.) Likewise, flexible classroom space provides alternatives for social programming also linked to learning.

We also recognize that much of student socializing revolves around alcohol. We seek two different approaches to this. While we appreciate our legal responsibilities to enforce current drinking laws, we call on the College to find ways to provide alcohol to legal adults. This minimizes the chance that these students might drive after drinking, and also allows the College to provide locations where adults can model moderate and responsible drinking. Second, we call for more social spaces and social activities that do not center around alcohol.

Trinity has also lost space that encouraged socializing and community among faculty and staff. The paucity of dedicated faculty and staff space, the loss of an academic

bookstore, and similar recent changes mean fewer opportunities for faculty, administrators and staff to engage with each other and with students. Such engagement has been an important source of a sense of community among those who work for the College and a venue for creating or fostering new ideas. The recent limitations on such opportunities have meant a real loss to Trinity, reflected not only in lower morale but also in reduced opportunities for such engagement.

Without question, having more faculty, staff and administrators living close to campus could play a positive and important role in this expanded landscape of social, cultural and intellectual life that we envision. Thus we strongly advocate creating housing options, supporting home buying programs, or other incentives that would encourage more Trinity employees to make such a choice.

With these concerns and ideas in mind we offer the following recommendations:

- a. Restore and refurbish dorm lounges and other residential spaces so they are attractive and inviting, and allow residents to determine their use
- b. Create (or free up) more functional, flexible and well-equipped spaces like Gallows Hill whose uses are to be controlled by students. As new spaces become available for permanent use, set aside some as dedicated spaces for new student groups. Dean of Students must establish fair and open process by which students make those determinations.
- c. Create (or refit) more and better quality spaces for arts and cultural programming, exhibitions, and accessible studio and practice spaces.
- d. Create flexible academic (teaching and learning) spaces within some residential and social halls (including Greek and cultural houses) and include them in the set of formal classroom options offered by the Registrar and the Calendar office.
- e. Build a student center (and meanwhile retool Mather to provide more spaces where students and student organizations can interact).
- f. Investigate the possibility of a “pub” or other on-campus alternative with alcohol and find ways to serve alcohol legally in other social spaces where appropriate.
- g. Restore and improve spaces for staff, administrators and faculty to gather, as well as for students and faculty.

- h. Offer various incentives to encourage faculty, staff and administrators to live closer to campus.

4. We need a residential and social life for students, faculty and staff that fosters a stronger sense of community and mutual responsibility, as well as one that encourages an open-minded embrace of diverse opinions and styles.

While providing physical spaces is crucial, so too is creating the opportunities to build community and to better coordinate, expand, and diversify our intellectual, cultural and social offerings. How do we use our spaces to best advantage to provide such experiences? What sorts of programming structures would most encourage broad intellectual, cultural and social engagement? How do we best set the stage for encouraging the broadest exchange of ideas and perspectives?

Part and parcel of such discussions is the role of fraternities and sororities, an issue that surfaced regularly in our conversations. We were mindful of the fact that the faculty voted four times in the past two decades, each one overwhelmingly, to call for the abolition of fraternities on campus. We were also mindful of the greater support Greeks received from many students and alumni, and the repeated efforts of the Trustees to reform the existing system. We concluded therefore that the future of the Greek system will depend in large measure on other issues not yet resolved, and which we hope our report begins to address. Nevertheless, although we recognize that there may be disagreement both within the Charter Committee and in the broader Trinity community about the current values and drawbacks of Greek life or about its future, our committee did agree that the fraternities and sororities hold disproportionate sway over the social life by dint of having control of much of the social space, and indeed the only social spaces that accommodate parties with alcohol. After much discussion, therefore, we agreed that

it would be unwise to resolve the future of the Greek system until there was an alternative social life available. It is for these reasons that we believe our immediate goal must be to create the spaces and opportunities to create such alternative social options.

Of course offering greater residential, social and cultural options requires money to fund new programs, social gatherings, technology to coordinate activities and communication, and safe and reliable transportation options into the Hartford area. But it also requires creating new organizational structures that encourage creativity and a sense of community both within Trinity and between Trinity and the broader world. Therefore we call for the creation of a coordinating body to facilitate planning for artistic, cultural and intellectual events on campus. We call as well for a restoration of the funding such programs previously enjoyed.

We believe students have an important leadership role to play. We seek to empower them to define their own social life and to create structures for themselves to do this. At the same time, we also seek to encourage collaboration among a number of constituencies wherever possible. This not only helps maximize resources, but also brings together groups of people who might not otherwise encounter each other and provides opportunities for leadership, cooperation and problem-solving.

But cultural programming is not sufficient to strengthen a sense of community. We call for stronger institutional support for community building when students first arrive on campus, and then within each residence hall. We urge a longer student orientation that extends into the academic year, allowing students to spend more time interacting in smaller groups and getting to know different parts of the community. We

also call for a second year orientation more focused on engagement with the Hartford community.

Community building must begin at home, in residence halls. The Resident Advisors balance two goals sometimes at odds: fostering community and policing that community. We call on the Dean of Students office to help RAs achieve that balance more comfortably and remain effective at both tasks. We also hope to foster the RAs' ability to create community as common spaces are restored to residence halls and by providing modest amounts of programming money. We ask RAs to organize and coordinate their students into social planning groups that would decide how to allocate that money and those spaces. That is, the RA would become an organizer rather than a social events planner, building community by bringing residents together to make decisions. If First Year students live separately, the Mentor could fulfill this role in addition to providing academic support, which would require that Mentors return to their earlier practice of living in First Year halls. We note that expanding the expectations and duties of RAs (and possibly Mentors) might also require altering their compensation.

Other campus student leaders, including PRIDE (Promoting Respect of Inclusive Diversity in Education) members and heads of student organizations and athletic teams, must also be empowered to play a greater role in fostering community and raising the level of expectation regarding student behavior. We therefore call on these leaders, as well as on RAs and mentors, to hold discussions with their groups on questions of community building, social inclusiveness, and the individual's responsibility to the community. Do their own policies and practices promote or inhibit inclusivity?

Similarly, student government has tremendous potential to foster social alternatives by thoughtful and deliberate policies regarding the disbursement of student activity funds. No student organizations should be denied basic funding solely due to lack of available money.

Given these considerations we offer the following recommendations:

- a. Launch a College-wide competition to propose alternative residential structures – houses, more theme dorms, or other configurations – and implement best feasible idea(s) that nurture community and responsibility.
- b. Create a collaborative umbrella committee for events; provide sufficient funds to support a wide variety of cultural, intellectual and artistic programs on campus and to subsidize tickets for such programs off campus. This committee’s work must be coordinated with new means of transportation for students so they can attend off campus events.

This umbrella group, which should bring together members of Student Government Association, Trinity College Activities Council, student cultural and affinity groups, and representatives from the faculty, Multicultural Affairs Office and the Dean of Students’ Office, will be expected to help coordinate cooperation and resource-sharing among groups planning intellectual and cultural events open to the entire campus, allocate funds to groups proposing events, and organize a number of their own events.

- c. Expand and support the role of student RAs and First Year Mentors in building community.

The RA, still living in the hall he or she serves, would continue to serve as mediator or informal intercessor between residents regarding behavior, and would also be charged with organizing his or her group into a social planning body.
- d. Call on leaders of all campus organizations and teams to hold discussions about building community with their group at least once per semester.
- e. The Dean of Multicultural Affairs should re-examine the timing and structure of PRIDE orientation to ensure the greatest effectiveness, expand the number of PRIDE leaders and enhance their role in fostering diversity and community on campus.
- f. Provide adequate funding to extend orientation programming into the academic year. Consider a Sophomore orientation, geared toward community building and fostering connections with the Hartford area.
- g. The Office of Communications should work with the Dean of Multicultural Affairs, students, academic departments and others to find multiple,

regular mechanisms for providing information regarding events to the Trinity community.

These might include: improve the accessibility of Exchange; consider a rolling scroll of daily events for Mather, the Cave and Bistro; use Facebook for better outreach to students; explore the feasibility of a new website that announces all cultural and intellectual events in a single calendar, provides links to campus and Hartford cultural groups and to nearby cultural and educational locations, posts alerts of bias incidents, offers links to relevant articles and resources and perhaps provides a space for discussion.

- h. Dean of Students' office should increase funding for student-faculty gatherings and other social and intellectual interactions outside of class, and better publicize the availability of such funds.
- i. Provide diversity training for faculty, administrators and staff particularly focused on issues of race, ethnicity, religion, social class, culture, physical ability, sexual orientation and gender identity.
- j. Rethink Vernon Social Center programming to provide for a wider array of activities.

5. We need to embed these values into our curriculum.

Teaching is at the heart of our enterprise and if we do not make community, openness to difference, intellectual flexibility, and cultural literacy central, we are not addressing key elements of our mission. This is not to suggest politicizing our classrooms or altering our high academic expectations for writing, reading, researching, and thinking. Rather it means finding ways to make it clear that to be a truly educated person is to be open to different perspectives, to be willing to explore new ideas and experiences, and to wrestle with different approaches to issues. It means recognizing that we can learn from one another and from our community, and that engagement with real-world examples of our studies enhances our learning and helps us understand academic concepts in a deeper and more meaningful way.

Tied into this broader educational vision are initiatives that link courses and extra-course programming, students and faculty, the College, the community and the world. We call particular attention to the successful implementation of two “co-curricular initiatives” on decolonization and on migrations in 1997-98 and 1998-99, respectively. Each initiative had a broad intellectual theme, linked several faculty and courses from different departments and programs, outside speakers, films, panel discussions, trips, and more, and engaged students at every level from planning to speaking. The level of participation and engagement was extraordinary and models much of what we seek to accomplish with this report.

Re-conceiving the curriculum in light of these challenges places new expectations on both students and faculty. It also requires us to rethink how and what we teach, to create, reinstate, or expand effective and successful retention programs, and to be creative with our use of technology. We applaud recent faculty decisions to strengthen Trinity’s curricular requirements, and strongly support further discussion of such issues.

To accomplish this we offer the following recommendations:

- a. Continue to advocate for a Hartford engagement requirement
- b. Reinstate a program to encourage and fund the organization of year-long co-curricular initiatives that would build on the best practices demonstrated in the 1997-99 initiatives.
- c. Provide greater structural support, including transportation, for Community Learning Initiative and other courses that link with Hartford.
- d. Restore or expand programs like Human Rights and Tutorial College that foster community, promote retention, and embody in microcosm the values we seek.
- e. Create an E (electronic) transcript, to appear alongside the student’s formal credit transcript, that lists student participation in internships, community and cultural groups, independent work, and so on, to highlight such activities and contributions to intellectual and cultural life.

- f. Work with the First Year Program to find more ways to incorporate issues of community, responsibility, openness, engagement, and respectful speech and behavior, including sexual behavior, into First Year seminars or other programs that First Year students attend. Provide the support necessary to accomplish this.
- g. Establish and support opportunities for Senior exercises or similar projects that use the power of interdisciplinary student collaboration to achieve the result (e.g. a political scientist, chemist, and environmental scientist conducting research on pollution in the Park River), to be identified on a student's E-transcript.
- h. Expand faculty workshops that offer ideas for creating and promoting classroom environments that are welcoming to all in our diverse student body.

6. We need to draw closer connections between Trinity and Hartford (including the larger Hartford metropolitan area); and to engage with the broader Hartford communities in all their diversity.

Part of our mandate as a liberal arts college is to help our students become more open-minded and cosmopolitan, to be flexible about change and open to new possibilities. To do this requires exposing students, staff and faculty to the widest array of perspectives and of social and cultural experiences and to encourage interaction with a broad diversity of people.

We also must provide opportunities to build community through the planning and coordinating of such events both among groups within Trinity and between Trinity and community groups. Several campus groups, including Cinestudio, the campus radio station WRTC, the Hartford Studies Project and Temple of Hip Hop offer proven models for success. Such programming also helps the broader Hartford area community by providing venues for their many activities and interests. This creates a related need – to make the campus more friendly and accessible to visitors. We must also expand the programs that bring community members into Trinity not as visitors but as students,

including the Academy of Lifelong Learning and Individualized Degree Program for adult students. And finally, we must encourage students to contribute their time and skills off-campus, to be active in the larger community in which Trinity makes its home, by strengthening outreach and volunteer programs such as the Community Service Office.

How do we maximize our own resources to achieve all of this? How well do we use the resources of the metropolitan area around us? We recognize that this certainly requires money, not only for programming but particularly to hire qualified and professional support staff to coordinate such programs and to do outreach to potential students, performers and cultural communities. We also recognize that fostering such connections requires both top-down structures and personnel, and the space for creativity to percolate from the bottom up.

We therefore offer proposals for both centralized structures and decentralized possibilities:

- a. Enhance Trinity's outreach educational programs that reach into the greater Hartford community, including IDP; and that serve the community, including the Community Service office.
- b. Host more cultural and arts events for and with the community (or more properly, Hartford's many communities). We envision a broad range of events, coordinated with good advertising and communication.
- c. To be effective in such programs Trinity needs a professional arts coordinator independent from any academic department who would be charged with finding performers, working with community groups, coordinating (and encouraging) the events planned by other campus groups, and overseeing performance spaces and scheduling.
- d. Work with the Vice President for Planning on the Master Plan and other campus development projects to consider the possibilities of our location, including the business opportunities on New Britain Ave. and the residential communities that surround us.
- e. Work with Community Relations and Communications to respond to community incidents or issues that involve Trinity or its members.

- f. Provide support for efforts by the SGA and Dean of Students' Office to improve transportation options for students traveling in and around Hartford.

Transportation entails providing cars and/or vans for community learning courses, Community Service programs, internships or visits to restaurants, museums, or cultural events; and establishing a relationship with a taxi or similar service to transport students to and from community locations if they can't drive themselves. This should be coordinated by an individual or office other than Campus Safety.

- g. Remove the existing fence separating our campus and Broad St., which serves more as a symbol of exclusion than an effective barrier against criminals. Discuss with Campus Safety what should replace this fence to protect against dangers such as traffic accidents causing injury or damage, or criminal activity.
- h. Publicize Hartford area events more widely on campus, including reduced price or free tickets and providing transportation.
- i. Post more (and better) campus maps at more locations on campus, and provide better signage on buildings.

Part III: Recommendations

The recommendations we offer vary along many dimensions. Some are relatively cost-free, others require a significant financial commitment. All are desirable, but we consider a number of them central to our mission of strengthening the Trinity community.

Additionally, as we noted above, many of these recommendations are integrally related.

To help move toward implementation, we have therefore created two priority lists. Those recommendations that require little or no funding, and those requiring funds that we nonetheless considered pressing and affordable at the moment, we include in a list of recommendations we believe can and should be implemented immediately. Of the remaining recommendations, several stand out as particularly important. We offer these in a separate list of top (and costly) priorities that we urge be incorporated into our ongoing planning process.

We call for the following recommendations to be implemented immediately:

Those with costs attached:

1. Refurbish spaces in dorms and on Vernon St. for student use and under student direction.
2. Establish an events committee that will fund, coordinate, and publicize more cultural, artistic and intellectual events on campus and subsidize some of those off campus. Consider funding a co-curricular initiative as part of this process.
3. Improve transportation options for students using Hartford in courses or to attend events or civic venues.

Those with low or no costs attached:

1. Create a President's Special Council to implement, oversee, and evaluate the effectiveness of these recommendations.
2. Strengthen our harassment policies, Code of Conduct, Integrity Contract, and judicial procedures and make sure they are consistent and effective.

3. Expand criteria for merit scholarships to include other proven indicators of quality beyond test scores.
4. Sponsor a competition for best organization of residential spaces.
5. Advocate for curricular requirement that engages Hartford.
6. Create an E-transcript for non-credit bearing community or intellectual activities.
7. Expand mentoring programs for new faculty and staff.
8. Hold campus-wide convocations with opportunity for dialogue each semester.
9. Sponsor teaching discussions on fostering inclusive classrooms; work with First Year program to incorporate issues of community and responsibility more completely into the first year experience.
10. Enable RAs to do more effective community building.
11. Call on Student Government Association to explore options for allocating Student Activity Fees differently, to allow them to fund a wider array of student activities and organizations.
12. Add a question about diversity to the Trinity application.
13. Extend orientation programming into the academic year; consider ways to expand on the possibilities and successes of PRIDE.
14. Require organizations to consider how their policies affect efforts at inclusion.
15. Inform the Trinity community of all crimes, including student-on-student crimes, with appropriate sensitivity to issues of confidentiality.
16. Publicize Hartford area events more widely on campus.
17. Post more and better maps around campus.

We consider these recommendations (some of which have significant costs associated with them) to be central to the achievement of our goals, and we urge their incorporation into the planning process:

1. Allocate more money for financial aid.
2. Restore funding for faculty opportunity hires and expand the program to include recruitment at all ranks.
3. Continue to create and refit arts, cultural, exhibition and social spaces.
4. Restructure residential options in accordance with the model chosen from the competition.
5. Build a true student center.
6. Hire a full-time arts director.

7. Sponsor annual co-curricular initiatives.
8. Reinstate or strengthen Human Rights, Tutorial College and other programs that promote community and intellectual engagement.
9. Expand funding for artistic, cultural and intellectual programs beyond existing levels.
10. Strengthen programs like IDP that reach into the Hartford community and bring local people onto the campus as fellow learners.

Appendix A

Selected Sources for Campus Climate Committee Work:

1. 1998 - Critical Issues Team, 1997-1998 Strategic Planning Process, Prof. Maurice Wade, Chair – "Report of the Diversity Critical Issues Team Submitted to the Priorities and Planning Council" – February 18, 1998.
2. 2002-2003 - Professors Laurel Baldwin-Ragaven [Human Rights Fellow], and Patricia Tillman [Studio Arts] – "Review of Successful TOP Proposals, 1996-2001, Assessing Curricular Merit and Curricular Need"
3. 2003 – "Umoja House, April 30, 2003" – Documentary film; a 17 minute version was screened at the Summer 2003 Curriculum Review Retreat; a 31 minute version was screened during "Dialogue Day," on September 16, 2003
4. 2003 - Task Force on Diversity, Prof. Fred Pfeil, Chair – "Report of the Summer Task Force on Diversity" – July 2, 2003 [committee formed after the summer, 2003, Curriculum Review Retreat]
5. 2003 - Office of Institutional Research and Planning – "Preliminary Analysis of the Evaluations of the September 16 [2003] Dialogue Day"
6. 2004 - Report by Karla Spurlock-Evans to the Trustees, April 1, 2004 – " Selected Activities Designed to Increase Understanding and Build Community Following Trinity College Dialogue Day"
7. 2004 - Faculty Conference – "Update on the 'Report of the Diversity Critical Issues Team'" – September 2004
8. 2004 - Professors Maurice Wade and Luis Figueroa – "Report on the 13th Annual Institute on [Minority] Teaching and Mentoring" – November 18, 2004
9. 2004 - Faculty Conference – "Affirmative Action and Diversity at Trinity College" – December 7, 2004
10. 2004 Cornerstones Advisory Committee on Diversity – Final Report – December 13, 2004
11. 2005 President's Cornerstone Planning Group -- "The Cornerstone Plan of Trinity College" – March 29, 2005
12. President's Cornerstone Planning Group – "The Cornerstone Plan of Trinity College"– May 6, 2005
13. 2006 - Accreditation Self-Study Committee – " Issues in Campus Community and Intellectual Engagement Studied by the Special Emphasis Self-study Committee"

14. 2006 – "Cinestudio Forum, November 15, 2006" – Documentary film – Screened at the December, 2006, meeting of the Trinity College Board of Trustees
15. 2006-2007 – Memoranda by Faculty, Students, and Staff, sent to the Climate Committee between December, 2006, and today
16. 2007 – Proposals for the Charter Committee on Campus Climate, by Jessica Lind-Diamond, Lindsay Dakan, Sarah Gardiner, Kyle Stone, Jared Hoffman, January 21, 2007

Appendix B

Statement of Community Principles

We expect every member of the College community to live by the following principles:

1. Respect and Consideration for Others
2. Honesty
3. Responsibility for Individual Actions and the Well-being of the College

Respect and Consideration for Others

Trinity welcomes thoughtful disagreement, critical evaluation, and artistic, scientific, religious, cultural or other means of expression. However we believe that these prized freedoms can co-exist with mutual respect and consideration. In the spirit of self-reflection*, you should ask yourself:

- Do I say hello to others when I pass on the Long Walk?
- Do I live my life in a way that is not disruptive to others?
- Do I avoid trying to make others feel inferior?
- Do I consider all points of view and get the facts before I make a judgment?
- Do I intervene when I hear offensive remarks?

Honesty

Honesty is a matter of being truthful with peers, colleagues, faculty, and staff in all aspects of work, study, and play. It is the foundation for trust, a quality that is essential to any meaningful relationship with another person or within the community. Moreover, honesty and integrity are a person's most valuable possessions outside of one's health.

- Do I admit to and try and learn from my mistakes?
- Do I take things that don't belong to me without the owner's permission?
- Am I careful not to represent other people's ideas as my own?
- Do I tell the truth even when to do so is not to my advantage?

Responsibility for Individual Actions and the Well-being of the College

Trinity is only as good as the best of our actions. These include the ideas we bring to the classrooms, studios, and labs; our efforts on playing fields, stages, service projects and committees; our willingness to stand up to that which we believe is wrong; and how we maintain the College's purposes and campus. We expect that each and every one of us will exercise personal responsibility and contribute to the well-being of the College.

- Do I try and make Trinity a place where all people feel valued?

- Do I come to class prepared and do I participate?
- Do I contribute my talents to the enrichment of campus life?
- Do I take action when I see something is wrong?
- Do I act in ways that I know to be fair?
- Do I look for constructive solutions to problems?
- Do I act in ways that reflect well on Trinity?
- Am I an ally when someone needs me?

*This document owes a debt of gratitude to Earlham College and our admiration for the thoughtful, interrogative manner in which they articulate their guiding principles.

Appendix C: Selected data regarding Trinity student and faculty diversity, provided by the Office of Institutional Research and Planning

Percent of Regular Undergraduate First Year Students Receiving Financial Aid at Trinity by Ethnicity and Cohort, 1992-2003

	<i>Entering Cohort</i>					
	1992-1993	1994-1995	1996-1997	1998-1999	2000-2001	2002-2003
Black	90%	89%	90%	97%	96%	94%
Black or Hispanic	82%	78%	86%	86%	90%	81%
Hispanic	71%	71%	84%	73%	86%	72%
Asian	51%	56%	57%	50%	45%	60%
White	43%	44%	37%	39%	35%	33%

Correlations between SAT and final GPA at Trinity by ethnicity

	Entering Cohorts	
	1992-5	1996-9
Black or Hispanic	-.01	.08
Black	.20*	-.02
Hispanic	-.02	.18
White or Asian	.22*	.26**
White	.21*	.28**
Asian	.26*	-.15

* Sig < .05 ** Sig. < .01

**Mean Withdrawal Rates for Cohorts 1993-1997
1998-2002 and By Ethnicity and Gender at Trinity**

Means, Cohorts 1993 to 1997				Means, Cohorts 1998 to 2002			
Ethnicity	Total	Women	Men	Ethnicity	Total	Women	Men
White	12.5%	12.3%	12.7%	White	11.9%	11.2%	12.6%
Asian	19.9%	16.7%	23.9%	Asian	10.3%	8.0%	13.4%
Hispanic	18.3%	12.0%	24.1%	Hispanic	13.8%	13.0%	14.9%
Black	23.9%	10.9%	35.5%	Black	9.5%	10.7%	8.1%

***Percent of Students of Color who report Cross-Ethnic Contacts, 2003:
Trinity and other Schools***

With someone from a different background...		Bates, Bowdoin, Colby, Conn College, Hamilton, and Vassar		
		Trinity	Other schools	
Studied	Very Often	59%	61%	58%
Ate meals	Very Often	59%	75%	67%
Socialized	Very Often	64%	75%	70%
Made close friendships	Very Often	57%	69%	63%
Roommate	Yes	86%	95%	86%

***Percent of students of color who have witnessed or experienced
racial/ethnic harassment, 2003: Trinity and Other Schools***

	Trinity	Bates, Bowdoin, Colby, Conn College, Hamilton, and Vassar	Other schools
Witnessed racial/ethnic insensitivity	72%	65%	71%
Experienced racial/ethnic insensitivity	64%	49%	50%
Witnessed racial/ethnic discrimination	62%	35%	42%
Witnessed racial/ethnic harassment	45%	27%	30%
Experienced racial/ethnic discrimination	39%	20%	23%
Experienced racial/ethnic harassment	26%	11%	13%

**Satisfaction with Community and Ethnic Climate at Trinity and Other Schools
(Percent satisfied)**

	Trinity		Peer Group Schools	
	Non-White	White	Non-White	White
Senior 2002 Survey (no neutral category)				
Sense of a community on campus	50%	61%	69%	81%
Sense of community where you live	65%	75%	77%	84%
Ethnic, racial diversity of campus	48%	49%	60%	69%
Climate for minority students on campus	52%	54%	67%	73%
2003 survey (with a neutral category)				
Sense of community on campus	16%	-	44%	-
Ethnic/racial diversity	10%	-	22%	-
Climate for minority students	14%	-	32%	-

**Satisfaction with Overall College Experience,
by Ethnicity and Comparison Group (1999 Cycles): Trinity and Other Schools**

		Very dissatisfied (1)	Dissatisfied (2)	Satisfied (3)	Very satisfied (4)	Mean
Trinity College	Non-White	5%	16%	63%	16%	2.9
	White	1%	7%	43%	49%	3.4
Comp Group	Non-White	1%	9%	44%	47%	3.4
	White	0%	4%	32%	63%	3.6

Percent of Full-time Undergraduate Student Body who are Black or Hispanic
at Trinity and Other Schools

Sorted by percent in Fall of 2004

School	Fall 2002	Fall 2003	Fall 2004
AMHERST COLLEGE	17%	18%	16%
SWARTHMORE COLLEGE	15%	16%	15%
POMONA COLLEGE	14%	14%	15%
HAMILTON COLLEGE	13%	11%	15%
WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY	15%	14%	14%
DARTMOUTH COLLEGE	13%	13%	13%
WELLESLEY COLLEGE	11%	11%	13%
UNION COLLEGE	10%	13%	12%
SMITH COLLEGE	11%	12%	12%
BARD COLLEGE	12%	11%	12%
BARNARD COLLEGE	12%	11%	12%
HAVERFORD COLLEGE	12%	10%	12%
OBERLIN COLLEGE	11%	12%	11%
BOWDOIN COLLEGE	8%	10%	11%
VASSAR COLLEGE	10%	10%	10%
TRINITY COLLEGE	11%	9%	9%
MOUNT HOLYOKE COLLEGE	9%	8%	9%
COLORADO COLLEGE	9%	9%	8%
SARAH LAWRENCE COLLEGE	10%	8%	8%
COLLEGE OF THE HOLY CROSS	8%	8%	8%
LAFAYETTE COLLEGE	7%	8%	8%
MIDDLEBURY COLLEGE	7%	8%	8%
CONNECTICUT COLLEGE	6%	8%	8%
COLGATE UNIVERSITY	7%	7%	8%
BRYN MAWR COLLEGE	6%	7%	8%
REED COLLEGE	5%	5%	7%
CLARK COLLEGE	6%	7%	6%
UNIVERSITY OF THE SOUTH	6%	6%	6%
BRANDEIS UNIVERSITY	5%	5%	5%
BUCKNELL UNIVERSITY	5%	5%	5%
FRANKLIN AND MARSHALL COLLEGE	5%	5%	5%
BATES COLLEGE	4%	4%	5%
COLBY COLLEGE	5%	5%	4%

Four Year Graduation Rates for Schools by Ethnicity

Sorted by graduation rate of Black and Hispanic cohort entering in 1998

	1996 cohort		1997 cohort		1998 cohort	
	Black and Hispanic	Not Black or Hispanic	Black and Hispanic	Not Black or Hispanic	Black and Hispanic	Not Black or Hispanic
BARNARD COLLEGE	75%	78%	69%	76%	98%	88%
SMITH COLLEGE	92%	74%	--	--	93%	83%
WELLESLEY COLLEGE	78%	89%	86%	87%	92%	91%
AMHERST COLLEGE	80%	86%	82%	90%	91%	96%
WILLIAMS COLLEGE	92%	92%	92%	92%	90%	97%
COLLEGE OF THE HOLY CROSS	79%	89%	81%	88%	90%	91%
WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY	91%	85%	76%	84%	89%	93%
MIDDLEBURY COLLEGE	71%	85%	74%	83%	88%	90%
POMONA COLLEGE	84%	84%	84%	86%	85%	91%
BRYN MAWR COLLEGE	72%	78%	70%	79%	85%	82%
SWARTHMORE COLLEGE	70%	91%	73%	85%	84%	93%
BRANDEIS UNIVERSITY	61%	81%	74%	80%	83%	89%
COLBY COLLEGE	72%	85%	76%	85%	78%	88%
HAVERFORD COLLEGE	67%	87%	81%	90%	77%	92%
VASSAR COLLEGE	78%	82%	74%	83%	77%	88%
MOUNT HOLYOKE COLLEGE	82%	76%	73%	72%	77%	79%
OBERLIN COLLEGE	55%	64%	51%	66%	77%	79%
CONNECTICUT COLLEGE	72%	79%	72%	83%	76%	86%
BOWDOIN COLLEGE	62%	85%	66%	82%	76%	90%
FRANKLIN & MARSHALL COLLEGE	67%	79%	59%	82%	76%	83%
BUCKNELL UNIVERSITY	78%	85%	74%	84%	75%	90%
TRINITY COLLEGE	66%	78%	59%	79%	75%	89%
COLGATE UNIVERSITY	73%	83%	79%	85%	72%	91%
BATES COLLEGE	71%	82%	57%	85%	72%	85%
SARAH LAWRENCE COLLEGE	69%	65%	65%	61%	71%	74%
LAFAYETTE COLLEGE	55%	81%	65%	81%	71%	87%
OCCIDENTAL COLLEGE	69%	77%	72%	73%	70%	76%
UNIVERSITY OF THE SOUTH	41%	74%	71%	79%	69%	79%
REED COLLEGE	42%	45%	43%	47%	60%	70%

Demographics of Full-time Trinity Faculty Who Were Active in a Given Academic Year (Not on Unpaid Leave)										
<i>Excludes temporary faculty hired as sabbatical and leave replacements.</i>										
	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
Fac. Ethnicity										
Asian	5	7	7	8	9	9	9	8	10	11
Black	8	9	9	9	9	8	8	7	8	9
Hispanic	7	7	12	13	12	12	14	12	13	11
Am. Indian				1	1	1	1	1	1	1
White	141	132	138	156	165	165	159	159	151	140
Total	161	15	166	187	196	195	191	187	183	172

**Percent of Full-Time Tenured or Tenure-Track Faculty
who are Black or Hispanic, 2001 and 2003: Trinity and Other Schools**

Sorted by percent of tenured in 2003

	Percent of Faculty Who are Black or Hispanic					
	Non-tenured Tenure-track Faculty			Tenured Faculty		
	2001	2003	Change	2001	2003	Change
SARAH LAWRENCE COLLEGE	16%	14%	-2%	12%	15%	2%
OCCIDENTAL COLLEGE	22%	21%	-1%	12%	13%	1%
HAVERFORD COLLEGE	13%	16%	3%	13%	12%	-1%
POMONA COLLEGE	21%	11%	-10%	10%	11%	1%
MOUNT HOLYOKE COLLEGE	16%	18%	1%	10%	10%	0%
SWARTHMORE COLLEGE	17%	13%	-3%	9%	10%	1%
COLLEGE OF THE HOLY CROSS	13%	6%	-7%	6%	10%	4%
TRINITY COLLEGE	24%	19%	-5%	7%	9%	2%
COLGATE UNIVERSITY	14%	8%	-7%	6%	9%	3%
WELLESLEY COLLEGE	8%	7%	-1%	9%	8%	-1%
COLORADO COLLEGE	12%	13%	1%	7%	8%	1%
BRYN MAWR COLLEGE	9%	10%	1%	9%	8%	-1%
OBERLIN COLLEGE	8%	13%	4%	7%	8%	1%
MIDDLEBURY COLLEGE	10%	9%	-1%	7%	8%	1%
BARD COLLEGE	21%	6%	-14%	5%	8%	2%
BATES COLLEGE	19%	18%	-1%	8%	8%	0%
SMITH COLLEGE	7%	11%	5%	6%	7%	2%
AMHERST COLLEGE	13%	10%	-2%	8%	7%	-1%
WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY	7%	8%	2%	6%	7%	1%
WILLIAMS COLLEGE	12%	11%	-1%	6%	7%	0%
BUCKNELL UNIVERSITY	3%	5%	1%	6%	6%	1%
FRANKLIN & MARSHALL COLLEGE	6%	2%	-4%	4%	6%	2%
CLARK COLLEGE	3%	3%	0%	5%	5%	0%
VASSAR COLLEGE	15%	13%	-2%	5%	5%	0%
COLBY COLLEGE	7%	9%	2%	5%	5%	0%
DARTMOUTH COLLEGE	4%	6%	2%	5%	4%	0%
CONNECTICUT COLLEGE	14%	17%	3%	4%	4%	0%
REED COLLEGE	10%	9%	0%	4%	4%	0%
WASHINGTON AND LEE UNIV	6%	0%	-6%	1%	4%	3%
BOWDOIN COLLEGE	11%	7%	-4%	3%	4%	0%
LAFAYETTE COLLEGE	5%	7%	1%	3%	3%	1%
BARNARD COLLEGE	10%	6%	-4%	3%	3%	0%
UNIVERSITY OF THE SOUTH	6%	4%	-2%	5%	2%	-3%
BRANDEIS UNIVERSITY	5%	5%	0%	2%	2%	0%
UNION COLLEGE	0%	4%	4%	0%	0%	0%

**Percent of Full-Time Executives and Managerial Staff
Black or Hispanic in 2003: Trinity and Other Schools**

Sorted by percent

SWARTHMORE COLLEGE	19.6%
BARNARD COLLEGE	18.2%
BRYN MAWR COLLEGE	12.8%
OCCIDENTAL COLLEGE	12.5%
TRINITY COLLEGE	11.8%
SARAH LAWRENCE COLLEGE	11.8%
HAVERFORD COLLEGE	11.6%
UNION COLLEGE	11.1%
COLORADO COLLEGE	11.0%
OBERLIN COLLEGE	9.3%
AMHERST COLLEGE	9.1%
SMITH COLLEGE	8.9%
POMONA COLLEGE	8.5%
WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY	8.4%
CONNECTICUT COLLEGE	8.0%
WILLIAMS COLLEGE	7.5%
BRANDEIS UNIVERSITY	7.4%
COLBY COLLEGE	6.4%
BATES COLLEGE	6.0%
WELLESLEY COLLEGE	5.9%
REED COLLEGE	5.7%
VASSAR COLLEGE	5.6%
FRANKLIN & MARSHALL COLLEGE	5.4%
DARTMOUTH COLLEGE	5.2%
LAFAYETTE COLLEGE	4.9%
MOUNT HOLYOKE COLLEGE	4.8%
COLGATE UNIVERSITY	4.2%
WASHINGTON & LEE UNIVERSITY	4.1%
CLARK COLLEGE	3.5%
BARD COLLEGE	3.1%
UNIVERSITY OF THE SOUTH	2.3%
COLLEGE OF THE HOLY CROSS	1.6%
MIDDLEBURY COLLEGE	1.5%
BUCKNELL UNIVERSITY	1.2%
BOWDOIN COLLEGE	0.9%