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Executive Summary:

The No Place for Hate taskforce and its committees have been working diligently toward achieving the recommendations from the initial report that was submitted one year ago. In addition, the committees were charged to refine and revisit ways in which the university leadership can support a more inclusive community at Ohio State University.

Per the taskforce recommendation, five sub-committees of the task force were formed:

- Committee on Curriculum
- Committee on Identity Based Harassment
- Committee on Faculty/Staff Recruitment & Retention
- Committee on Student Recruitment & Retention
- Committee on Diversity Awareness

Although a few faculty and staff were committee members, in the spirit of the original movement the committees were largely student populated and student driven. Each committee was given recommendations from the initial report to assess viability and implement when appropriate. The committees were successful. Much of the time of the steering committee was devoted to determining process and buy-in while ensuring the most pressing recommendations made it through the university processes.

Some milestone accomplishments include:

- Implementation of the preferred name mechanism in university systems.
- Rollout of collaboration with No Place for Hate Week and the Freedom Festival as diversity awareness initiatives.
- Robust proposals regarding curricular change.

The Identity Based Harassment and Recruitment and Retention committees did useful research regarding trends in higher education, best practices, and actual realities at Ohio State. Moving forward, the committees would work to create buy-in to deliver on programs and initiatives that further create welcoming and inclusive communities at Ohio State; whereby all members of that community feel safe.

Another priority as the committees and the taskforce moved forward will be to determine ways in which the work of No Place for Hate addresses recommendation findings from the diversity consultant’s report. We intend to conduct a needs assessment from the Board of Trustee’s diversity consultant report and address any gaps in what No Place for Hate already attends to and what the report calls for. However we will still maintain the integrity of the original No Place for Hate report and recommendations while also addressing the refined recommendations of this annual report.
In the upcoming year the committees will continue to convene and ideally we envision an “ongoing working group” model. To this end, we want to focus on completing more of the tasks and recommendations that have come forth and to refer and assign where necessary. Furthermore, assessment will be a greater priority and we will work toward refining and defining processes as we prepare for another academic year, and another annual report.

No Place for Hate Taskforce Committee
Committee on Curriculum

NPFH Curriculum Committee Final Report, 2012-13

Submitted by: Dr. Debra Moddelmog, Chair

Committee Members: Faculty, Staff and Students
Dr. Leslie Alexander
Marjorie Dorime-Williams
Pat Enciso
Dr. Darcy Haag Granello
Candi Krish
Trevon Logan
Antonio Philip Lytle
Nicole Nieto
Divya Raj
Dr. Maurice Stevens
Chris Woods

The NPFH Curriculum Committee believes that “diversity” is not some object or “steady-state” of experience a person or institution can somehow obtain, and this belief shapes how we define diversity and the recommendations we make for how it might manifest in curricula. Because the federal government and OSU have already identified groups that have been systematically and historically underrepresented in higher education, the tendency is often to think about diversity in terms of numbers only. Thinking about damages and restitution in these ways has made diversity a question of quotas, a question, in short, of representation and reparation. And while studies continue to show that people and social systems do benefit from consistent engagement with diverse peoples, diverse ideas, and broad experiences, the NPFH Curriculum Committee insists on thinking about diversity in additional ways as well.

The NPFH Curriculum Committee also believes that diversity is an activity, a lived performance of meaningful and experiential engagement with the edges of what we have heretofore experienced and known. Diversity is not only an ideal, not only an accounting, not only an aspect of a strategic plan, but it is also a practice. This practice involves a way of living and growing that while taking root in the differences between people that result from systems of power and oppression, flowers most fully in the commonalities that diverse people and systems come to know and cultivate with one another through direct, vulnerable, courageous, and thoughtful contact. The NPFH Curriculum Committee urges that we move from thinking only in terms of a “diversity requirement” in the curriculum, to considering how our curriculum can develop our students’ capacity to engage diversity in ways that are meaningful and transformative. We also recommend that the university provide multiple pedagogical avenues for students to become competent global citizens through extended diversity-related learning opportunities.

Our work this year has focused on developing several recommendations that might move Ohio State in the direction of offering students multiple and sustained curricular opportunities to
engage diversity in meaningful and transformative ways. We have a number of other proposals that are still in the development phase, so this will necessarily be a multi-year project involving additional consultations and collaborations with administrators, faculty, staff, and students across the university. Here are the recommendations that we forward at this time.

(1) Require and support a unique General Education U.S. Diversity Course for all students that provides them with sustained engagement with the histories, contemporary circumstances, and/or expressions (in literature, film, political writing, the media, music, visual images, etc.) of U.S. groups that have been historically marginalized and oppressed along the lines of race, class, gender, gender expression, sexual orientation, disability, ethnicity, and religious belief. We cannot assume that simply because the majority of our students live in the United States, they have developed an informed understanding of social differences and their basis in persistent inequities or arrived at thoughtful ways of engaging diversity. A reconfigured U.S. diversity requirement will be a first step in this direction. (See attached description.)

(2) Add a fifteen-hour interdisciplinary U.S. Diversity Minor as an option that students across the university can take to complement their majors, to prepare for their careers, or simply to increase their understanding of the histories, contemporary situations, and future possibilities of our diverse U.S. society, including situations where that diversity traverses our national borders through actions such as immigration, colonization, and political conflict. A discussion with Arts and Sciences should determine the specific content and structure of the minor. For example, one vehicle for developing and supporting this process might be DISCO.

(3) Work with the College of Arts and Sciences to consider restructuring the Arts and Humanities Development (PHD) into a “Fellows Program,” which will include a substantially more holistic approach to participant development. It will be comprised of five interconnected and mutually supportive components that emphasize recruitment, development, retention, and vitality. Its structure is based on the following linked notions. First, enhancing the experience of underrepresented students and faculty at Ohio State (and thereby recruiting, retaining, and reinvigorating them) requires the integration of the entire spectrum of academic experiences. Second, making Ohio State an academic destination and intellectual home for students and faculty is as much a matter of climate and culture, as it is a question of financial support. Drawing on these insights, the DISCO Fellows Program will include the following components:

1. Year-long OSU Undergraduate Fellows Component
2. OSU and Visiting Undergraduate Fellows Summer Research Component
3. Graduate Student Fellows Component
4. Post-Doctoral Fellows Component
5. Faculty Fellows Component

See attached proposal for details about each of these components, including the curricular requirements, and the goals of the entire program.
(4) Coordinate with the Diversity Awareness Committee to make sure all potential, incoming, and current students are aware of curricular diversity and educational diversity opportunities. Sources to reach out to include: advisers, tour guides, orientation leaders, first-year experience, second-year transformational experience program (STEP), RA's, curriculum and assessment committees, new faculty orientation, faculty, staff, and administrators. Among the curricular and degree programs to be promoted are the majors, graduate degrees, and/or minors in African American and African Studies, American Indian Studies, Asian American Studies, Comparative Ethnic and American Studies (in Comp Studies), Disability Studies, Diversity Studies (proposed minor; see above); Folklore Studies, Inequality and Society (in Sociology), Jewish Studies, Latino/a Studies, Multicultural and Equity Studies in Education (Ph.D.), Religious Studies, Sexuality Studies, and Women’s, Gender, and Sexuality Studies.

Information about the Committee’s Work:

1. The committee met three times (Nov. 13, December 7, and January 24). Several committee members also attended the all-hands NPFH committee meetings on Feb. 19 and April 11. And we did some work by email.

2. Committee members gathered information on diversity GEs and other diversity curricula from the following: Arts and Sciences; Social Work; Engineering; Business, Food, Agriculture and Environmental Sciences; and Medicine (which began implementing their new curriculum this past August and is still in the process of designing years three and four. They shared a powerpoint presentation which includes their learning objectives and content that we have established in the first two years with some projected content for years 3 and 4). We posted much of this information on a Carmen site that was set up for the committee.

3. We also discussed (minimally) some national literature that has been written on diversity in higher education, in particular Christine E. Sleeter, The Academic and Social Value of Ethnic Studies: A Research Review (National Education Association, 2011). Sleeter’s work was helpful in reminding us that ethnic studies programs attract diverse students even if these students don’t pursue those programs and that students from privileged backgrounds may often need more than a single course on diversity to “get it.”

4. Three of us (Leslie Alexander, Maurice Stevens, and I) met on March 25 with the Advisory Committee of DISCO, along with representatives from the Folklore Center and the Women’s Place. Representatives from the Melton Center, the Center for the Study of Religion, the Multicultural Center, ODI, and the Kirwan Institute were also invited but unable to attend. At this meeting, we discussed the revised GE U.S. Diversity requirement, the proposed Diversity Minor and Major, and the DISCO Fellows Program.

5. We collaborated with Annabelle Estera, a Graduate Administrative Associate, who organized a “School Days” Freedom Dialogue on April 4 in the Multicultural Center that was attended by approximately 50-60 students and moderated by two of our committee members, Pat Enciso and Nicole Nieto. I was one of the “small group” facilitators. Students were asked about how much
diversity they had/have in both their K-12 and OSU curricula and what they would like to see more of. Annabelle shared her notes from the event with us.

6. I have consulted with Steve Fink, Associate Executive Dean of Curriculum of Arts and Sciences about the GE U.S. Diversity Requirement. As of April 30, he is checking on some procedural matters with Randy Smith and Alexis Collier, and after that, we will meet to discuss the feasibility of advancing the proposal to revise the U.S. diversity GE.
Committee on Identity Based Harassment

NPFH Identity Based Harassment Committee Final Report, 2012-13

Submitted by: Bryan Ashton, Chair

Committee Members: Graduate and Undergraduate Students and Staff

1. Sami Ali
2. Bryan Ashton
3. Katherine Betts
4. Pat Hall
5. Shirley Lin
7. Dawn Miles
8. Derrick Mitchell-El
9. Andrew Philip
10. Sarah Scisson
11. Derrick Tillman-Kelly

Refined and New Recommendations

As we increasingly look into the committee charge of assessing policies related to identity based harassment on Ohio State’s campus, we find it ever more important to raise awareness of reporting options for these incidents for the following reasons:

- Based upon of the current data, we do not feel that we have adequate information regarding the number of incidents occurring at Ohio State.

- Due to many of these incidents being based around actions involving speech, we have looked increasingly at education as an option to ensure that first amendment rights are protected.

- We will look to Bias Assessment and Response Team (BART) to receive these reports, and act on them with educational programs and disciplinary actions when appropriate.

Additional recommendations include:

- Inclusion of the results of BART reporting (as an aggregate) in the Annual Safety Report to increase awareness of reporting of incidents.

- Launch a BART awareness campaign to increase reporting.
-Provide stock language for syllabi around incidents of bias and opportunities for reporting.

-Formalize the faculty and staff bias reporting.

-Develop a comprehensive set of guidelines for BART incidents and the mechanisms of referral.

-Increase resources allocated to InterGroup Dialogue (IGD) Course to expand service to the Second-Year Transformational Experience Program (STEP).

-Explore the idea of centralization of faculty, staff and student reporting for an incident of bias.

Any completed/achieved recommendations:

Create a Public Safety Hate Crime Alert

This recommendation is in the final stages of implementation and should be completed during summer 2013 as public safety examines the alerts during that time.

Make sure each alert message references the Bias Assessment and Response Team (BART) as an additional resource and includes a link to its website

-This recommendation is the final stages of implementation and should be completed during summer 2013 as public safety examines the alerts during that time. In the meantime, links have been added to the Public Safety website in numerous key areas to attract visitors drawn from the current Safety Crime Alerts.

Support the second year InterGroup Dialogue as a course requirement for the second year/sophomore transformational experience initiative

We will be looking at a phased implementation of the InterGroup Dialogue into the STEP. Please refer to Appendix C for the most recent plan developed for implementation.

Investigate the opportunity for OSU students to select a preferred name, to be incorporated in the OSU student systems.

The implementation of this recommendation is underway. There have been a few delays due to the computer systems, but expect full access by the Autumn 2013 term.

New Report

Please find the MCC report on IGD’s and our recommendations for Public Safety attached.

Challenges or obstacles regarding committee work.

The largest challenge that our subcommittee has seen is ensuring that we maintain compliance with the first amendment in any recommendation that we have regarding identity based harassment as it deals with incidents of bias related to speech. As we continue to move forward,
this will be at the forefront of our group’s discussion and will continue to influence our desire for enhanced education requirements and collaboration with all other No Place For Hate Subcommittees.

Committee on Faculty/Staff & Recruitment Retention
Overview

The primary goal of the No Place for Hate Task Force Subcommittee on Faculty and Staff Hiring and Retention was to develop proposals that would increase the number of faculty and staff from diverse backgrounds at The Ohio State University.

The subcommittee concluded that creating a more diverse university required implementing the following four-part action plan. The plan involves 1) accurately assessing where the university currently stands in terms of diversity among faculty and staff; 2) developing and implementing strategic recruitment and hiring plans at the hiring unit/department level; 3) developing and implementing policies and programs at the college level to promote success among faculty and staff from diverse backgrounds; and 4) making concerted efforts to retain faculty and staff from diverse backgrounds when outside job offers/opportunities arise. The reasoning behind this approach is discussed below, as are the subcommittee’s short and long-term recommendations.

Part 1: Assessing faculty and staff diversity at Ohio State

Diversity among faculty and staff across the university is uneven. Some colleges and departments are models of diversity, while others lack it completely. Developing an effective plan for increasing diversity at the university starts with identifying those units that are diversity rich (units with an established track record of diversity among faculty and staff), diversity growing (units that are clearly moving in the direction of greater diversity among faculty and staff), and diversity poor (units that continue to lack diversity especially in the critical areas of race, ethnicity, and gender). Diversity rich units offer models for how to increase and sustain diversity at the university. They need to be acknowledged and rewarded for their forward thinking and positive action. Diversity growing units need to be encouraged to continue in the direction of greater diversity and provided resources to assist in the transition. Diversity poor
units have to be challenged to think anew about diversity within their ranks and should be required to develop and implement immediate diversity plans.

**Recommendation:** Within the next academic year (AY 2013-2014), the university should conduct a thorough statistical analysis of diversity across the university that identifies all current faculty and staff from diverse backgrounds, the units in which they are housed, the number of years they have been employed at the university and, for faculty, their rank. The analysis should also include data on faculty and staff from diverse backgrounds who left the university over the last 10 years, contacting such persons, whenever possible and necessary, to identify the reasons for their departure. This data will serve as a baseline for the university, providing empirical evidence pertaining to the degree of diversity in all units across the university, and enabling the identification of diversity rich, diversity growing, and diversity poor units.

**Part 2: Strategic recruitment and hiring plans at the hiring unit/department level**

Increasing the number of faculty and staff from diverse backgrounds will not occur by accident. It will only result from purposeful action. A number of hiring units across the university have developed diversity plans over the years. The development and implementation of diversity plans by all hiring units is an absolute necessity for increasing diversity at the university. It is the blueprint for success

**Recommendation:** All hiring units must update and/or develop strategic plans for increasing the diversity of their faculty and staff during AY 2013-2014. These plans are to include self-assessments of each unit’s diversity strengths and weaknesses; clear goals for increasing the unit’s diversity over the next 3, 7, and 10 years; clear plans for recruiting faculty and staff from diverse backgrounds; and an explanation of how the diversity impact of every potential hire will be assessed.

**Part 3: Policies and programs at the college level to promote success among faculty and staff from diverse backgrounds**

It is not enough to simply hire faculty and staff from diverse backgrounds. It is essential that the university create pathways for them to succeed once they have been hired. Colleges must take the lead here. They are better resourced than academic departments and smaller hiring units and their organizational structure creates opportunities for faculty from diverse backgrounds in different hiring units to engage with one another. Colleges have to develop policies that incentivize and reward retention and promotion of faculty from diverse backgrounds. They must also create programs that provide faculty from diverse backgrounds with the teaching and research resources, professional mentorship, and opportunities for interdisciplinary exchange and
collaboration that they need to thrive at Ohio State. In recent years, several colleges, including the former College of Humanities, have created such programs, and they have proven successful.

Recommendation: Within the next academic year (AY 2013-2014), each college should create, re-establish, strengthen, or expand professional support programs for faculty (and staff when appropriate) from diverse backgrounds. For those colleges currently without such programs, new ones should be up and running by the start of the following year (AY 2014-2015). Colleges should commit to supporting these programs for a minimum of seven years, or the length of a tenure and promotion cycle. Colleges should also actively promote policies that reward departments and hiring units that meet diversity hiring and retention goals outlined in their strategic diversity plans and penalize those that consistently fall short.

Part 4: Retaining faculty and staff from diverse backgrounds

Ohio State has the highest quality faculty and staff, including faculty and staff from diverse backgrounds. Therefore, it is in the best interest of the university to retain them. Doing so requires promoting a culture of inclusiveness (as opposed to a culture of hostility or indifference for people from different backgrounds). It also requires effective communication and aggressive action when diverse faculty and staff are being courted by other institutions. It makes little sense to invest the time, energy, and resources into recruiting, hiring, and developing diverse faculty and staff only to let them walk away because of a failure to communicate or act aggressively on the university’s desire to retain them.

Recommendation: Within the next academic year (AY 2013-2014), a memo detailing how to properly and effectively handle retention cases involving faculty from diverse backgrounds should be drafted and distributed to all heads of hiring units. The memo should include best practices for communicating effectively with faculty and staff who are considering leaving.
Committee on Student Recruitment & Retention

NPFH Student Recruitment & Retention Committee Final Report, 2012-13

Submitted by: Justin McGee, Chair Faculty, Staff and Professional Students

Committee Members:

1. Sharrell Hassell-Goodman
2. Shannon Gonzales-Miller
3. Dr. D’Andra Mull
4. Lauren Mungin

Our Approach

- Gather demographic data comparing student population proportions at OSU and with greater Ohio/national proportions; also, compare with other similar universities
- Collect data from Admissions Office about current diverse student recruitment efforts for both in-state and out-of-state students, their yield rates
  - Also find application rates, if available
  - Also gather information about reasons underrepresented/diverse students turn down admission when they receive it
- Request data from Office of Student Life about retention of student populations
- Find a ‘master-list’ of diversity-related scholarships at OSU, including all colleges, offices, etc.
- Create a contact list for the regional campuses’ comparable offices (Student Life, Admissions, ODI, etc.) and gather similar data as above to compare with Columbus campus
- Research ‘Best Practices’ of comparable universities’ student recruitment efforts
- Observe the Fisher v. U. Texas decision and determine impact on student recruitment
- Meet with legal department with other committees (when scheduled)

Challenges:

The Committee Chair set the scope of action too widely and lacked focus in the beginning. It is recommended going forward to complete phases by specific deadlines and not to move onto the next phase until the prior is complete.

Moving Forward:

- Phase I
  - Set deadlines for gathering the necessary data, specifically regarding current OSU recruitment methods and effectiveness
o Compile qualitative data regarding reasons students from various populations decided not to attend OSU after gaining admission (for Columbus and smaller Campuses)

o Gather data for the reasons students of various populations were not retained after first, second, third year (for Columbus and smaller campuses)

- Phase II
  o Research ‘Best Practices’ of comparable universities’ student recruitment efforts
  o Observe the Fisher v. U. Texas decision and determine impact on student recruitment

- Phase III
  o Depending on patterns uncovered during the data gathering, generate suggested alterations for the university
    ▪ Increased recruitment effort around Ohio/out of state targeting specific populations
    ▪ Support other committees in increasing openness of campus climate
    ▪ Adjust marketing towards specific student populations
    ▪ Obtain access master list of diversity-related scholarships
Committee on Diversity Awareness

NPFH Diversity Awareness Committee Final Report, 2012-13

Submitted by: Habiba Kamagate, Chair – Staff, Graduate and Undergraduate Students

Committee Members:

1. Matt Couch
2. Dr. Davida Haywood
3. Allen Cochran
4. Deb Kuzawa
5. Carmen Flores-Carrion
6. Sean Hicks
7. Kelly Chen
8. Maaeeshah Pupspits
9. Jade Holmes
10. Indra Leyva-Santiago
11. Angie Wellman
12. Gisell Jeter
13. Tai Cornute
14. Brittany Woodley
15. Sharayna Oree
16. Suparna Reddy

Focus of the Committee on Diversity Awareness

- Campaign of publicity and awareness
- Outreach/ Training/ Consulting with Student Organizations

Tasks of the Committee on Diversity Awareness

- Create a universal OSU Helpline, with dispatchers trained in university referrals (i.e. health, safety, wellness, hate crimes, escort services, etc.)
- Create an opportunity for all students to “opt – in” to diversity email listservs (e.g. MCC, Hale Black Cultural Center, Kirwan Institute, etc.) Place a reminder in Buckeyelink To-Do-List to alert students of the opportunity to join such listservs.
- Require participation in the Office of Student Life Multicultural Center’s Open Doors Pilot program for student staff workers (e.g. University Ambassadors, Orientation Leaders, Student Life Resident Assistants, Union Student Staff, Office of Diversity and Inclusion Student Staff workers, etc.)
• Develop a university accepted and supported definition of diversity, as well as broadly distribute the university mission statement and include a definition of diversity.
• Include all segments of university community concerning general messaging about diversity and inclusion.
• Ensure that diversity and inclusion is a priority by making it a part of all institutional “branding” efforts.
• Design new and revise existing institutional homepages to include prominent “links” directly to diversity and inclusion initiatives, statements and offices.
• Promote a system of accountability for all student organizations regarding diversity programming.

Joint Committee Tasks

• Committee on Diversity Awareness & Committee on Student Recruitment and Retention
  o Establish new and expand existing outreach programs connected with rural and urban high schools that historically sent few students to Ohio State.
• All Five Committees
  o Create Opportunities for students, faculty and staff to engage in OSU’s history (positive and negative aspects), signaling to campus community that issues of race, racism and the institution’s historical legacy are acknowledged and understood.

Diversity Awareness Committee Meetings

On November 27, 2012, at 6pm the Diversity Awareness Committee met in the Multicultural Center. Four people were in attendance for the first meeting: Habiba Kamagate, Angie Wellman, Suparna Reddy, and Sean Hicks.

This committee has since struggled to meet consistently due to conflicting schedules, but regular meetings will resume in June 2013, to map out a plan of execution for the Autumn 2013 and Spring 2014.

Diversity Awareness Progress

The focus of the Diversity Awareness Committee: Campaign of publicity and awareness, as well as, Outreach/ Training/ Consulting with Student Organizations were met through collaboration and partnerships with student organizations and campus departments through events and campaigns such as “No Place for Hate Week” and “Freedom Festival Week”.

The Diversity Awareness Committee in collaboration with the newly formed student organization, The Network, successfully hosted “No Place for Hate Week”, which took place during spring semester, April 1st – 5th, 2013.
The Network is a student organization at the Ohio State University that focuses on building relationships among various clubs and organizations on campus in an effort to increase student involvement in the Buckeye community that is beneficial to society. They focus mainly on connecting student organizations through philanthropy, diversity, awareness, and education initiatives.

**Other Diversity Awareness Committee Partnerships & Collaborations:**

In addition to the collaboration with No Place for Hate Week, the Diversity Awareness Committee also partnered with the Student Life Multicultural Centers Annual Signature Event “Freedom Festival”, which also took place spring semester April 1 - 6, 2013.

Freedom Festival celebrates and commemorates Ohio State's relationship with journeys of freedom both historical and contemporary. Freedom Festival celebrates freedoms that all individuals, groups and communities can identify with while highlighting the mission and core values of the Multicultural Center, *Diversity, Transformative Education, Building Community, Collaboration, Innovation, Social Justice, Empowerment, and Tradition.*

With inspiration from this year's theme "The Evolution", the Multicultural Center focused on raising awareness about the evolution and cultural shift of the term "Freedom" and how it is viewed among today's generation. The event creatively journeyed back in time and revisited the challenges of the past, how they may have evolved, how generations of the past fought and raised their voices in relation to how this generation chooses to address relevant social issues.

Through the exciting line up of events for Freedom Festival 2013, students were able to leave with a renewed sense of purpose and an introspective look at themselves as well as renew a stronger sense of leadership within all OSU students.

**Diversity Awareness Committee Goals for Summer 2013:**

- Several Diversity Awareness Committee student members have since graduated, and the plan moving forward is to invite more staff and student voices to the committee moving forward.
- Create an opportunity for all students to “opt – in” to diversity email listservs (e.g. MCC, Hale Black Cultural Center, Kirwan Institute, etc.) Place a reminder in Buckeyelink To-Do-List to alert students of the opportunity to join such listservs.
- Require participation in the Office of Student Life Multicultural Center’s Open Doors Pilot program for student staff workers (e.g. University Ambassadors, Orientation Leaders, Student Life Resident Assistants, Union Student Staff, Office of Diversity and Inclusion Student Staff workers, etc.)
- Develop a university accepted and supported definition of diversity, as well as broadly distribute the university mission statement and include a definition of diversity.
• Promote a system of accountability for all student organizations regarding diversity programming.

**Diversity Awareness Committee Goals for Autumn 2013:**

• Include all segments of university community concerning general messaging about diversity and inclusion.
• Ensure that diversity and inclusion is a priority by making it a part of all institutional “branding” efforts.
• Design new and revise existing institutional homepages to include prominent “links” directly to diversity and inclusion initiatives, statements and offices.
• Create a universal OSU Helpline, with dispatchers trained in university referrals (i.e. health, safety, wellness, hate crimes, escort services, etc.)
Taskforce Steering Committee

NPFH Taskforce Steering Committee Final Report, 2012-13

Submitted by: Terah TJ Stewart, Administrator

The Taskforce Steering Committee was charged with maintaining consistent and productive meetings with the committee chairs and committee members. The sub-committee chairs were a large focus of our time and energy. Their support was of the utmost importance to our process and to achieving all of the aforementioned tasks, research, and data collection.

In addition we were constantly trying to determine ways to ensure longevity with the task force, its committees and initiatives. We identified three ways to support this goal.

1. No Place for Hate Website – We received overwhelming feedback (formally and informally) that students wanted the university to be transparent in activities regarding the work of the No Place for Hate taskforce. Furthermore, students expressed concern that the work of the taskforce should be in the spirit of the original report and recommendations. After some conversations and focus groups we realized that this perception existed because we had no meaningful way to share the information or what the task force was working on. Thus a website was created that would be a central place for updates to be given. This will hopefully alleviate concern from students and community members. The URL has been approved (nohate.osu.edu); we are currently working on creating content and graphics and are planning for an AU 2013 rollout.

2. No Place for Hate GAA – There were several staffing changes that created a need to reevaluate how work was distributed and maintained. It was agreed that Graduate Administrative support would be crucial to future success of the task force and its initiatives. We have created a GAA position and it will be piloted for one academic year. This GAA (preferably a MA or Doctoral student) will assist with the day-to-day needs of the task force, coordinate meetings, and work on select report recommendations. The GAA role will still report to a full-time staff member who will serve as an administrator to ensure goals are being met and that initiatives are moving in the right direction. This GAA will start August and will work through May 2014.

3. National Conference Representation – Very early on a priority was set to share with our university colleagues on how Ohio State has responded since the vandalism of the Frank W. Hale Black Cultural Center. In addition a need for information was identified so that we could ensure we were at the forefront of best practices around university response to bias. Thus we presented at two national conferences about Ohio State and how we responded in hope of facilitating an information exchange with our peers. The presentation was titled: “Long Live Zimmerman: Structural and Strategic University Bias Response.” We presented at two conferences, the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) annual conference in Orlando, Florida and American College Personnel Association (ACPA) annual conference in Las Vegas, California. Both
presentations were extremely successful and we were able to collect and share valuable information to the process of the task force and its future endeavors.

NEXT STEPS:

There are proposals that have been developed by the various committees that will be forwarded to the appropriate colleges and departments for feedback, review and further development. The NPFH Taskforce Steering Committee will continue to work through the 2013-2014 academic year.