

**Task Force on Diversity
Report to the Karnea
August 2016**

Chairman: Jaison D. Desai, Theta Epsilon, 2006
Bryan Adams, Gamma Nu 2007
Tanner Floyd, Lambda, 2017
Ivy Gonzales, Epsilon Phi, 2016
John Laputz, Gamma Eta, 2011
Rian Mehta, Iota Xi, 2013
Derek Olive, Epsilon Xi, 1991
Timmy Paul, Iota Omega, 2016
Justin Williamson, Epsilon Phi, 2015
Doug Russell, Epsilon Xi, 2010

This report summarizes the work of the Delta Tau Delta National Task Force on Diversity. This organization was formed in October 2015 with the mandate to assess where the fraternity stands regarding its diversity and what the fraternity needs to do in order to diversify its membership. The Task Force of 10 brothers represented a variety of backgrounds and experiences and sought to maintain total objectivity through data analysis in its approach. Initially, the Task Force determined that the term “diversity” can be applied to a wide variety of traits besides the classic identifiers of race, religion, and sexual orientation. Using this broader definition, the Task Force designed and disseminated a survey to all undergraduate members of Delta Tau Delta in April 2016, which had a response rate of approximately 11%.

Overall, the Task Force believes that Delta Tau Delta should consider itself a diverse organization that is accepting of men from all backgrounds who choose to live by the Delt Values. Survey respondents overwhelmingly felt that their chapters are welcoming to men who exhibit diverse qualities. Yet the organization can benefit from continued education, outreach, and engagement to improve perceptions about the fraternity, encourage individuals from diverse backgrounds to join the fraternity, and enhance brothers’ understanding of the benefits of diversity in membership.

Observation #1: When asked how comfortable they would be in accepting a brother of a different race, religion, or sexual orientation, or one with a disability or who is transgender, the comfortability of the respondent to accept someone who was different than them was higher than their belief that their chapter would accept someone of the same category.

Observation #2: Respondents were surprisingly less comfortable at the thought of accepting a brother with a physical, mental or learning disability than someone of a different sexual orientation, race, or religion. Interestingly, 6.7% of respondents indicated they had a physical, mental, or learning disability, which is well above the national average for men attending a 4-year college full-time.

Observation #3: Over 15% of respondents said they believed their chapter had a culture that accepted certain kinds of discrimination as the norm. Over 15% of respondents said members of

their chapter make negative jokes or statements about people from other races and 15% said members of their chapter make negative jokes or statements about people with other sexual orientations.

Observation #4: Respondents strongly agreed that their chapter would support them if they stood up against discrimination and that their chapter welcomes individuals from diverse backgrounds through the recruitment process. Yet respondents also believed that their chapter could do more to increase its diversity.

Observation #5: A surprisingly large number of respondents - 9.8% - said they choose not to consume alcohol. A similarly surprising number of respondents - 5.8% - said they choose to practice celibacy. Considering the widely-held stereotypes of fraternities, it is important to highlight the magnitude of these responses.

Based on the discussions of the Task Force and the findings of the survey, the members recommend several actions that can be taken to assist the fraternity with achieving greater diversity. At the Chapter level, men should actively seek out ways to appeal to diverse groups across their campus and community. Nationally, the fraternity should add a FAAR category for Diversity Programming, highlight stories of diversity throughout the fraternity through video and print products, and consider how it would like to continue gathering survey data. The Arch Chapter should formally adopt language that clarifies the responsibility of members in preventing discrimination during the recruitment of new members and engagement with all members of the fraternal, campus, and global communities.

Mission & Guidance

On 10 October 2015, International President Jody Danneman appointed a National Task Force on Diversity to, “examine the Fraternity’s current environment in the realm of diversity and to provide vision to the Arch Chapter and Central Office staff on how we will attract men of character to Delta Tau Delta in the coming years.” This was motivated by the Arch Chapter’s acknowledgement of the changing demographics of college campuses, along with a desire to assess the nature of diversity within the fraternity and take proactive measures to ensure its growth over the next decades.

President Danneman specifically asked that the committee take two actions – first, conduct a “lay of the land” examination of where the fraternity currently stands regarding its diversity; second, assess what the fraternity needs to do in order to diversify its membership and remain “open, accepting, and inviting”. Additionally, the committee reviewed the action of the Arch Chapter in changing its nondiscrimination clause at the January 2016 Arch Chapter meeting.

This Task Force was designed as a temporary body, formed with a mandate through the August 2016 Karnea for the specific purpose of undertaking the objectives directed above and any additional measures necessary to achieve those objectives. As part of the mandate, this Task Force was requested to provide a report to the 2016 Karnea on findings and recommendations based on its work. This document is the fulfilment of that requirement.

The Task Force was initially comprised of 13 appointed members. The final official membership was 10 brothers, as two appointed members did not participate in any fashion and one appointed member requested to be relieved of his commitment shortly after the committee began. The brothers responsible for the outputs of this Task Force are annotated on the cover page of this report.

Definition of Diversity

Prior to commencing work on assessing the nature of diversity within the fraternity, the Task Force deemed it essential to define what “diversity” actually consisted of. Due to the passing of the adjusted Arch Chapter nondiscrimination clause in the January 2016 meeting, the Task Force initially reviewed and considered this clause:

Delta Tau Delta International Fraternity does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, ethnicity, sexual orientation, or gender identity. Delta Tau Delta is open to all men of superior character including transgender males.

Although not a part of the *Constitution and Bylaws*, this action by the Arch Chapter created a great deal of feedback, both positive and negative, from members of the fraternity. Specifically, the inclusion of the term “transgender males” in the new definition factored heavily into the discussion within the Task Force. Overall, members of the Task Force were encouraged by the progressive approach being taken by the Arch Chapter with acknowledging transgender individuals, yet were concerned by the practicality of enforcing such a statement. Specifically,

- How is a chapter supposed to differentiate a “transgender male”? Though the Central Office response appears to be that this is the gender as reflected on the driver’s license of the individual, this approach is fraught with issues. We find it difficult to believe that chapters will ask to see driver’s licenses as verification and they certainly will not ask for everyone’s drivers licenses, thus singling out those who are transgender.
- This definition is only an Arch Chapter policy, not a policy resident in the fraternity’s overall framework. Thus, without consideration at the Karnea, this wording is not enforceable at the chapter level. This has the potential to create further confusion amongst chapters and members regarding those who are eligible and desirable for membership within the fraternity.

Recommendation: The Arch Chapter and Central Office Legal Officer should thoroughly review the wording pertaining to inclusion of transgender individuals seeking membership within the fraternity. Guidance should be published to all chapters regarding how best to handle the following instances: 1) A transgender individual desires to join the undergraduate chapter; 2) A brother who is already a member has a female gender identity and seeks to transition. As necessary, pertinent legislation should be brought before the Karnea for discussion.

The other major discussion topic regarding the Arch Chapter’s diversity definition highlighted the lack of inclusion of disability as a qualifying factor. Members of the Task Force felt that there will be many more instances of individuals with physical, mental, or learning disabilities

seeking membership than transgender individuals. Additionally, disabilities are routinely highlighted in legislation and discrimination clauses relating to inclusiveness in organizations.

- It is highly likely that individuals with physical, mental, and/or learning disabilities will seek membership in Delta Tau Delta. If definitions are going to specifically highlight categories of individuals that the fraternity does not discriminate against, it is appropriate to include those who have some form of disability in the protected groups.

Recommendation: The Arch Chapter should add the term “disability” to the nondiscrimination clause passed in the January 2016 meeting. The Task Force does not feel that adding the qualifiers “physical” or “mental” is required, but leaves that discussion to the members of the Arch Chapter.

Following review and discussion of the Arch Chapter’s definition, the Task Force discussed what should be included when discussing the term “diversity” in the fraternal context. Generally, the Task Force concluded that the term “diversity” can be applied to a variety of different traits – both physical traits and personal belief systems – that are embodied by members of the fraternity. To restrict the concept of diversity to only include the standard contexts of, for example, race, religion, creed, culture, sexual orientation, etc., runs the risk of neglecting to consider other ways that brothers improve the variety of the organization. Some additional examples of what the Task Force considers to be areas of potential diversity within Delta Tau Delta are:

- Age – brothers are from a range of age groups, both while enrolled as an undergraduate and while remaining active as alumni
- Nonstandard Learning Timeline – many individuals take time off between high school and college, to include those who serve in nonprofits, obtain work experience, travel, or serve in the military
- Major Area of Study – diversity within different colleges and programs of study across the university enhances the ability of the chapter to achieve an interdisciplinary membership
- Political Beliefs – representing a spectrum of ideas and beliefs and learning to respect differing opinions
- Personal Belief Systems – examples of which include those who are vegetarian, celibate, or who willingly choose not to consume alcohol
- Socioeconomic Status – ensuring that the fraternal world is not reserved for only those who come from a wealthy or privileged background
- First Generation Greeks – recruiting members who have no familial ties to the Greek world and opening up a new generation to the benefits of membership in a fraternity

After acknowledging this broader definition of diversity, the Task Force agreed that its work to assess and make recommendations to the fraternity regarding diversity must include this wider concept. Limiting the assessment to simply include the core segments of race, color, creed, sexual orientation, etc. would severely limit the understanding of how diverse of an organization Delta Tau Delta truly is.

- In many ways, the Task Force assessment of the term “diversity” and what it represents to the fraternity are in keeping with the inclusive style of Article IV of the *Constitution* of the

Fraternity, which states, “Eligibility for membership in the Fraternity shall be limited to men of superior character and shall not be affected or determined in any manner by inappropriate or illegal discrimination.”

- Aside from the above statement, discrimination is not mentioned in the *Constitution, Bylaws, or MRGs*. This presents chapters with a nebulous situation in which the primary guidance consists of the Delt Values and the one statement above preventing “inappropriate or illegal discrimination” but not defining said term. Considering the variety of member backgrounds and the presence of chapters across all parts of the country, such broad language and the ability for individuals to interpret it as they see fit will likely create significant differences in its perception depending on the individual and the chapter.

Recommendation: The Arch Chapter should formally adopt language that clarifies the responsibility of members in preventing discrimination during the recruitment of new members and engagement with all members of the fraternal, campus, and global communities. This statement should become an official part of the operational documents of the fraternity so as to serve as a reference for all chapters. The Arch Chapter should not attempt to direct how chapters must operate but should clearly explain that the fraternity is an inclusive organization and that acts designed to prevent membership based solely off discriminatory practices will not be tolerated. One recommendation is to craft a document similar to the “Policy on Alcohol and Substance Abuse” that is an addendum to the MRGs.

Survey Instrument Overview

In order to achieve its goals, the Task Force required demographic data regarding “diversity” within the fraternity at a national level. Unfortunately, this data is not collected by the Central Office in any fashion, thus creating an information void. To achieve the data required, the members of the Task Force determined that a survey instrument was an optimal way to gain data on both demographics and sentiment from various groups of interest. Initially, the Task Force considered producing three different surveys to achieve specific effects:

1. Ask Chapter VPs/Secretaries to fill out basic demographics based on our diversity definition (Organizational View)
2. Ask undergraduate men to fill out a poll on their own demographics and perceptions (Individual View)
3. Ask Greek Life directors to fill out a poll on their views of Delta Tau Delta vs. other Greek organizations (Institutional View)

Initial discussions quickly led the Task Force to reject the Greek Life survey as a viable option. Members felt that response rates would likely be very low and that the data gained from such a survey would not be useful. Members also questioned the objectivity of the Greek Life officers as their involvement and perceptions vary amongst campuses depending on their responsibilities. This perspective would still provide unique data, should the Arch Chapter desire to obtain such

viewpoints, yet future efforts should involve direct contact with Greek Life directors personally asking for specific, limited feedback.

In discussing the other two surveys, the Task Force determined that the chapter-level poll completed by the executives would be onerous in addition to an individual-level poll and could also put officers in a precarious position of guessing whether brothers fit into certain demographic categories or not. While this could have allowed for comparisons between how the executive officers felt about the status of the chapter as compared to how individuals viewed the chapter, such a micro-viewpoint is outside the scope of this initial Task Force effort. Additionally, such a survey instrument is likely better achieved through discussion with the chapter advisor during officer transitions or as an ungraded addendum to be submitted annually with the FAAR.

The Task Force settled on crafting and conducting a single survey instrument to be disseminated to all undergraduate members of the fraternity asking for anonymous individual responses. After soliciting input on the questions from members of the Task Force, the resulting survey had four major sections:

- Basic Identification Demographics

Respondents were asked to identify their division and chapter (with a reminder that data was private), academic standing, age, ethnicity, gender, and sexual orientation

- Chapter & Personal Sentiments

Respondents were asked a series of questions on a 5-point sentiment scale from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree” responses. The first block contained questions where the ideal answer was “agree” from a diversity acceptance stance; questions were focused at the chapter level and sought to determine if the individual felt his chapter was a diverse organization. The second block contained questions where the ideal answer was “disagree” from a diversity acceptance stance; questions were focused at the chapter level and sought to determine if the individual felt his chapter was accepting of all men regardless of differences. The third and fourth block contained questions that sought to determine if the individual would be accepting of brothers who differed from them and if the individual thought his chapter would be accepting of brothers who differed from the majority.

- Personal Traits / Values

Respondents were asked to identify traits and values they hold that may enhance the diversity of the organization, as reflected by the expanded definition of “diversity” that the Task Force utilized. Questions included birthplace, citizenship, language, socioeconomic status, Greek familial legacy, college major, military service, political views, religious practices, and disability. Respondents were also provided with a free-answer block to highlight any other traits or belief systems not highlighted in the survey that they felt added to the diversity of their chapter.

- Summary Opinions

Respondents were encouraged to provide free-answer responses regarding the best way that Delta Tau Delta could ensure it is inclusive of all men of good will and thoughts regarding Delta Tau Delta's approach to matters of diversity.

After finalizing the content and a legal review by Central Office, the survey was disseminated to all undergraduates on April 4, 2016 via the SurveyMonkey platform. The survey officially closed at the end of April and results were provided to the Task Force on May 3, 2016.

- A total of 1,068 respondents replied to the survey, for a rate of approximately 10.7%
- Approximately 1,055 respondents (98.8%) provided answers to the first section on basic identification demographics
- Approximately 926 respondents (86.7%) provided answers to the second section on chapter & personal sentiments
- Approximately 895 respondents (83.8%) provided answers to the third section on personal traits & values
- A total of 566 respondents (53.0%) provided some entry in the free-answer response regarding the best way Delta Tau Delta can ensure it is inclusive of all men of good will
- A total of 320 respondents (30.0%) provided some entry in the free-answer response regarding thoughts on Delta Tau Delta's approach to matters of diversity

Highlights of Survey Findings

Overall, the Task Force believes that Delta Tau Delta should consider itself a diverse organization that is accepting of men from all backgrounds who choose to live by the Delt Values. Respondents overwhelmingly agreed that their chapters are welcoming to men who exhibit diverse qualities. Yet the organization can benefit from continued education, outreach, and engagement to improve perceptions about the fraternity, encourage individuals from diverse backgrounds to join the fraternity, and enhance brothers' understanding of the benefits of diversity in membership.

The response rate of the survey was comparable to other surveys the fraternity has asked undergraduates to complete. Further, the number of respondents that can be categorized as antagonistic or unhelpful (providing inappropriate or unrealistic answers to questions) was quite low, resulting in an overwhelming number of respondents who truly cared about making the survey a successful tool.

The complete results will be submitted as an appendix to this report for review by the Arch Chapter. However, these results should not be disseminated in raw form beyond the Arch Chapter and Central Office as anonymity in responses was assured to those who participated. Below, the Task Force selected several results from the survey intended to highlight the key takeaways.

Basic Identification Demographics

Responses by Division

Based off of approximate numbers provided by the Central Office, the fraternity composition by division is roughly: 27% Northern, 22% Western Plains, 22% Southern, 18% Eastern, 11% Western Pacific. Among those who identified which division they belonged to (discounting those who stated they did not know), the respondent proportions were: 31% Northern, 13% Western Plains, 19% Southern, 27% Eastern, 12% Western Pacific. Thus, the Eastern division was significantly overrepresented in the survey while the Western Plains division was significantly underrepresented in the survey.

In what year of University-level schooling did you join Delta Tau Delta?

This question was designed to determine whether Delta Tau Delta achieves recruitment primarily from within the freshman class or if upper-level recruits serve as a significant source of new members. There was no differentiation made between schools that allow first-semester undergraduates to rush and those that restrict rush eligibility.

- Not surprisingly, the vast majority of respondents (74%) said they joined in their first year of college
- Over 19% of respondents stated they joined in their second year and nearly 7% said they joined in the third year or later

What is your ethnicity?

This question was designed to determine whether Delta Tau Delta is representative of different racial backgrounds and to compare them to national statistics. A common preconception of the fraternal world is that it is dominated by Caucasian men.

- Not surprisingly, the respondents primarily identified as Caucasian (80.2%)
- Hispanic, Latin American (6.5%) was the second largest demographic of respondents
- Asian (including India) (5.8%) was third largest among respondents
- Other (4.42%) was fourth largest – the majority of write-in responses said they considered themselves multi-ethnic or representing multiple categories
- African descent (e.g. African-American) (3.1%) was the smallest demographic among respondents

As a basis for comparison, demographics from the US Census Bureau website are presented below. Data are from the October 2014 Current Population Survey and reflect the subset of men enrolled in 4-year colleges on a full-time basis, as this is the eligible population for membership in the fraternity.

	US Census CPS: Men enrolled full-time in 4- year college (n = 4,351,000)	Delta Tau Delta Diversity Survey Respondents Who Answered Question (n = 1,040)
White alone, non-Hispanic (Caucasian)	63.6%	80.2%
Hispanic	14.2%	6.5%
Black alone	11.7%	3.1%
Asian alone	9.6%	5.8%

Table 1. Racial Demographics compared to all full-time men in 4-year colleges¹

Clearly, the makeup of respondents suggests that the fraternity is likely higher than the national average in members who are white and underrepresented in minorities. However, the inclusion of the ability to select “other” as an option in the survey means that the minority percentages are likely higher than reflected if respondents had been forced to select only of the four CPS categories. Regardless, it is extremely notable that the fraternity appears to be lagging primarily in brothers of Black/African-American background. The presence and popularity of African-American Greek organizations is also a likely contributing factor.

Another consideration is that Delta Tau Delta chapters may simply reflect the majority demographics of their universities. Thus, a chapter such as Delta Beta at Carnegie Mellon University (45% White, 29% Asian) will naturally attract more minority students than, for example, Gamma Nu at the University of Maine (84% White).² Such detailed analysis is not possible without full data from all undergraduates. Yet it is possible to assess the current locations of chapters against universities known to have diverse student bodies. Utilizing the US News and World Report College Ranking Lists Diversity Index and cross-referencing with the current locations of chapters and colonies of Delta Tau Delta produces the following observations:³

- Delta Tau Delta has chapters at only 6 of the top 24 national universities (25%) rated highest on the US News and World Report Diversity Index (we exclude Texas Women’s University)
- Delta Tau Delta has chapters/colonies at only 8 of the second 25 national universities (32%) rated highest on the US News and World Report Diversity Index

¹ “Table 5. Type of College and Year Enrolled for College Students 15 Years and Over, by Age, Sex, Race, Control of School, Attendance Status, and Enrollment Status: October 2014.” Current Population Survey, October 2014. *United States Census Bureau*. Retrieved from <https://www.census.gov/hhes/school/data/cps/2014/tables.html>.

² Data from search on www.collegedata.com

³ “Campus Ethnic Diversity, National Universities.” Best College Rankings and Lists. *US News and World Report*. Retrieved from <http://colleges.usnews.rankingsandreviews.com/best-colleges/rankings/national-universities/campus-ethnic-diversity>

- Thus, Delta Tau Delta has chapters/colonies at only 14 of the top 49 national universities (29%) on the diversity index

While some of these universities likely are not candidates for expansion or do not have Greek Life programs, there are numerous universities on this list that could be targeted for future chapters. Of the 35 universities currently without chapters, only 3 have inactive chapters. Of the 14 universities with a Delt presence, only 1 (Emory) is a colony.

Recommendation: The Arch Chapter and Central Office should consider the diversity ranking of institutions and actively investigate expansion opportunities to those universities that have high levels of diversity. Expansion to institutions that have a larger diversity rating among the student body should theoretically result in chapters that are more diverse in their composition. (See Appendix C)

What gender do you associate with?

This question was designed to identify if there are individuals currently within the fraternity who associate with a gender other than male or who are questioning their gender. Considering the Arch Chapter's adoption of language regarding transgender individuals and the fact that many individuals have expressed divisive views, this response is important to highlight.

- 2 respondents stated that they identified as Female. After reviewing the full response sheet of both individuals, there is no reason to believe these are erroneous entries.
- 9 respondents stated that they identified as Other/Unsure. After further review, it is clear that 7 of the 9 responses were inappropriate and thus cannot be recognized under this category.

While the discussion of transgender individuals or those members who may question their gender or seek to transition to the female gender applies to very limited number of cases, it must be recognized that there are currently members of this fraternity who associate with a gender other than male. Thus, action and discussion regarding this issue is warranted at the national level to ensure acceptance and clear understanding of policies amongst all chapters.

I consider myself to be (identify sexual orientation)

This question was designed to elicit responses regarding the sexual orientation of respondents, who had the option to select Straight/Heterosexual, Gay/Homosexual, Bisexual, Asexual, or Other. The wording was specifically inclusive of the multiple terms for the major categories in recognition that different members may associate negativity with use of a certain label as opposed to another label.

- Respondents primarily identified as Straight/Heterosexual (91.6%)
- 4.9% of respondents identified as Gay/Homosexual
- 2.6% of respondents identified as Bisexual
- 0.5% of respondents identified as Asexual
- Of the 5 respondents who selected Other, review of the report and explanation showed that 4 of these respondents provided inappropriate responses

It is important to provide some context of these data to national statistics. Though it was not possible to locate statistics on sexual orientation for the subset of males in college, the broader population subset shows that Delta Tau Delta appears to be well-diversified in this regard.

	NHIS 2013 (n = 34,557) [men subset]	Delta Tau Delta Survey Respondents who Answered (n = 1,043)
Straight / Heterosexual	97.8%	91.6%
Gay / Homosexual	1.8%	4.9%
Bisexual	0.4%	2.6%

Table 2. Sexual Orientation demographics compared to all men⁴

Chapter & Personal Sentiments

In this section, respondents were presented with a series of statements in response blocks. They were then asked their sentiments from the scale of Strongly Agree (+2), Agree (+1), Neutral (0), Disagree (-1), or Strongly Disagree (-2). The overall response is thus an average of all scores across all respondents (for example, an overall sentiment of 1.5 would be somewhere between Agree and Strongly Agree).

Block 1: Diversity of Chapter – ideal response is “Strongly Agree”

This section of questions was designed to determine how strongly the respondent felt his chapter was positioned regarding diversity and supporting individuals who may be considered to be from diverse backgrounds.

- Overall, respondents showed strong agreement that their chapter accepts those from diverse backgrounds and would support them in standing up to discrimination
- Over 92.5% of respondents stated that they believed their chapter would support them if they stood up against discriminatory action, the highest positive response rate of any question in this section
- Over 35% of respondents were either neutral or disagreed when asked if their chapter participated in events that celebrated diversity

Recommendation: Chapters should actively seek out opportunities to participate in events across campus and the local community that celebrate diversity. This will enhance the image of the fraternity, educate brothers to other cultures and perspectives, and introduce the fraternity to potential new members from diverse backgrounds who may not have considered joining a fraternity.

⁴ Ward, B., et. al. “Sexual Orientation and Health Among US Adults: National Health Interview Survey, 2013.” *National Health Statistics Reports*. July 15, 2014. Retrieved from <http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nhsr/nhsr077.pdf>

Recommendation: The FAAR should add a graded category under Miscellaneous Operations for Diversity Programming. This response should be open-ended to allow the chapter to describe how they are accomplishing the goal of participating in events that celebrate diversity. Examples could include co-hosting an event with a minority or LGBT organization, original programming highlighting the contributions of the chapter to support inclusiveness on campus, outreach to underrepresented groups, etc.

Block 2: Acceptance of Chapter – ideal response is “Strongly Disagree”

This section of questions was designed to determine how strongly the respondent felt his chapter accepts others who may be from diverse backgrounds and specifically sought to elicit whether members engaged in behavior that may be perceived as antagonistic.

- Overall, respondents disagreed with statements that chapter members engaged in discriminatory behavior; the responses were not as strong as compared to the responses presented in Block 1 above
- 81.5% of respondents were neutral or agreed with the statement that their chapter could do more to increase its diversity, which is the opposite expected direction of sentiment; this suggests that while members feel their chapter is accepting of diversity it can still do more to increase it
- Over 85% of respondents disagreed with the statement that their chapter had rejected someone from receiving a bid because they were “different” from the majority, the strongest response in this section
- **Over 15% of respondents said they believed their chapter had a culture that accepted certain kinds of discrimination as the norm**
- Over 15% of respondents said members of the chapter make negative statements or jokes about people from other races
- Over 15% of respondents said members of the chapter make negative statements or jokes about people different sexual orientations
- Over 6% of respondents said members of the chapter make negative statements or jokes about people with physical or mental disabilities

These numbers are unnerving. Yet attempting to find a solution to fix bias and the use of derogatory and discriminatory language among undergraduate brothers is a monumental task, far beyond the scope of this Task Force.

Block 3 & 4: Acceptance of Individuals Who Are Different – ideal response is “Very Comfortable”

These two sections of questions were designed to determine how comfortable the respondent would be having a brother in the chapter from a different race, religion, or sexual orientation from them, one who is transgender, or one who has a physical, mental, or learning disability. The second section asked the responded to rate how comfortable they believed their chapter would be in recruiting members of those different categories.

- Respondents were overwhelmingly comfortable with the idea of a brother of a different race or religious belief. They were still highly comfortable with accepting a brother of a different sexual orientation or one with a disability, but less enthusiastically than from the first two categories
- Over 23% of respondents said they would not be comfortable accepting a brother who is transgender, with another 24% remaining neutral on the topic; overall respondents were weakly comfortable
- Similar to the individual section, respondents overwhelmingly believed their chapter would be comfortable accepting a brother from a different race or religious belief and a bit less enthusiastic about accepting one with a different sexual orientation or one with a disability.
- Over 27% of respondents believed their chapter would be uncomfortable accepting a transgender brother, with another 28% remaining neutral on the topic

While the results regarding transgender individuals are hardly surprising, the comparatively low comfortability with individuals who have disabilities vice those of a different sexual orientation was unexpected.

Perhaps the key takeaway is that, overall, respondents' own willingness to accept those of a different race, religion, sexual orientation, disability or who were transgender was higher than their belief that their chapter would accept someone of the same category.

Additional Analysis: Responses by Division

The results of this analysis are presented in Appendix D to this report.

Personal Traits / Values

The questions in this section were designed to highlight a large array of characteristics that could be considered as adding to a chapter's "diversity" and asked the respondents to self-identify into these categories. Highlighted below are some of the more interesting results from this section:

Language

- Over 6% of respondents indicated that English was not their first language
- Over 26% of respondents indicated they were multi-lingual

Economics

- 69% of respondents said they came from a suburban upbringing, with 19% rural and 12% urban
- Over 53% of respondents said they considered their upbringing to be from Upper Middle Income or High Income status
- Over 50% of respondents reported they hold a job while in school; this is higher than the 39% national average of men who attend a 4-year college full time⁵

⁵ "Table 5. Type of College and Year Enrolled for College Students 15 Years and Over, by Age, Sex, Race, Control of School, Attendance Status, and Enrollment Status: October 2014."

First Generation Greeks

- Over 96% of respondents said their father was not a member of Delta Tau Delta
- Over 80% of respondents said their father was not a member of any fraternity
- Over 82% of respondents said their mother was not a member of any sorority

Military Service

- Only 1.6% of respondents reported military service or being in an ROTC program; while this is around the national average, the Task Force expected this number to be higher

Political Views

- Political views were fairly evenly split, with 33% on the Conservative end, 32% Moderate, 27% on the Liberal end and 8% unsure or not political

Religious Views

- 66.1% of respondents reported they were Christian or Catholic, 13.5% said they were Agnostic, 9.0% said they were Atheist, and 4.5% reported they were Jewish. Compared to the national religious landscape, Delta Tau Delta appears to be well diversified in non-Christian faiths and those who are Agnostic or Atheist.⁶
- Over 44% of respondents stated they were either non-practicing or did not follow a religious faith; only 20% indicated they were mostly or very devout

Personal Belief Systems

- **5.8% of respondents stated they practice celibacy**
- **9.6% of respondents stated they choose not to consume alcohol**
- 2.0% of respondents stated they were vegetarians or vegans
- Respondents were given the opportunity to highlight other qualities they believed added to the diversity of their chapter, examples of which included:
 - First generation college student
 - Immigrant parents
 - Environmentalist
 - Type 1 Diabetic
 - Athlete
 - Survivor of an illness or disease
 - Experience with travel, volunteering, or living in various places

Disability

Current Population Survey, October 2014. *United States Census Bureau*. Retrieved from <https://www.census.gov/hhes/school/data/cps/2014/tables.html>.

⁶ 2014 Religious Landscape Study. *Pew Research Center*. Retrieved from <http://www.pewforum.org/religious-landscape-study/>

- 6.8% of respondents reported they had a physical, mental, or learning disability. This is significantly higher than the 2.6% national average of all men attending 4-year colleges full-time.⁷

Summary Opinions

What is the best way for Delta Tau Delta to ensure it is inclusive of all men of good will?

This question was designed to elicit suggestions regarding the second mandate of the committee – how to diversify membership and remain “open, accepting, and inviting.” Open-ended responses were requested in the form of a comment box.

566 of 1068 respondents (53%) provided some comment

- 231 of 556 comments (42%) stressed developing and maintaining Standards of conduct and acceptance amongst brothers, staying true to our values, and being open to all
 - “Stressing acceptance and equality in all mankind”
 - “To look for men of good character of all races, religions and creeds; not by filling “diversity quotas”.”
 - “The traditions of Delta Tau Delta speak for themselves. Good will is not bound by certain ethnic or religious groups; however, on campus, a certain type of background is most likely to try rush. It is important to highlight the values of Delt and Greek Life before rush so they can see the benefits.”
- 227 of 556 comments (41%) stressed Recruitment practices in seeking out those who are diverse or making sure recruitment is unbiased
 - “Focus on the character of the man and that only. What abilities and gifts does he bring to the chapter. That should be what decides who gets a bid and who does not.”
 - “Bidding must be based on personality only”
 - “Active support of recruitment on all college campuses and strong lobbying of college administrations to keep recruitment period open, inclusive, and regulated.”
 - “We should try to reach out to people we are not used to hanging out with and get them to join our fraternity.”
- 67 of 566 comments (12%) stressed Outreach and Education efforts to help promote the ideas of diversity
 - “we need to have a wide variety of events that foster open-mindedness, through learning more about other lifestyles unlike our own.”
 - “Sharing results of surveys such as this, having programming at each yearly Division conference, increasing general awareness, etc.”
 - “Have a more diverse selection of speakers at Karnea, Division Conferences, etc. to represent the under-represented minorities that feel marginalized by Greek Life”

⁷ “Table 5. Type of College and Year Enrolled for College Students 15 Years and Over, by Age, Sex, Race, Control of School, Attendance Status, and Enrollment Status: October 2014.” Current Population Survey, October 2014. *United States Census Bureau*. Retrieved from <https://www.census.gov/hhes/school/data/cps/2014/tables.html>.

Recommendations for Actions

Chapter Operations:

- Chapters should actively seek out opportunities to participate in events across campus and the local community that celebrate diversity. This will enhance the image of the fraternity, educate brothers to other cultures and perspectives, and introduce the fraternity to potential new members from diverse backgrounds who may not have considered joining a fraternity.
- Chapters should assess their recruitment operations and determine ways in which they can better appeal to all members of the campus community who share the Delt Values.

National Initiatives:

- The FAAR should add a graded category under Miscellaneous Operations for Diversity Programming. This response should be open-ended to allow the chapter to describe how they are accomplishing the goal of participating in events that celebrate diversity. Examples could include co-hosting an event with a minority or LGBT organization, original programming highlighting the contributions of the chapter to support inclusiveness on campus, outreach to underrepresented groups, etc.
- Stories of Diversity. This can be conducted in a similar fashion as the My Delt Story initiative, which seeks to gain testimonials of brothers' experiences. The Central Office should seek out and highlight members of the fraternity and how they embody a culture of diversity, create video and written testimonials, and then utilize these in recruitment and educational material. Instead of generic products that may insinuate the organization is diverse, these should directly announce the openness of Delta Tau Delta to people of all backgrounds. Such testimonials could include a homosexual brother sharing his story of support from his brothers, a brother with a mental disability describing how his chapter welcomed him to the family, a brother from a minority group who never thought of joining a fraternity until he found Delt, etc.
- Surveys. The Central Office should discuss the benefits and drawbacks of providing similar surveys to the one presented here at various times in the fraternal life of brothers. If continual demographic data is desired, then a survey during the New Member Education process may be appropriate to obtain such baseline information. An exit survey near the time of graduation would also provide important data and could assist in identifying growth and trends, though the response rate for such a survey would likely be low. Revising and redistributing the survey developed here every 4 years is also another option to provide rolling assessments without being overly cumbersome.

Arch Chapter Operations:

- The Arch Chapter and Central Office Legal Officer should thoroughly review the wording pertaining to inclusion of transgender individuals seeking membership within the fraternity. Guidance should be published to all chapters regarding how best to handle the following

instances: 1) A transgender individual desires to join the undergraduate chapter; 2) A brother who is already a member has a female gender identity and seeks to transition. As necessary, pertinent legislation should be brought before the Karnea for discussion.

- The Arch Chapter should add the term “disability” to the nondiscrimination clause passed in the January 2016 meeting. The Task Force does not feel that adding the qualifiers “physical” or “mental” is required, but leaves that discussion to the members of the Arch Chapter.
- The Arch Chapter should formally adopt language that clarifies the responsibility of members in preventing discrimination during the recruitment of new members and engagement with all members of the fraternal, campus, and global communities. This statement should become an official part of the operational documents of the fraternity so as to serve as a reference for all chapters. The Arch Chapter should not attempt to direct how chapters must operate but should clearly explain that the fraternity is an inclusive organization and that acts designed to prevent membership based solely off discriminatory practices will not be tolerated. One recommendation is to craft a document similar to the “Policy on Alcohol and Substance Abuse” that is an addendum to the MRGs.
- The Arch Chapter and Central Office should consider the diversity ranking of institutions and actively investigate expansion opportunities to those universities that have high levels of diversity. Expansion to institutions that have a larger diversity rating among the student body should theoretically result in chapters that are more diverse in their composition.

Task Force on Diversity:

- At this time, the members of the Task Force feel there is no need to continue as a formal body beyond the intended dissolution at the 2016 Karnea. These results should be analyzed by the Arch Chapter and any questions or requests for clarification can be addressed to the Chairman. While this level of detailed investigation may be appropriate at regular intervals (for example, every 4-6 years), the recommendations presented here can be managed by appropriate individuals at the Central Office.

Appendix A Diversity Task Force Survey Summary Results

This Appendix is provided as a separate attachment and displays the summary report of the survey from the SurveyMonkey website.

This Appendix is recommended for general release to members of the fraternity.

Appendix B Diversity Task Force Survey Individual Results

This Appendix is provided as a separate attachment and displays the individual answers of all respondents from the survey.

This Appendix is **NOT RECOMMENDED** for general release to members of the fraternity and should be disseminated only to approved members of the Arch Chapter and Central Office. This document should be properly secured at all times.

Appendix C Campus Ethnic Diversity Rankings of National Universities

The rankings were compiled through the US News and World Report Campus Ethnic Diversity Index. The methodology of the rankings can be located on the reference website. Members of the Delta Tau Delta National Task Force on Diversity acknowledge this is only one particular metric and does not necessarily reflect the broader definition of “diversity” outside of racial demographics.

It is important to recognize that the list below is not segmented in any way with regards to Greek Life potential or accessibility. It is merely as starting point for Arch Chapter review and consideration.

Rank	Diversity Index	Name of Institution	Delta Tau Delta Presence
1	0.76	Rutgers – Newark	
2	0.74	Andrews University	
3	0.74	St. John’s University	
4	0.74	University of Houston	
5	0.74	University of Nevada-Las Vegas	
6	0.73	Stanford University	Beta Rho
7	0.73	University of San Francisco	
8	0.72	University of California – Los Angeles	Delta Iota
9	0.72	University of Hawaii – Manoa	
10	0.71	Nova Southeastern University	
11	0.71	Texas Woman’s University	
12	0.71	University of California – Santa Cruz	
13	0.71	University of Illinois – Chicago	
14	0.71	University of Texas – Arlington	
15	0.71	University of the Pacific	
16	0.70	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	Beta Nu
17	0.70	New Jersey Institute of Technology	
18	0.70	University of California – Davis	<i>Theta Sigma – Inactive</i>
19	0.70	University of California – Santa Barbara	Delta Psi
20	0.70	University of Texas – Dallas	Iota Omega
21	0.69	Barry University	
22	0.69	Georgia State University	
23	0.69	Rice University	

24	0.69	San Diego State University	
25	0.69	University of California – Riverside	Theta Lambda
26	0.68	University of California – Berkeley	<i>Beta Omega – Inactive</i>
27	0.68	University of Southern California	Delta Pi
28	0.67	Florida Atlantic University	Iota Nu
29	0.67	Rutgers – New Brunswick	
30	0.67	University of California – Irvine	
31	0.66	George Mason University	
32	0.66	Harvard University	
33	0.66	SUNY – Stony Brook	
34	0.66	University of Maryland – Baltimore County	
35	0.66	University of Massachusetts – Boston	
36	0.66	University of Texas – Austin	Gamma Iota
37	0.65	Azusa Pacific University	
38	0.65	California Institute of Technology	
39	0.65	Carnegie Mellon University	Delta Beta
40	0.65	Emory University	Beta Epsilon CC
41	0.65	Illinois Institute of Technology	Gamma Beta
42	0.65	Johns Hopkins University	
43	0.65	Pepperdine University	Iota Rho
44	0.65	Princeton University	
45	0.65	University of California – San Diego	<i>Theta Beta – Inactive</i>
46	0.65	Yale University	
47	0.64	New York University	
48	0.64	University of New Mexico	
49	0.64	University of North Texas	
50	0.64	University of Pennsylvania	Omega

Reference: “Campus Ethnic Diversity, National Universities.” Best College Rankings and Lists. *US News and World Report*. Retrieved from <http://colleges.usnews.rankingsandreviews.com/best-colleges/rankings/national-universities/campus-ethnic-diversity>

Appendix D Chapter & Personal Sentiments Analysis by Division

This appendix is intended for Arch Chapter use only, as the rankings can be easily misconstrued by readers of this report who do not fully intend the analytical construct. Additionally, these results were not tested for statistical significance in differences, but are simply averages of all respondents who also identified their division in the survey. Readers are also reminded that the difference between “Agree” and “Strongly Agree” is relative to the respondent; thus focus should be placed on outliers rather than small differences.

Block 1 Sentiments by Division (<i>higher number is preferable</i>)						
2 = "Strongly Agree", 1 = "Agree", 0 = "Neutral", -1 = "Disagree, -2 = "Strongly Disagree"						
	Overall	Eastern	Northern	Southern	Western Pacific	Western Plains
My chapter is regarded by the brothers as a diverse organization	1.08	1.06	1.14	1.02	1.13	1.01
My chapter is diverse compared to other Greek organizations on campus	1.02	1.00	1.14	1.13	1.12	0.75
My chapter welcomes individuals from diverse backgrounds through the recruitment process	1.55	1.61	1.65	1.38	1.45	1.53
My chapter encourages individuals of diverse backgrounds to take leadership positions	1.39	1.45	1.42	1.30	1.34	1.42
My chapter encourages brothers to openly share their diverse characteristics with each other	1.34	1.36	1.43	1.28	1.22	1.30
I have met people from different backgrounds because of my membership in Delta Tau Delta	1.47	1.51	1.56	1.35	1.43	1.41
I believe that my chapter would support me if I stood up against discriminatory action	1.56	1.62	1.63	1.44	1.46	1.51
My chapter participates in events that celebrate diversity	0.82	0.82	0.85	0.76	0.79	0.79

- Overall, responses across divisions were fairly homogenous. As indicated, the Northern division respondents tended to express the most confidence in their chapters' ability to encourage diversity, while the Southern division respondents were less confident.
- The Western Plains division had a much lower rating than the other divisions when asked about diversity of their chapter compared to other Greek organizations on campus

Block 2 Sentiments by Division (<i>lower number is preferable</i>)						
2 = "Strongly Agree", 1 = "Agree", 0 = "Neutral", -1 = "Disagree, -2 = "Strongly Disagree"						
	Overall	Eastern	Northern	Southern	Western Pacific	Western Plains
My chapter could do more to increase its diversity	0.31	0.23	0.44	0.23	0.31	0.36
I am uncomfortable sharing my personal traits and values with the members of my chapter	-1.04	-1.03	-1.11	-0.97	-1.05	-1.07
I believe my chapter has a culture that accepts certain kinds of discrimination as the norm, i.e., preconceived notions against people different in some way from the majority.	-0.78	-0.93	-0.74	-0.68	-0.80	-0.77
Members of my chapter make negative statements or jokes about people from other races	-0.79	-0.87	-0.82	-0.74	-0.69	-0.73
Members of my chapter make negative statements or jokes about people of different sexual orientations	-0.82	-0.93	-0.80	-0.74	-0.89	-0.72
Members of my chapter make negative statements or jokes about people with physical or mental disabilities	-1.26	-1.25	-1.29	-1.25	-1.19	-1.33
My chapter has rejected someone from receiving a bid because they are "different" from the majority	-1.37	-1.48	-1.48	-1.14	-1.23	-1.36

- Again, the responses tended to be relatively homogenous across divisions. In this section, the Eastern division respondents tended to express the most confidence that brothers did not engage in discriminatory or bigoted practices, while the lowest confidence division varied.
- The Southern Division respondents had the lowest desirable response across the divisions when asked about the chapter supporting a culture of discrimination as the norm
- The Southern Division respondents had the lowest desirable response across the divisions when asked whether their chapter had rejected someone from receiving a bid because they were "different"

Block 3 Sentiments by Division (<i>higher number is preferable</i>)						
2 = "Strongly Agree", 1 = "Agree", 0 = "Neutral", -1 = "Disagree, -2 = "Strongly Disagree"						
	Overall	Eastern	Northern	Southern	Western Pacific	Western Plains
How comfortable would YOU feel having a brother in your chapter of a different?						
Race	1.84	1.86	1.88	1.74	1.86	1.81
Religious Belief	1.80	1.83	1.85	1.72	1.83	1.74
Sexual Orientation	1.41	1.61	1.54	1.16	1.60	0.99
Who identifies as transgender	0.51	0.68	0.66	0.24	0.85	0.07
Who has a physical, mental, or learning disability	1.37	1.36	1.49	1.33	1.33	1.23

Block 4 Sentiments by Division (<i>higher number is preferable</i>)						
2 = "Strongly Agree", 1 = "Agree", 0 = "Neutral", -1 = "Disagree", -2 = "Strongly Disagree"						
	Overall	Eastern	Northern	Southern	Western Pacific	Western Plains
How comfortable do you believe YOUR CHAPTER would be in recruiting members of a different?						
Race	1.74	1.78	1.79	1.63	1.72	1.70
Religious Belief	1.73	1.77	1.78	1.60	1.75	1.65
Sexual Orientation	1.22	1.47	1.33	0.83	1.45	0.83
Who identifies as transgender	0.30	0.48	0.35	-0.05	0.56	-0.01
Who has a physical, mental, or learning disability	1.05	1.12	1.10	1.01	0.99	0.90

- Overall, respondents stated more confidence in their personal willingness to accept a brother of a different background than their confidence in their chapter’s willingness to accept a brother of a different background.
- Responses tended to be quite homogenous when it came to accepting a brother with a different race or religious belief, with all towards the high end of the scale.
- Comfortability with those of a different sexual orientation varied widely, with the Southern and Western Plains division respondents indicating a position between Neutral and Agree, with the other divisions expressing strong Agree positions. The Southern division has a notably high drop between the comfortability of individuals and their belief in whether the chapter will be comfortable.
- There is a large drop in the belief that the chapter will accept those with a disability. Across all divisions, respondents tended toward a more tepid agreement than with other categories.
- Comfortability with transgender individuals varied widely among division respondents. While all expressed slightly positive comfortability individually, the Southern and Western Plains division respondents actually expressed neutral-discomfort that their chapters would be willing to accept transgender brothers. The Western Pacific division expressed higher support than any other division.

Summary:

The Division Presidents and Arch Chapter should use these responses as a general “temperature gauge” to assess where their members may stand as compared to other divisions. While many of the results are hardly surprising, perhaps the biggest takeaway is the relative homogeneity across divisions. The responses do not show major differences in the numbers, except in the few cases noted. Additionally, aggregation to this level is not necessarily representative of the true sentiment within the division. These were obviously limited to only those brothers who responded and many individuals likely were not inclined to support this survey for a variety of reasons. Division Presidents are encouraged to keep these sentiments in mind when making site visits during the year and to more carefully review the responses of their division from the detailed data in Appendix B.