

Research Policies Committee

Minutes of March 19, 2021

Circulated: April 29, 2021

Approved: April 29, 2021

Present: Natalie Colabianchi, Maddy Paxson, Irene St Charles, Vania Hinkovska-Galcheva, Allen Liu, Zenon Sommers, Teri Rosales, Jay Vornhagen, Marisa Conte, Nicholas Harris, Vitaliy Popov, Elizabeth Devlin

Absent: Hafiz Malik, Robert Ploutz-Synder, Mimi Dalaly

Guests: Elyse Aurbach, Public Engagement Lead; Rachel Niemer, Director, Outreach and Access

11:33 Chair Colabianchi called the meeting to order.

A motion was made to approve the minutes from the February 19, 2021 meeting, the motion was so moved and seconded. There being no further discussion the minutes were approved by committee.

- I. Public Engagement and Impact: Elyse Aurbach, Public Engagement Lead, Center for Academic Innovation; Rachel Niemer, Director Outreach and Access, Center for Academic Innovation
 - a. In 2017 President Schlissel announced a new strategic focus area of faculty led public engagement.
 - b. Named four units as core partners for this focus area, Center for Academic Innovation, Office of the Vice President for Research, Office of the Vice President of Communications, and Office of the Vice President for Government Relations.
 - c. There are 170 programs on campus dedicated to advancing public engagement.
 - i. A database with public engagement resources was shared: <https://ai.umich.edu/pe-faculty-fellowship/guide-to-campus-pe-resources/>
 - d. Development of a common understanding of what public engagement refers to, to be more thoughtful and strategic, to help advance a clearer sense of common language, to help advance capacity building initiatives, and ensuring that people are connected with the correct resources at the right time.
 - e. Public Engagement Challenges, these challenges have been exacerbated by the COVID 19 pandemic.
 - i. Faculty members have had opportunities for capacity building to learn to be just and equitable partners and the impact of the training and lack of training on the power dynamics on community engaged relationship.
 - ii. Intuitional/policy related barriers to be able to be an equitable and mutually beneficial partner, especially in community engaged context.
 - iii. The need for larger community building.
 - f. The Public Engagement Faculty Fellowship is one approach to addressing some of the challenges that have been presented.
 - i. <https://ai.umich.edu/pe-faculty-fellowship/>
 - ii. Intended to advance recognition for public engagement in a meaningful way, capacity building to help support ethical and effective engagement work regardless of discipline and domain, and to build interdisciplinary and intergenerational community across the university.
 - iii. Engaged Michigan principles and values: <https://engaged.umich.edu/about/principles-and-values/>



- g. Committee members requested documentation of the process.
 - i. A report from the conceptualizing public engagement series that focuses on findings versus processes is available, guests offered to consult on the process to committee members who would like to further that discussion.
 - ii. A link to the report was shared:
https://drive.google.com/file/d/1wOjvm1CEzmRSLl5E9NjoiKDD8lKr_00w/view?usp=sharing
- h. Committee members requested resources for faculty members interested in specific domains.
 - i. The link to the resource database was provided that will allow faculty members to search by type of public engagement to find units that are supporting public engagement in that domain.
<https://ai.umich.edu/pe-faculty-fellowship/guide-to-campus-pe-resources/>
- i. Committee members were interested in educational outreach particularly for K-12 and who they could connect with to express their interest in participating in these engagement opportunities.
 - i. Wolverine Express out of the Center for Educational outreach is a way for faculty to connect with schools in southeast Michigan and they are creating a virtual version.
<http://ceo.umich.edu/we/>
- j. Committee members asked if there are incentives for faculty members to engage more in public engagement.
 - i. There are discussions surrounding incentives for faculty members and is a long-term recommendation.
 - ii. The committee recommended perhaps that the Faculty Fellowship program is where the incentive can come from and requested some history and scale of the program.
 - iii. Public Engagement Faculty Fellowship emerged from the report from the Conceptualizing Public Engagement series. It's a brand-new program that is in its second year.
 - 1. Program size is 15-18 people per year.
 - 2. Current structure are two levels of participation as a fellow role and one as a mentor and fellow role. The distinction being the level of experience that they have in engagement work and their goals.
 - 3. The program is designed to help faculty participate in engagement work, so they have connections beyond their departments and interdisciplinary boundaries and help make sure that they have support in exploring the large amount of campus resources that already exist.
- k. Committee requested plans for incorporating other Ph.D. trained faculty/staff and post docs into these outreach opportunities.
 - i. There are university sponsored supports, especially for late-stage trainees, that are not faculty but there is a lot of room to grow.
 - ii. One large program that Rackham sponsors is called The Program in Public Scholarship that has some learning and grant opportunities and internships/externships available.
 - iii. Faculty in the Faculty Engagement program are encouraged to have their trainees participate/contribute to their engagement work.
 - iv. They will be partnering with the National Center for Intentional Diversity to think about a set of workshops open to the entire campus that will cover some of the content in the faculty fellowship specifically geared towards anti-racist scholarship.
- II. DEI plans across academic and research units, progress, and next steps in reviewing documents.
 - i. Committee member Teri Rosales shared a thematic analysis of the year four research related action items.
 - ii. Actions to date
 - iii. DEI terms & aim



- iv. Rationale for DEI
- v. DEI plans: 6 vital strategies
- vi. DEI domains support innovative & inclusive scholarship and teaching. Noting that Research is missing from the domain on supporting innovative and inclusive scholarship and teaching
- vii. UMOR plan
- viii. Sharing a thematic analysis of the year four research related action items.
 1. First set of recommendations DEI-informed research development including more explicit about research, community of practice, UMOR is increasingly partnering with other U-M units to cultivate DEI-informed research, creating a hub for research, and continuous learning, and looking at the entire research pipeline and looking at tenure and non-tenure track faculty research positions.
 2. There was a total of over 2,000 action items across the fifty unit DEI plans, about 4% pertained to research development or research activity.
 - a. Support and or promotion of DEI Research.
 - b. Research for evaluation and internal or internal unit analysis.
 - c. Actions to address the research pipeline and fortify the research pipeline.
 - d. Enhance communication of DEI related research.
 - e. Tracking DEI related research.
 - f. Success of research faculty.
 3. Recommendations:
 - a. Continue the RPC charge three into the next committee year. This next year the university's five-year DEI effort will be ending and there will be a full year of evaluation which is a great opportunity for the RPC to continue the work and shadow the evaluation year.
 - b. Plan a series of DEI informed studies for research faculty including post-docs, professional research staff, and the entire research pipeline. The work to be done in distinguishing DEI in research.

Committee Next Steps: Chair Colabianchi would like to review and discuss the DEI findings at the April committee meeting.

12:31 Meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted by,

Elizabeth Devlin
Faculty Senate Office