

To: SACUA

From: Nicolai Lehnert, Chair, Committee for Fairness, Equity, and Inclusion

Subject: Report on Activities of the Committee for Fairness, Equity, and Inclusion for AY 22-23

Members: Nicolai Lehnert (Chair), Mark Allison, Michael Atzman, Daniel Burns, Yi-Su Chen, Loyd Mbabu, Nilton Rennó, Bénédicte Veillet, Rahul Jain (Graduate Student), Chelsea Oh (Undergraduate Student)

SACUA Liaison: Tom Braun, Simon Cushing

Meeting Dates: 10/11/22; 11/8/22; 12/13/22; 1/17/23; 2/2/23; 3/6/23; 4/17/23

Committee Charge

SPECIFIC CHARGE 2022-2023

1. Developing metrics for inclusion and campus climate: in order to improve campus climate, we need to identify data-driven ways to quantify and measure it. That will allow us to track campus climate and assess our successes and misses going forward, and to take countermeasures. This work was started before 2022 and needs to continue. In the previous year, the committee asked the office of Equity, Civil Rights, and Title IX Office (ECRT) for similar reporting for title VII (civil rights) as it does with title IX protections. There is reporting for title IX but not discrimination.

2. Developing tangible goals to improve representation and campus climate for DEI 2.0: it is important for the university to set hard targets as part of DEI 2.0, which is a part that was left out in the first DEI plan. The fact that no tangible goals were set in the first DEI plan left many wondering how serious we really are when it comes to improving diversity, inclusion and campus climate. The committee can make a key contribution here, by identifying areas where targets should be set, and making suggestions what these targets could/should be. This connects directly to the first charge.

3. Tri-campus fellowship proposal: The committee began work towards a proposal that would allow for students and faculty to access resources between campuses towards inclusion, but more work is necessary in this area.

Committee Actions

The committee focused on establishing metrics to quantify and track campus climate, other than via the annual climate survey. Meetings took place with Academic HR, ECRT leadership, ADVANCE, and Chief Diversity Officer Tabbye Chavous to work to address this need.

It was suggested that an annual report be developed by ECRT addressing racially motivated harassment, issues and complaints for the three campuses. It was suggested to Academic HR,

as well as to ECRT and ADVANCE, that exit interviews should be conducted with outgoing faculty, and that the responses should be included in an annual report summarizing the data obtained.

In a meeting with the ECRT, they expressed interest in the idea of establishing an annual report on race-based misconduct. They requested that the committee submit ideas for the report. In response, the committee compiled a list of ideas and submitted them back to the ECRT. This list of recommendations can be found in the attached file.

During the meeting with Chief Diversity Officer Tabbye Chavous, the committee advocated for improvement of recruiting and retention of faculty/staff/students of color on all three campuses as part of DEI 2.0. Another topic was to discuss incorporating proper intervention techniques and best practices that have been proven to be effective in creating inclusive excellence. The full list of topics discussed with CDO Chavous can be found in the attached file. The committee plans to continue engaging with CDO Chavous, and has a joint meeting with CDO Chavous and the Committee on Anti-Racism scheduled for June.

Information Obtained

During the committee's review of the statistics on racially motivated harassment, issues and complaints for the three campuses, it was determined that there is inadequate information currently available. There is a need for more data to be collected, and that data should be disseminated broadly in an annual report in order to address issues identified. Due to the decentralized nature of UM, it can be difficult for central offices to determine when individuals are leaving their position at the university prior to their departure. Addressing this issue should be a priority.

It was determined that not all departments have set bylaws at this time. Moreover, some departments have outdated bylaws and do not use them. There should be a focus on establishing departmental bylaws across all units within UM. These bylaws can be important for equity and fairness in decisions such as hiring and in grievance processes. Mechanisms were discussed that the university could use to establish bylaws in all units. One idea that was favored was for the Regents to pass a minimal set of bylaws that would apply to all units, with the option for the units to then expand on this and establish more detailed bylaws that are adjusted to their particular needs.

Each campus has their own Diversity Officer. The policies are unique to each campus, and are set by the campus's diversity officer. Engaging with the diversity officers at Flint and Dearborn, in addition with continued contact with Ann Arbor's CDO Tabbye Chavous is recommended as a priority for this campus moving forward.

Recommendations

- Continue meeting with administration officials to provide input on issues of fairness, equity, and inclusion. Ask these individuals and entities how the committee can assist them.



- Continue to engage with:
 - ECRT.
 - ADVANCE.
 - Academic HR.
 - Chief Diversity Officer Tabbye Chavous.
- Engage with:
 - DEI officers at Flint and Dearborn Campuses.
- Work to provide recommendations to SACUA and the administration regarding DEI 2.0, as well as developing metrics for inclusion and campus climate.
- Advocate for the development of bylaws in all departments.
- Address issues of fairness, equity, and inclusion across each campus should they arise.
- Continue to advocate for the development of an annual report addressing racially motivated harassment, issues and complaints for the three campuses.

Appendices

- Talking points for the meeting with Tabbye Chavous, UM Chief Diversity Officer. CFEI Committee input for DEI 2.0
- CFEI Committee input for the ECRT Report on Race-Based Misconduct.



Appendix 1: Talking points for the meeting with Tabbye Chavous, UM Chief Diversity Officer (Meeting took place on 2/2/23)

- 1) DEI 1.0 was largely focused on “doing” activities on campus, like starting new initiatives, workshops, programs, etc. at the university, raising awareness for DEI issues, public discussions, seminars, etc. What we would like to see in DEI 2.0 are concrete, tangible goals and hard targets. A focus on outcomes, and not activities. This includes hard goals for:
 - a) REPRESENTATION of faculty, staff and students of color (and other groups) on campus, which is achieved by recruiting AND, often forgotten, RETENTION.
 - b) EQUITY (Transparency in Procedures), for example with respect to access to resources, start-up packages, salary, and leadership positions for faculty and staff of color, **but also ensuring that Departments have, develop and implement proper Bylaws/Policies** that govern faculty tenure procedures, grievances (require policies), etc. Address lack of transparency in Departmental procedures.
 - c) CAMPUS CLIMATE (also a big part of retention) for faculty, staff and students and concrete measures for improvement.

**How are these goals incorporated into DEI 2.0? What are the priorities for DEI 2.0?
How are these different aspects incorporated and addressed in DEI 2.0?**

- 2) What strategies can be used to “redirect” Departments that do not show inclusive excellence, evidenced by (and/or arising from):
 - a) not hiring diverse faculty.
 - b) having large salary gaps between white male faculty and faculty of color (and other groups).
 - c) not having bylaws/policies that clearly lay out Departmental procedures, including promotion procedures, distribution of resources, teaching assignments, transparency and equity in decision making, etc.
 - d) not having a proper code of conduct (should there be an institutional code of conduct that automatically covers all units?).
 - e) having above average numbers of complaints, faculty departures, etc.
 - f) having squeezed or facilitated resignations of faculty of color.

What are the mechanisms for recourse for faculty and staff, when equitable procedures are not applied? How are Departments monitored and held accountable to ensure that equitable procedures are applied?

- 3) As a direct consequence of 1), in order to assess campus climate, we need to develop concrete metrics for inclusion and campus climate. For example:
 - a) The Equity, Civil Rights, and Title IX Office (ECRT) needs to file an annual report detailing and analyzing civil rights and race-based offenses/misconduct, etc.,



similar to the annual report on sexual misconduct. This includes transparency in reporting cases, and mandatory reporting by Departments to the ECRT.

- b) Exit interviews are currently conducted by ADVANCE, but due to the decentralized reporting structure many faculty who leave the university are only contacted after they have already left. A better reporting process is needed or exit interviews could be conducted by the units and the data could then be collected and analyzed by ADVANCE.
- c) The surveys conducted to assess climate issues need to be analyzed differently. We would like to see more differentiation with respect to race and other marginalized groups on campus. For example, whereas the overall satisfaction of faculty with the campus climate might be high, this is likely not the case when the data for faculty of color, etc., are analyzed. Data in this regard are included in the DEI 1.0 report, but the presentation of the results is difficult to follow. Also, when survey data are presented at summits, these important results should be highlighted in the presentation, and in this way, more broadly disseminated.
- d) The CDO should release an annual report that includes a summary of a)-c), including data for all three campuses, and then also include data for students of color (and other groups) enrollment and graduation on the three campuses, faculty salary and startup numbers for the three campuses, data on faculty promotions, etc. ALTERNATIVE: make all reports available at one location (CDO Office website, etc.) plus hold an event where the data are presented and discussed

How will assessment be incorporated into DEI 2.0? What else are you planning to do as part of DEI 2.0 to address and document the issue of campus climate?

- 4) What is the situation with respect to Dearborn and Flint? How much coordination is there with Dearborn and Flint, and how much should there be? **How are Dearborn and Flint incorporated into DEI 2.0?**
- 5) Are there any follow-up steps? What are the ways the CFEI and CAR Committees can continue to engage in the process in the future (past this meeting)?



Appendix 2: Suggestions for ECRT Report on Race-Based Misconduct

The report will be based on the complaints filed with the ECRT office, and these complaints constitute the “data”. How should the data be analyzed? What are important categories to be used for breaking down the data?

Suggested main categories and subcategories:

(a) General Statistics

- a. How many complaints were received versus how many were further pursued by ECRT?
- b. How many were found to have merit?
- c. How many led to disciplinary action?
- d. How many complaints were about retaliation?

(Important related question: how does ECRT protect individuals against retaliation?)

(b) Who are the individuals filing the complaints?

- a. Analyze by profession (faculty/staff) and rank
- b. Analyze by College, and then further by Departments or larger subgroups (for example, in LSA those could be Natural Sciences, Social Sciences, Linguistics, etc.). It is important to make sure that individuals cannot be identified, so the subgroups have to be large enough to avoid this.
- c. Analyze by race, gender, etc.

(c) What is the nature of the complaints?

- a. Discrimination in the workplace, for example financial (salary, start-up, bonuses, etc.), denied or delayed promotions, office or laboratory status and location (quality of office and/or research space), etc.
- b. Harassment in the workplace, for example treated disrespectfully, racial remarks, hostile work environment, being bullied, being targeted by supervisor(s) (Department Chairs, managers, etc.), being targeted by colleagues, being alienated, being a target of micro aggressions, etc.
- c. Harassment in the classroom, for example treated disrespectfully, racial remarks, hostile environment, being bullied/targeted by students, target of micro aggressions, etc.

(d) Are there intersections with sexual-, gender-, age-, and/or disability status-based misconduct?



(e) Identify pattern of misconduct

- a. Out of the total number of complaints received, how many of these individuals have filed more than one complaint?
- b. Are there individuals with multiple complaints filed against them? Categorize by number of complaints filed against individuals.

(Important related question: what is ECRT's policy for patterns of complaints?)

(f) How long did it take ECRT to investigate the complaints? Categorize by time (months).