

Provost's Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion

Report: *Achieving Equity & Inclusion at Michigan*

University of Michigan

May 2014

University of Michigan Provost's Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion

Chair

Robert Sellers, Professor and Chair, Department of Psychology

Members

Marlyse Baptista, Professor of Afroamerican and African Studies & Linguistics

Barry Checkoway, Professor of Social Work and Urban & Regional Planning

Dilip Das, Committee Staff, Assistant Vice Provost for Academic Affairs

Adam Eickmeyer - Student, LSA/School of Public Health

LaGina Gause, Doctoral Student, Joint Program in Political Science & Public Policy

Steve Grafton, President & CEO, U-M Alumni Association

Graham Rex Holland, Professor of Dentistry

Elizabeth James, Program Manager, Department of Afroamerican and African Studies

Karyn Lacy, Associate Professor of Sociology and Afroamerican and African Studies

Ashley Lucas, Associate Professor of Theatre and Drama; Director, Prison Creative Arts

Arno Kumagai, Professor of Internal Medicine and Medical Education

Shobita Parthasarathy, Associate Professor of Public Policy

Ken Powell, Professor of Aerospace Engineering

David Wooten, Professor of Marketing, Ross School of Business

Frank Yates, Professor of Psychology and Professor of Business Administration

Executive Summary

We celebrate and promote diversity in all its forms, seeking the understanding and perspective that distinct life experiences bring...in which ideas may be freely expressed and challenged, and all people are welcomed, respected and nurtured in their academic and social development.

University of Michigan Vision Statement¹

There is considerable evidence of the University of Michigan's commitment to its public flagship role of providing access to excellence in education, research, and service for *all* the people of Michigan and the world². The University has a commendable, often inspiring record of responding to public needs – *of leading* – where others may shrink away. In many cases, those public needs were also articulated by U-M students³.

U-M students have again raised their voices and provided the University with an opportunity to respond to a significant set of needs: the consistent decline in the number of enrolled underrepresented minority students and the consistent reports, among students, of an unwelcoming, sometimes hostile, classroom and campus climate for students of color.

The Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion was appointed in December 2013 by Provost Pollack as one step in the University's response to these student-identified needs. The Committee presents, herein, 13 recommendations for action on reversing declines in underrepresented minority student enrollment and improving the campus climate for all students, faculty, and staff.

The Committee's recommendations are grouped in four sub-sections that are listed here and fully described within the report below. *See Appendix A for a summary of recommendations in table format.*

General Recommendations:

1. Appoint and charge a *Staff Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion* to gather data on staff hiring, promotion, and climate and make recommendations to address consistent reports of an unsupportive or hostile workplace climate, with respect to staff of color and other underrepresented groups at U-M.

¹ U-M Office of the President: <http://president.umich.edu/mission.php>

² An oft-cited example is U-M's defense of affirmative action in the Supreme Court in 2003. A recent example of service to the state is the \$429 million in-kind services provided by the U-M Health System in Fiscal Year 2012

³ See, for example, Black Action Movement: <http://bentley.umich.edu/research/topics/bamdocs.php>; Coalition for Tuition Equality: http://www.fordschool.umich.edu/news/?news_id=1127; and Student of Color Coalition: <http://www-personal.umich.edu/~mercury/OCR.html>

2. Develop and launch, as part of the Strategic Plan for Diversity, a public campaign led by the President and Provost that *positions diversity and an inclusive campus climate as core values* of the University of Michigan.
3. The University launch a public campaign reaffirming the University's commitment to diversity as a core value.
4. Hold Schools and Colleges accountable for their performance (or lack thereof) around diversity, as well as continue to provide them with resources and tools to successfully promote diversity.
5. The Provost fund a central unit to provide systematic, continuous evaluation of existing diversity and academic support programs.

Student Recruitment Recommendations

6. Develop and launch a robust, well-coordinated, long-term academic achievement and recruitment initiative in selected middle and high schools to increase the proportion of underrepresented minority students who apply, are admitted, and enroll at U-M.
7. Charge a *Taskforce on Admissions Criteria* to examine existing and alternative admissions criteria and their relationship or correlation to group disparities in educational opportunities.

Student Climate & Retention Recommendations

8. Develop and launch the *U-M Excellence in Teaching* professional development program for *all* faculty and instructors. This can include peer-training models focusing on effective practices for inclusive teaching pedagogies.
9. Charge a *Taskforce on Student Success* to examine existing academic support structures and make recommendations to achieve *outcome parity* in GPA, intended majors, off-campus/international credit opportunities, and graduation rates for all students.
10. Develop, promote, and launch a centralized web portal that provides critical information and resources for students, including students of color and other marginalized groups, with initial foci on academic support structures specific to diverse identities and explicit directions on reporting incidents of harassment and discrimination.

Faculty Recruitment & Retention Recommendations

11. Require all deans to demonstrate increased participation in the Provost's Faculty Initiative Program (PFIP) and expand funding as needed.
12. The Provost require all Schools and Colleges to evaluate their existing faculty search processes and propose new procedures designed specifically to develop more diverse pools of applicants.
13. Given that diversity is a core University value, the Provost Office should include materials demonstrating the candidates' diversity-related activities as an explicit requirement for all tenure and promotion dossiers.

Committee Purpose and Context

Charge of the Committee:

In December 2013, Provost Martha Pollack charged the Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (the Committee) with identifying and recommending 3-5 short term (1-2 years implementation) and 3-5 medium term (2-3 years implementation), high-priority actions to “build a climate of inclusion and address pipeline issues” that impact enrollment. *See Appendix B for the full charge to the committee.*

The Committee was formed in January 2014, and is composed of 11 faculty members from eight Schools and Colleges, one undergraduate student, one graduate student, and two staff members.

The formation of the Committee followed a series of events on the U-M campus in the Fall 2013 semester that highlighted both the perceived unwelcoming or hostile campus climate for students of color, and the significant, consistent decline in underrepresented minority freshman enrollment, especially for African American and Native American freshmen.

The precipitous fall in enrollment is demonstrated by the gap between the population of school-aged African American children in the state of Michigan, 16%⁴, versus the percentage of freshman African American students enrolled in 2013, 4.12%⁵. Thus, U-M enrolls only *one-quarter* of the ratio of school-aged African Americans in the state, down from *one-half* in 1997. *See Appendices C-F for detail.*

The steepest percentage decline of any minority group in the freshman cohort at U-M, according to self-identified data from the admissions application, is among Native American students, whose percentages have vacillated between 0.2% and 1.0% of all students for the past 25 years. In 2013, *only seven students*, or 0.12%, in the freshman cohort identified as Native American, down from 50 in 2007.

Committee members brought to the process a wealth of experience dealing with diversity-related issues at U-M and other campuses. At the same time there was significant heterogeneity with respect to the perspectives and orientations of the Committee members. This diversity of perspectives was extremely helpful to the process of developing a broad array of recommendations for the present report.

Refining the Committee’s Charge. Given the enormity and complexity of the original charge, the composition of the committee, and the short timeframe, one of the initial acts of the committee was to revise the initial charge. The Committee unanimously agreed to recommend

⁴ Michigan Department of Technology, Management & Budget: http://www.michigan.gov/cgi/0,4548,7-158-54534_51713_51714-261003--,00.html

⁵ U-M Office of the Registrar: <http://www.ro.umich.edu/report/13enrollmentsummary.pdf>

in this final report that staff concerns about equity, climate, and diversity should be immediately addressed by a separate committee reporting to both the Provost and the Associate Vice President for Human Resources and led by a staff member and composed largely of staff from across the University. It should be emphasized that the Committee's decision not to take up staff issues in detail in the present charge was in no way based on the belief that staff diversity concerns are in any way less important or less pressing than diversity concerns for students and faculty. In fact, the opposite is true. The Committee felt strongly that staff diversity concerns are every bit as important and pressing as those of students and faculty. Staff concerns are so important and pressing that they deserve the full focus of their own committee led by a staff member and including greater staff representation.

After meeting with the Committee, Provost Pollack agreed to the revision of the original charge to focus specifically on issues of diversity that most directly related to students and faculty at the University of Michigan.

Committee Process

The process leading to the present report included three steps. The first step was to gather as much information as possible from as many different perspectives as possible around issues related to diversity, inclusion, and equity on the campus. The second step was to distill all of the information gathered in step 1 into specific conclusions regarding the state of diversity, equity, and inclusion issues on campus. The third step was then to develop specific recommendations related to the various conclusions that were reached.

The Committee met for the first time on February 17, 2014 and then met weekly for two hours through May 14, 2014. In addition, various subgroups of the Committee met or communicated independently to complete the work of the Committee.

The Committee decided to divide into three subcommittees to address the broad issues and concerns regarding diversity: 1) student recruitment; 2) student retention and success; and 3) faculty recruitment, retention, and success. These three sub-committees included members who had particular interests and experience related to the specific themes.

Specifically, the Committee's focus on student recruitment examined current U-M pipeline issues, admissions criteria, financial aid, as well as existing strategies here and at other peer campuses.

The Committee's focus on student retention and success examined issues of academic support, social support services on campus, campus climate issues, classroom dynamics, and student experiences.

Finally, the Committee's work on faculty recruitment, retention, and success focused on unit search processes, faculty mentorship, differential opportunities for educational leadership and advancement, climate, and administrative accountability.

Step 1: Information Gathering

During the data gathering process of Step 1, we had two primary sources of information. The first source was based on archival information compiled by Committee staff at the recommendation of Committee members and the Committee staff. This archival information consisted of relevant reports, articles, and data that was stored on a c-tools site and made available to all Committee members (see Appendices for a copy of the information.) The second source of information came from a series of panel discussions with various stakeholders with relevant expertise and experience relating to the Committee's charge. From February 24 through April 7 the Committee as a whole met with these stakeholders.

The bi-directional discussions were frank, honest, and informational. There is no doubt that the Committee was unable to meet with *ALL* of the individuals on campus who are relevant to the Committee's charge, but the Committee was satisfied that the panel discussions provided a representative picture of the issues at hand. Below are the list of panel members and their affiliations.

February 17, 2014

Martha Pollack, Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs

February 24, 2014

Lester Monts, Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs

Maya Kobersy, Associate General Counsel

March 10, 2014

Ted Spencer, Executive Director, Office of Undergraduate Admissions

Nick Collins, Director, Center for Educational Outreach

Gloria Taylor, Interim Director, Office of Academic Multicultural Initiatives

March 17, 2014

Kelly Maxwell, Co-Director, Program on Intergroup Relations (IGR) and Chair, University Diversity Council

Cathy Conway-Perrin, Interim Director, Comprehensive Studies Program (CSP)

Dwight Fontenot, Associate Director, CSP and Summer Bridge

Katrina Wade-Golden, Assistant Director, Office of Academic Multicultural Initiatives

Undergraduate Student Panel:

Duane Gardner, Engineering undergraduate student

Robert Greenfield IV, Engineering undergraduate student

Chloe Brown, LSA undergraduate student

Anna Garcia, LSA undergraduate student

Aliza Hirani, LSA undergraduate student

Alex Ngo, LSA undergraduate student

Austin McCoy, Rackham graduate student

March 19, 2014

Abby Stewart, Professor of Women's Studies, LSA; Director of ADVANCE

Terry McDonald, former dean of LSA; Director of Bentley Library

Alec Gallimore, Associate Dean and Arthur F. Thurnau Professor, Engineering

March 24, 2014

Joint Meeting with members of the Vice Provosts and Associate Deans Group Diversity Programs Subcommittee:

Derek Collins, LSA, Chair

Carla O'Connor, School of Education

Alan Deardorff, Ford School

James Holloway, Vice Provost for Global and Engaged Learning

April 7, 2014

Royster Harper, Vice President for Student Life

Step 2: Conclusions

The Committee as a whole met several times to discuss general conclusions that could be drawn from our interactions with the panelists and information provided on the c-tools site. First, a set of general conclusions was discussed with the Committee as a whole. Next, the

three sub-groups met individually to discuss specific conclusions relating to their themes. Finally, these specific conclusions were discussed and refined by the Committee as a whole.

Step 3: Recommendations

A process similar to that described for Step 2 was employed to develop general and specific recommendations.

Conclusions

General Conclusions

1. Across the University, there are many programs and efforts designed to promote diversity, equity, and inclusion across almost all units on campus. Despite these efforts, the University has much work to do:
 - a. to meet our long-standing commitment to develop a campus community that is diverse with regard to the backgrounds of the students, faculty, and staff;
 - b. to assure our processes are equitable with respect to the opportunities afforded to all faculty, students, and staff;
 - c. to assure that students, faculty, and staff are, as our vision states, welcomed, respected and nurtured in their academic and social development.

As a result, the University must commit to further support existing efforts and programs that have demonstrated success; reform or terminate existing efforts and programs that have proved to be less effective; and invest in developing new efforts and programs that show promise for success.

2. There is relatively little coordination of efforts across programs both within and across schools. This lack of coordination makes it difficult to achieve successful outcomes for individual students when those outcomes are dependent upon the efforts of multiple units (e.g., student outreach, admissions, financial aid). The lack of coordination also makes it difficult for units to share best practices regarding what is and what is not successful. Finally, there is little capacity to share data on individual students across various support programs.
3. There is a relative dearth of data from which to evaluate (in all forms) the success and efficacy of our existing efforts. This dearth of information makes it impossible to coordinate efforts, develop a strategic plan, or assess progress (or the lack of it).
4. While central administration offers some resources (e.g. PFIP) as incentives for schools and colleges to engage in diversity-enhancing activities, there appear to be few negative

consequences for schools and college who choose not to engage in diversity-enhancing activities. Consequently, deans are not held accountable for the diversity-related efforts (good or bad) of their units. As a result, there remains significant variability in the extent to which various schools and colleges are committed to and successful at promoting diversity-enhancing activities.

5. The largely decentralized nature of the University makes it difficult for individual students, faculty, and staff to be aware of all the diversity-relevant resources and services available to them on campus. As a result, too many individuals are unable to access these potential resources and services. This is an especially acute issue for students, faculty, and staff from under-represented minority communities. This lack of effective communication of the resources that are available also helps to fuel a perception that the University is not committed to addressing these needs.
6. Many in the University community have used the passage of Proposal 2 as an inappropriate excuse for inactivity around diversity issues. There is significant confusion as to what can and cannot legally be done about diversity in the current climate. The tendency is for some individuals and units to be much less aggressive around diversity issues than may be allowed under the law.

Student Recruitment Subcommittee Conclusions

1. The University's current efforts of outreach and pipeline development to secondary schools in Michigan and in key cities nationally have not developed a large enough pool of students from under-represented backgrounds who have the necessary academic profile under the current admissions criteria to produce sufficiently diverse classes of admitted students.
2. The University is not competitive enough in its recruitment and financial aid offerings for out-of-state students from under-represented backgrounds. Proposal 2-related restrictions make recruiting out-of-state students from under-represented backgrounds particularly difficult.

Student Climate and Retention Subcommittee Conclusions

1. The overall campus culture, including the rules and informal practices in schools and departments across the university, has created conditions that make it particularly challenging to create a more inclusive campus climate. Unfortunately, our classrooms are often spaces where many of our students experience persistent micro-aggressions as a result of their race/ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, and/or disability status. As a result of poor pedagogical training, instructors (faculty, lecturers, and GSIs) often unwittingly exacerbate these experiences of victimization for many students. Too few instructors have the training and skills to teach in a diverse classroom.

2. Too little focus is placed on providing academic support for students that will result in *ALL* students' reaching their full potential. The current measures of success for our diversity efforts focus almost exclusively on the number of students matriculating into and graduating from the institution to the exclusion of the assessment of whether true exit parity has been reached, such that there are no group differences in academic outcomes other than graduation (e.g., grades, majors, internship, job, and graduate school opportunities). This requires the University to take seriously the societal group disparities in K-12 educational opportunities in providing, planning, and executing sufficient academic support for *ALL* students.

Faculty Recruitment and Retention Subcommittee Conclusions

1. The University as a whole needs to do a better job in recruiting, hiring, and retaining a diverse faculty. Although there are examples of departments and other units that are successful in developing and maintaining a diverse faculty, these units are the exception rather than the rule. Too few units are utilizing existing resources (e.g., STRIDE: Strategies and Tactics for Recruiting to Improve Diversity and Excellence; PFIP) and best practices to develop diverse candidate pools with respect to race, ethnicity, and gender.
2. Minority faculty, and faculty from other underrepresented groups, are disproportionately called upon to take on service roles that are related to issues of diversity. Unfortunately, these roles are often under-valued within their units and the academy at large. At the same time, faculty from underrepresented groups are provided fewer opportunities to engage in service roles that are more highly-valued (i.e. academic leadership roles).

Recommendations

These recommendations are proposed at various stages of readiness, expense, and time frame. Some recommendations require further work, including the formations of committees to help plan and implement the ideas, while others can be implemented immediately. Although this report was originally commissioned by Provost Pollack, the implementation of these recommendations will require the full and enthusiastic support of not only the Provost, but also the President and the Deans of the University's Schools and Colleges.

The Committee submits these recommendations under the belief that these recommendations will be the stimulus and foundation for a general strategic diversity plan for the University. The Committee endorses Provost Pollack's expressed commitment that significant resources and attention will be devoted to the implementation of the recommendations put forth in this

report. The following recommendations represent necessary, but not sufficient, steps in helping the University of Michigan achieve its stated mission of being an institution that values diversity as a method of achieving excellence in learning, teaching, and scholarship for *ALL*.

The Committee recommends the following:

General Recommendations

1. The Provost and Associate Vice President for Human Resources charge a committee (chaired by a staff member and comprised primarily of staff, but also including faculty and students) to examine the hiring, promotion, and climate for staff, including staff of color and staff who are part of other underrepresented groups at the University of Michigan. The committee will be empowered to make recommendations that the Provost and Associate Vice President for Human Resources will commit to considering.
2. The University develop a strategic plan for diversity (the Plan). The Plan must have buy-in at all levels of the University. The Plan must address issues related to the recruitment and retention of a diverse student body, faculty, and staff, as well as the development of a climate that promotes diversity, equity, and inclusion as a strategy for excellence. The Plan must have specific actions, goals, and timelines. In addition to a strategic plan at the level of central administration, each Dean must be responsible for developing a strategic plan for her/his School or College. In addition, the Dean must appoint an Associate Dean to be responsible for the day-to-day implementation of the unit's strategic plan. These Associate Deans should have a clearly defined relationship to the Vice Provost for Equity, Inclusion, and Academic Affairs.
3. The University launch a public campaign reaffirming the University's commitment to diversity as a core value. This campaign must include the University leadership (President and Provost) providing frequent, clear, and consistent public messages that diversity is a core value for the entire University. This message must be stated and evident throughout the University community.
 - a. The message that diversity is a core value of the University should be a part of recruitment materials for *ALL* students, faculty, and staff.
 - b. The orientation program for incoming students should include workshops for all students so they will learn how to interact with individuals who are different from themselves in a respectful and effective manner. These workshops should require *ALL* students to examine their own identities and the privilege associated with them, as well as provide concrete instruction on how to operate appropriately and effectively at a university that values diversity at its core. (Inter Group Relations and Office of Housing may be important groups in developing such a workshop.)

- c. All staff should be provided with a professional development experience and training that addresses working in a diverse environment. These professional development experiences should require ALL staff to examine their own identities and the privilege associated with them, as well as provide concrete instruction on how to operate appropriately and effectively at a university that values diversity at its core. (Inter Group Relations, Office for Institutional Equity, and Human Resources may be important groups in developing such a workshop.)
4. The University leadership hold Schools and Colleges accountable for their performance (or lack thereof) around diversity, as well as continue to provide them with resources and tools to successfully promote diversity.
 - a. Demonstrated success with diversity-related issues should be a specific requirement for the appointment and re-appointment of all deans, as well as an important part of their annual merit review process.
 - b. Schools and colleges, in consultation with the Provost's office, must report on progress related to their strategic diversity plan as part of the annual budget review process. The school and college's performance with respect to the plan must play a consequential role in the overall budget of the school.
5. The Provost fund a central unit to provide systematic, continuous evaluation of existing diversity and academic support programs. Currently, most programs do not have the expertise or resources in-house to provide the kind of evaluation that is essential to the planning process. In lieu of developing a new central unit, the Provost may consider hiring existing resources on campus to provide these services. Regardless, there must be a commitment of resources to address this critical need.

Student Recruitment Recommendations:

6. The University invest significantly into existing and new programs that build partnerships and relationships with targeted school districts in Michigan and out-of-state to increase the pipeline of college-ready underrepresented minority students as well as first-generation students.
7. The Provost charge a taskforce to evaluate the existing undergraduate admissions criteria, as well as alternative indicators of academic excellence, to determine whether changes in existing criteria might yield more diverse but still qualified classes. The taskforce should be specifically charged with empirically comparing existing criteria with possible alternative criteria that may ameliorate the impact of existing group disparities in educational opportunities on the admission process, while still maintaining the University's commitment to educational excellence.

Student Climate & Retention Recommendations:

8. The University create a professional development program designed to enhance the teaching skills of all faculty. This professional development program would expose faculty to current best practices in classroom teaching. A fundamental aspect of this training experience would include training on how to effectively supervise a diverse classroom. It is further recommended that ALL teaching faculty be required to successfully complete the professional development program every 5 years in order to be certified to teach at the University. New faculty would be required to successfully complete such a program as part of their initial orientation process. Requiring teaching faculty to demonstrate a baseline level of competence is consistent with other requirements for professional development that faculty have to meet.
 - a. The Provost incentivize workshops, seminars, and other activities that encourage the development of expertise and training around the pedagogy of teaching a diverse student body (e.g., LSA Faculty Diversity Institute). Programs that are open to faculty across schools and colleges are especially valuable.
9. The Provost charge a taskforce composed of relevant students, faculty, staff, and administrators to assess the existing academic support structures and make recommendations regarding the following: whether or not the support structures are properly funded; whether they have adequate support plans to achieve outcome parity for all students; and the development of mechanisms for sharing individual student data and best practices across support structures.
10. The Provost create a single point-of-access (website) for members of the University community to obtain information and access resources related to diversity, inclusion, and equity, as well as resources related to supporting marginalized students. The current web presence is not adequate. This access site must provide concrete information including links to existing sites (e.g., directions on how and to whom to report incidents of harassment and discrimination).

Faculty Recruitment & Retention Recommendations

11. The Provost require all deans to demonstrate their School's or College's robust participation in the Provost's Faculty Initiatives Program (PFIP) and expand Provost funding for that program as needed. In addition, establish a pool of financial resources to incentivize departments and faculty recruitment committees to attract and retain diverse faculty and/or create a climate of inclusiveness (e.g., 3rd Century Initiative Program for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion; Rackham's Diversity Allies grants).
 - a. The President and Provost significantly promote and expand the President's Postdoctoral Fellowship Program (PPFP) beyond the STEM fields to include all units. Active participation in the PPFP to be measured as part of dean and department chair yearly review procedures.

12. The Provost require all Schools and Colleges to evaluate their existing faculty search processes and propose new procedures designed specifically to develop more diverse pools of applicants. Schools and Colleges should utilize existing resources (e.g., STRIDE, NextProf at College of Engineering) to assist in the development of effective policies and practices.
13. Given that diversity is a core University value, the Provost Office should include materials demonstrating the candidates' diversity-related activities as an explicit requirement for all tenure and promotion dossiers.
 - a. Deans should be encouraged to include faculty and staff diversity efforts as part of the faculty annual review process.

Appendix A: Summary of Recommendations

<i>Recommendations</i>	<i>Implementation Horizon</i>	<i>Estimated Cost Needed</i>
<p>1. The Provost and Associate Vice President for Human Resources charge a committee (chaired by a staff member and comprised primarily of staff, but also including faculty and students) to examine the hiring, promotion, and climate for staff, including staff of color and staff who are part of other underrepresented groups at the University of Michigan. The committee will be empowered to make recommendations that the Provost and Associate Vice President for Human Resources will commit to considering.</p>	<p>Immediate</p>	<p>Minimal One-Time/Non-recurring</p>
<p>2. The University develop a strategic plan for diversity (the Plan). The Plan must have buy-in at all levels of the University. The Plan must address issues related to the recruitment and retention of a diverse student body, faculty, and staff, as well as the development of a climate that promotes diversity, equity, and inclusion as a strategy for excellence. The Plan must have specific actions, goals, and timelines. In addition to a strategic plan at the level of central administration, each Dean must be responsible for developing a strategic plan for her/his School or College. In addition, the Dean must appoint an Associate Dean to be responsible for the day-to-day implementation of the unit's strategic plan. These Associate Deans should have a clearly defined relationship to the Vice Provost for Equity, Inclusion, and Academic Affairs.</p>	<p>Immediate to Long-term: Will need to develop campus-wide opportunities for input.</p>	<p>Minimal One-Time/Non-recurring</p>
<p>3. The University launch a public campaign reaffirming the University's commitment to diversity as a core value. This campaign must include the University leadership (President and Provost) providing frequent, clear, and consistent public messages</p>	<p>Immediate</p>	<p>Moderate Long-Term</p>

<p>that diversity is a core value for the entire University. This message must be stated and evident throughout the University community.</p>		<p>Recurring</p>
<p>4. The University leadership hold Schools and Colleges accountable for their performance (or lack thereof) around diversity, as well as continue to provide them with resources and tools to successfully promote diversity.</p>	<p>Short Term: Will need to build into current budget and hiring practices.</p>	<p>Minimal to Moderate Long-Term Recurring</p>
<p>5. The Provost fund a central unit to provide systematic, continuous evaluation of existing diversity and academic support programs. Currently, most programs do not have the expertise or resources in-house to provide the kind of evaluation that is essential to the planning process. In lieu of developing a new central unit, the Provost may consider hiring existing resources on campus to provide these services. Regardless, there must be a commitment of resources to address this critical need.</p>	<p>Short Term to Medium Term</p>	<p>Moderate to Significant Long-Term Recurring</p>
<p>6. The University invest significantly into existing and new programs that build partnerships and relationships with targeted school districts in Michigan and out-of-state to increase the pipeline of college-ready underrepresented minority students as well as first-generation students.</p>	<p>Immediate to Long-Term: Will need a review of existing programs and recommendations for continued support</p>	<p>Significant Long-Term Recurring</p>
<p>7. The Provost charge a taskforce to evaluate the existing undergraduate admissions criteria, as well as alternative indicators of academic excellence, to determine whether changes in existing criteria might yield more diverse but still qualified</p>	<p>Immediate to Short-Term</p>	<p>Moderate to Significant</p>

<p>classes. The taskforce should be specifically charged with empirically comparing existing criteria with possible alternative criteria that may ameliorate the impact of existing group disparities in educational opportunities on the admission process, while still maintaining the University's commitment to educational excellence.</p>		<p>Long-Term Recurring</p>
<p>8. The University create a professional development program designed to enhance the teaching skills of all faculty. This professional development program would expose faculty to current best practices in classroom teaching. A fundamental aspect of this training experience would include training on how to effectively supervise a diverse classroom. It is further recommended that ALL teaching faculty be required to successfully complete the professional development program every 5 years in order to be certified to teach at the University. New faculty would be required to successfully complete such a program as part of their initial orientation process. Requiring teaching faculty to demonstrate a baseline level of competence is consistent with other requirements for professional development that faculty have to meet.</p>	<p>Short-Term to Long-Term</p>	<p>Moderate Long-Term Recurring</p>
<p>9. The Provost charge a taskforce composed of relevant students, faculty, staff, and administrators to assess the existing academic support structures and make recommendations regarding the following: whether or not the support structures are properly funded; whether they have adequate support plans to achieve outcome parity for all students; and the development of mechanisms for sharing individual student data and best practices across support structures.</p>	<p>Immediate to Short-Term</p>	<p>Moderate to Significant (Depending on Task Force Findings) Recurring</p>
<p>10. The Provost create a single point-of-access (website) for members of the University community to obtain information and access resources related to diversity,</p>	<p>Short-Term</p>	<p>Minimal</p>

<p>inclusion, and equity, as well as resources related to supporting marginalized students. The current web presence is not adequate. This access site must provide concrete information including links to existing sites (e.g., directions on how and to whom to report incidents of harassment and discrimination).</p>		<p>Long-Term Recurring</p>
<p>11. The Provost require all deans to demonstrate their School's or College's robust participation in the Provost's Faculty Initiatives Program (PFIP) and expand Provost funding for that program as needed. In addition, establish a pool of financial resources to incentivize departments and faculty recruitment committees to attract and retain diverse faculty and/or create a climate of inclusiveness (e.g., 3rd Century Initiative Program for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion; Rackham's Diversity Allies grants).</p>	<p>Short-Term</p>	<p>Significant Long-Term Recurring</p>
<p>12. The Provost require all Schools and Colleges to evaluate their existing faculty search processes and propose new procedures designed specifically to develop more diverse pools of applicants. Schools and Colleges should utilize existing resources (e.g., STRIDE, NextProf at College of Engineering) to assist in the development of effective policies and practices.</p>	<p>Short to Intermediate- Term</p>	<p>Minimal One-Time/Non- recurring</p>
<p>13. Given that diversity is a core University value, the Provost Office should include materials demonstrating the candidates' diversity-related activities as an explicit requirement for all tenure and promotion dossiers.</p>	<p>Intermediate- Term</p>	<p>Minimal</p>

Appendix B: Charge to the Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion

The University of Michigan has a deep and abiding commitment to the values of diversity, equity, and inclusion. In November 2006, shortly after the passage of Proposal 2, the University Diversity Blueprints Task Force was formed and charged with developing fresh, innovative approaches to sustaining and enhancing diversity along a broad range of dimensions. The task force issued its report in March 2007, and in the years since then, many of its recommendations have been implemented, thanks to the commitment and hard work of many people across campus. Ongoing, important work on these topics continues through:

- the University Diversity Council, which oversees a rich set of activities focused on all areas of diversity;
- the Division of Student Life, which has a large number of important programs that address issues of identity and justice in the context of creating a diverse and inclusive campus;
- a task force of associate deans, who are assessing an inventory of campus diversity programs to provide insight on best practices that might be shared, as well as obstacles and gaps; and
- the work of many more individuals and organizations.

The Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion is being formed to complement this ongoing work, to bring more faculty directly into the conversation, and to respond to recent incidents on campus, and at other campuses across the nation, that highlight the work we still need to do to create the kind of community to which we aspire. We will ask the committee members to meet with representatives of the groups listed above, and will also share with them specific recommendations that have been made by the University Diversity Council.

The task for this committee is to develop a set of proposals for actions that that will let us jump start the next phase of our efforts to build a climate of inclusion and to address pipeline issues. Specifically, the committee should:

- Assess our progress since 2007, recognizing the hard work and success of many people and groups, and identify the most important remaining challenges and key next steps for progress.
- Recommend a set of 3-5 highest priority steps that we should take to address the challenges identified, and that can be implemented within the short term (1-2 years). The recommendations should include both steps that are bold, innovative, and frame-breaking and may require significant resources, as well as ones that are clearly feasible, incremental steps forward.
- Similarly, recommend a set of 3-5 steps that can be implemented in the medium term (2-3 years).

Ideally, the proposed activities will span different challenges we face, include ones that arise both inside and outside the classroom and that involve both academics and student life: for example, they might focus on recruitment and retention, equitable teaching practices, academic and professional success, the student experience, the faculty and staff experience, and/or the fostering of constructive interactions among various groups so that all members of our community are able to benefit from our collective diversity.

The committee is asked to produce a set of recommendations by May 16, 2014. The challenges we face as we strive towards true diversity, equity, and inclusion are complex, and we recognize that the recommendations of this committee are not likely, by themselves, to entirely address them. But the work of identifying highest priority short- and near-term actions is extremely important, and can and will be followed up by longer-term strategic planning.

Appendix C: President Mary Sue Coleman's Comments to Board of Regents, February 20, 2014

<http://record.umich.edu/articles/coleman-addresses-diversity-and-campus-climate-feb-20-remarks>

Appendix D: Undergraduate Enrollment, University of Michigan Registrar's Office

<http://www.ro.umich.edu/report/13enrollmentsummary.pdf>

Appendix E: Campus Climate Survey (U-MAY) Data (large data file)

http://obp.umich.edu/wp-content/uploads/almanac/Almanac_Ch7_Dec2013.pdf

Appendix F: State of Michigan School-Aged Population Statistics Ages 0 – 25

Source: Michigan Department of Technology, Management, and Budget http://www.michigan.gov/cgi/0,4548,7-158-54534_51713_51714-261003--,00.html

Population of Michigan by Single Year of Age, Race, Sex, and Hispanic Origin: Part 1b: Total Residents by Race, 2010

(Each race includes Hispanics and non-Hispanics)

Age	Grand Total (All Races)	White Alone	Black Alone	Native American Alone	Asian Alone	Pacific Islander Alone	Other Race Alone	Multiracial
All Ages	100%	78.9%	14.2%	0.63%	2.4%	0.03%	1.49%	2.3%
0	100%	69.2%	17.6%	0.71%	2.8%	0.02%	2.70%	7.1%
1	100%	69.8%	17.3%	0.70%	2.8%	0.03%	2.58%	6.9%
2	100%	70.3%	16.7%	0.70%	2.9%	0.02%	2.72%	6.6%
3	100%	70.9%	16.5%	0.75%	2.9%	0.03%	2.65%	6.2%
4	100%	71.2%	16.5%	0.74%	3.0%	0.02%	2.64%	6.0%
5	100%	71.9%	16.0%	0.71%	3.0%	0.04%	2.57%	5.8%
6	100%	72.4%	15.9%	0.70%	3.1%	0.03%	2.46%	5.5%
7	100%	72.8%	15.7%	0.74%	3.0%	0.03%	2.51%	5.2%
8	100%	72.9%	16.0%	0.73%	2.8%	0.03%	2.38%	5.1%
9	100%	72.9%	16.3%	0.75%	2.8%	0.03%	2.28%	5.0%
10	100%	73.0%	16.6%	0.72%	2.6%	0.03%	2.24%	4.8%
11	100%	73.6%	16.3%	0.75%	2.5%	0.03%	2.11%	4.7%
12	100%	73.6%	16.5%	0.77%	2.5%	0.04%	2.07%	4.5%
13	100%	74.1%	16.5%	0.73%	2.3%	0.03%	2.02%	4.3%
14	100%	74.2%	16.6%	0.75%	2.3%	0.02%	1.97%	4.1%
15	100%	73.8%	17.5%	0.76%	2.1%	0.02%	1.94%	3.9%
16	100%	73.0%	18.3%	0.78%	2.1%	0.02%	1.97%	3.8%
17	100%	72.9%	18.8%	0.76%	2.2%	0.03%	1.84%	3.6%
18	100%	73.1%	18.5%	0.74%	2.5%	0.03%	1.95%	3.3%
19	100%	73.3%	18.3%	0.73%	2.7%	0.03%	1.85%	3.1%
20	100%	73.4%	18.2%	0.72%	2.9%	0.03%	1.85%	2.9%
21	100%	75.1%	16.3%	0.71%	3.2%	0.03%	1.86%	2.8%
22	100%	75.5%	15.9%	0.68%	3.2%	0.04%	2.01%	2.7%
23	100%	76.1%	15.5%	0.72%	3.1%	0.05%	1.99%	2.5%
24	100%	76.1%	15.4%	0.70%	3.2%	0.03%	2.01%	2.5%
25	100%	76.6%	15.1%	0.67%	3.2%	0.03%	2.10%	2.3%