

## **LSA Anti-Racism Task Force Report**

Submitted to Dean Anne Curzan of the College of Literature, Science, and the Arts on April 15, 2021, by the members of the LSA Anti-Racism Task Force.

### Task Force Members:

Tabbye Chavous, Director, National Center for Institutional Diversity, Associate Vice President for Research, and Professor of Education and Psychology (co-chair)

Matthew Countryman, Chair, Department of Afroamerican and African Studies, and Associate Professor of Afroamerican and African Studies and History (co-chair)

Samer Ali, Associate Professor of Arabic Language and Literature

RaShonda Flint, Assistant Dean for Undergraduate Education and Student Academic Affairs

Stephanie Fryberg, University Diversity and Social Transformation Professor of Psychology

Stephanie Hicks, Lecturer, Program on Intergroup Relations, Faculty Affiliate of the Institute for Research on Women and Gender

Vincent Hutchings, University Diversity and Social Transformation Professor of Political Science

Robert Megginson, Arthur F. Thurnau Professor of Mathematics

Whitney Peoples, Assistant Director, Focus on Race and Ethnicity Courses, Center for Research on Teaching and Learning

Ryan Perry, Undergraduate Student, Economics

Teresa Satterfield, Professor of Spanish

Isis Settles, Professor of Psychology and Afroamerican and African Studies

Vanessa Sih, Associate Chair, Department of Physics, and Professor of Physics

Ruby Tapia, Chair, Department of Women's and Gender Studies, Associate Professor of English Language and Literature and Women's and Gender Studies

Doreen Tinajero, Project Senior Manager, Center for Social Solutions

Aunrika Tucker-Shabazz, Doctoral Student, Sociology

# **LSA Anti-Racism Task Force Report**

*(updated April 11, 2021)*

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

[Executive Summary](#)

[Section 1: LSA Anti-Racism Task Force Charge](#)

[Section 2: Introduction & Vision Statement](#)

[Section 3: Key and Cross-Cutting Recommendations](#)

[Section 4: Undergraduate Student Enrollment and Retention](#)

[Section 5: Graduate Student Enrollment and Retention](#)

[Section 6: Faculty Diversity](#)

[Section 7: Staff Diversity](#)

[Section 8: Curriculum \(Race & Ethnicity Requirement and Beyond\)](#)

[Section 9: College and Campus Climate Issues](#)

[Section 10: LSA and Efforts to Dismantle Carceral Practices and Policies](#)

[Section 11: U-M's Role in Urban and Tribal Communities in Michigan](#)

[Section 12: Anti-Racism and COVID-19 Impact Responses](#)

## Executive Summary

LSA Dean Curzan appointed and charged a small task force group in September 2020 to: (a) provide a statement of a vision and goals for anti-racism in teaching, research/scholarship, and service/engagement in LSA; (b) identify institutional policies, programs, and practices in the college (and university, as relevant) that sustain systemic racism and that must be investigated, revised, and/or overturned; (c) identify current policies, practices, programs, and positions that contribute to eliminating racism and racial inequities and that merit additional investment to meet these goals; (d) outline recommendations to inform LSA leadership in decisions for developing infrastructures, strategies, and other action steps to advance anti-racism as a core value in LSA work, in the short-term and longer-term.

The task force was made up of faculty, staff, and students across a range of LSA disciplines/fields, academic and administrative units, and demographic backgrounds (gender, race/ethnicity), each with expertise and records of sustained engagement in anti-racism work, at department, college, university, and/or broader community and public levels. The task force met over the fall term (as a group and subgroups) to discuss and review extant and emerging work on anti-racism in higher education and society, formal and informal data/information gathered from across campus, and potential solutions that may work in LSA and at U-M. Through this work, the group identified challenges and potential action steps; the action steps include measures - that might be more quickly implemented or executed to provide relief/support to our community; as well as challenges that require medium- and longer-term action steps and sustained efforts.

Examples of task force *Key and Cross-Cutting Recommendations* include:

1. **Recommit to the goal of abundant representation (requiring significant increases)** of African Americans, Latinxs, Native Americans/Indigenous Peoples, Asian Americans, and Middle Eastern/North Africans among its student, faculty, and staff **AND** to a range of active recruitment and retention efforts and activities designed to meet that goal. At the same time, emphasize in all relevant policy and practice discussions that representation of these communities at our institution is necessary but insufficient to address systemic racism.
2. **Take steps to create a culture of accountability**, addressing unevenness in LSA departments around student, faculty, and staff DEI efforts and outcomes and creating structures to uniformly incentivize DEI efforts/outcomes across ALL departments. Equip LSA members and others across U-M to differentiate between DEI as an issue of representation, participation, and recognition of communities of color and a necessarily justice-focused component of deliberately anti-racist commitments. Require LSA department-level DEI plans with goals, action steps, and metrics for students, faculty, and/or staff, as appropriate for department type/function. Create a learning community for sharing/exchange of knowledge and effective models and practices across departments; partner with and provide on-going support to departments through developed principles and guidance for planning, along with resources (financial, educational, professional, etc.), and reward/recognition structures for authentic, impactful DEI efforts.
3. **Revisit and revise LSA Race & Ethnicity requirement**, (a) building on its past evaluation to refine the course requirement guidelines and approval process and (b) extending beyond the one course requirement to infuse anti-racism content across the College curriculum, including specific content on understanding, identifying, and working to change systemic (not only individual) forms of bias.
4. In future LSA justice-based DEI planning, **refine the concept of “climate” (and climate goals)** to focus on individual and group experiences reflecting systems of inequality, inequity, and injustice, rather than a primary focus on positive or negative intergroup interactions. Climate examinations and actions should include classroom, co-curricular, professional, l(ocal) community and non-curricular contexts and spaces that are racialized, gendered, ableist and otherwise supportive of majority structures and perspectives While important to distinguish unique experiences/needs of students, faculty, and staff, also consider linkages across the climate experiences of these groups, including safety and security.
5. **Leverage research and practice efforts around anti-racism led by LSA staff, faculty, and student community** and catalyze new ideas, innovations, and actions for greatest impact by establishing an infrastructure (e.g., institute or collaborative) for connecting existing and future anti-racism programs, including research initiatives, pedagogical and public programming, and local scholar-activist projects.

The task force also outlined in more detail challenges and recommendations around the following specific topic areas: (1) Undergraduate Enrollment and Retention; (2) Graduate Enrollment and Retention; (3) Faculty Diversity; (4) Staff Diversity; (5) Curriculum-R&E Requirement and Beyond; (6) College & Campus Climate; (7) Dismantling Carceral Practices and Policies; (8) U-M's Role in Urban and Tribal Communities in Michigan; and (9) Anti-racism and Responses to COVID-19.

## Section 1: LSA Anti-Racism Task Force Charge

*Group Charge.* A small task force group was formed in September by LSA Dean Anne Curzan (see task force charge document and membership in appendices). Key components of the charge included:

- Creating a clear statement of a vision and goals for anti-racism in teaching, research/scholarship, and service/engagement in LSA.
- Identifying institutional policies, practices, programs, and positions in the college (and at the university, as relevant) that sustain systemic racism and that must be investigated, revised, and/or overturned.
- Identifying current policies, practices, programs, and positions that contribute to eliminating racism and racial inequities and that merit additional investment to meet these goals.
- Proposing an infrastructure and concrete next steps required for advancing anti-racism as a core value in LSA work. This could include specific actions/changes that can and should be done immediately by LSA based on extant data and clear indicators of impact; needed data gathering/synthesis and stakeholder input processes; as well as necessary structures, partnerships or collaboratives to be formed within and/or outside of LSA in order to advance anti-racism.

It should be noted that our task force is made up of faculty, staff, and students across a range of LSA disciplines/fields, academic and administrative units, and demographic backgrounds (gender, race/ethnicity). The group is not representative of all LSA departments and units, but all appointed task force members have expertise and records of sustained engagement in anti-racism work, at the department, college, university, and/or broader community and public levels. Furthermore, the task force process was intended to provide a foundation for the next stages of College work on anti-racism, including formal and informal input processes on the report recommendations across a broad range of LSA community constituencies and stakeholders.

*Task Force Process.* Our group met over the course of the Fall 2020 semester to identify and outline key challenges, barriers, and potential action steps and solutions. We spent time in full group and subgroup meetings and tasks, reviewing extant and emerging work related to anti-racism in higher education and society, sharing information from our respective colleagues/networks across campus, gathering information and learning about other related efforts (on campus and nationally), and identifying and prioritizing potential solutions that may work in LSA and at U-M. Through this work, we identified challenges and action steps - some that could be more quickly implemented or executed to provide immediate relief/support to those in our community; along with challenges and action steps that require medium-, longer-term and sustained efforts for recovery and reform.

We are mindful of the fact that challenges of systemic racism in our College community reflect historical, on-going, broader institutional and societal inequalities that are deep-seated; and as such, will require proactive and long-term sustained efforts to address them. This report is an initial step in our long-term fight to dismantle systemic racism. In it, we articulate an aspirational vision of an anti-racist LSA in its teaching, research and scholarship, and engagement missions; identify key challenges or obstacles to realizing this vision within our current structural and cultural processes and norms, and recommend priority areas for focusing immediate energy and action and for organizing for change. The report is intended to provide a transformative framework and set of priorities to inform LSA Dean Curzan and her leadership team in planning the necessary next steps and infrastructures to put into place to advance anti-racism as a part of the fabric and functioning of LSA and to make anti-racism a central and necessary component of LSA's DEI goals and strategic planning going forward. *These next steps and structures will draw on the expertise and require the energy, commitment, and participation of many departments/units, faculty, staff, and students across our College.*

## Section 2: Introduction & Vision Statement

### LSA ANTI-RACISM VISION and COMMITMENT STATEMENT

*How can we live up to being the institution that we say we are — one that strives to be diverse in its members, as well as equitable, just, and inclusive for all members of our campus and society? How can we move beyond limiting parameters and discourses that have been constructed in and around our university's current DEI efforts to explicitly name and institute commitments to anti-racism, including social and racial justice? What would it take to realize these visions in LSA?*

Through our task force work, we developed and offer the following vision and commitment statement to support and guide efforts and actions to advance anti-racism as a core value in the fabric, operation, and functioning of our College:

Anti-racism is fundamental to advancing our core values of diversity, equity, and inclusion, and necessarily challenges current and future DEI efforts to address racial injustice beyond generalized issues of representation and climate. Thus, we are committed to recognizing and taking action to eliminate systemic and institutional racism. We commit to actively and collaboratively engaging in the functions of teaching, scholarship, and service/engagement in ways that challenge and reduce racial oppression and injustice - at individual, interpersonal, structural, and institutional levels - within all aspects of our academic units, college, university, communities, and society.

- We are committed to - creating, supporting and nurturing, and sustaining a community of students, faculty, and staff that is reflective of our increasingly racially and culturally diverse society, a necessary condition for advancing anti-racism in our College community. Achieving this requires full inclusion of communities of color within the university community. Without a critical mass of students, faculty and staff from historically underrepresented and marginalized racial/ethnic groups, the university - and the College by extension - will remain an exclusionary institution incapable of contributing to the larger mission of ending structural racism in the U.S.
  - We are committed to the revision, development, and implementation of strategies and practices that dismantle racism and racial oppression within all aspects of our academic units, college, university, communities, and society. We will work to ensure that these strategies and practices are grounded in knowledge from scholarship and practice, including forms of knowledge that are created by members of racially marginalized communities and that center the lived experiences of racially marginalized communities.
  - We are committed to the on-going work of anti-racism; thus, we will engage in continual education, exploration, examination, and self-reflection around explicit and implicit racial biases and injustices embedded in the life and culture of the College as manifested through our policies, programs, practices, and social norms. As we learn about these biased structures and norms, we commit to naming, addressing, and correcting them. The task of deepening our anti-racist education must be paired with purposeful systemic changes to promote racial equity and justice within our College community.
  - We emphasize that an anti-racist LSA requires participation and action across all parts and constituencies of our College community. Anti-racist actions and efforts should not be viewed as only the dean's office or central administration's responsibility; nor should it be approached as only or primarily the labor of racially marginalized communities. It is important though to address the balance of providing racially marginalized groups the opportunity (but not the obligation) to participate in change efforts, as well as to honor, invite, and center the scholarly expertise of our faculty and students (of all races and ethnicities) whose intellectual foci include critical race and ethnic studies across various disciplines. Racism undermines and compromises the excellence, integrity, and health of our entire College and University community. Thus, the anti-racism charge must be embraced and undertaken by all of us; we are all accountable.
-

## **Background and Context:**

Important context for our task force work - supported by institutional data and other documented data on the experiences of LSA community members - includes:

--The U.S. is moving towards a majority-minority population, and our higher education system is not reflecting that diversity, nor are communities of color reaping the full benefits of higher education.

--Michigan's Proposition 2 (outlawing race- and gender-based affirmative action) has undercut Black and Native American enrollment and severely limited Latino/a/x enrollment. University admissions policies and practices have not yet effectively accounted for both racial inequities in public education in the state and nation in ways that would enable the restoration and eventually the expansion of enrollments of historically underrepresented racial/ethnic minority (URM) groups in higher education. University- and college-level efforts also have not yet adequately addressed documented campus and classroom climate concerns among students from Black, Indigenous, and People of Color backgrounds (or, BIPOC, which include both URM and non-URM students of color, both which experience racially marginalizing campus climates) that contribute to challenges in successful recruitment of BIPOC students.

--The overall representation (percentage) of URM faculty in LSA has been largely stagnant, despite innovative initiatives like the LSA Collegiate Fellows and Presidential Postdoctoral Fellowship Program. Most URM faculty in LSA are in a handful of departments (e.g., see faculty diversity section of report). Proposition 2 contributes additional barriers (many in the form of misperceptions about the policy and legal parameters) to active recruitment of URM faculty. Documented climate concerns persist among URM faculty (and non-URM faculty of color), including contributions of climate to attrition.

--Staff diversity (including representation from URM communities) is low and an ongoing challenge for the College and broader campus. Proposition 2 contributes to additional barriers (including misconceptions of policy) to active recruitment. Staff climate reports indicate that URM staff report the most negative climate experiences. Along with explicit or overt racially stigmatizing experiences (e.g., discrimination, microaggressions, stereotype-based treatment or expectations), toxic or dysfunctional work climates/ecosystems in some units can function in indirect and less explicit ways to stigmatize, devalue, or demoralize, thereby contributing to staff attrition.

-- Many faculty, staff, and students of color report "standing out like a sore thumb," feeling out of place, needing to represent or perform race, and otherwise being hypervisible in unwelcome ways. Simultaneously, many also report being invisible when attention is needed or deserved. This problem is particularly pronounced when community members are moving from environments in which they were the majority and that embraced their identities to predominantly White U-M and LSA environments that may misunderstand and/or devalue their personal and cultural identities and contributions.

--Too often, popular DEI programmatic approaches (for students, faculty, staff) concentrate too heavily on intra/interpersonal processes (implicit bias, individual cultural awareness) as the sole or primary solution for systemic inequities. In order to realize real advances towards racial equity within the university there must be greater focus on systemic and institutional processes (at the levels of the College and departments) (including hiring, admissions, promotions, awards, and advancement, etc.) as the focus of interventions.

## **Guiding Principles for a Vision of Advancing Anti-racism in LSA**

We make explicit several guiding principles that informed our vision and recommendations for an anti-racist LSA:

- Anti-racism as a central tenet within our diversity, equity, and inclusion values and goals must be made an explicit and integrated hub/axis/fulcrum of our institution's core mission.
- Effective and authentic diversity, equity, and inclusion work must include and cannot be disconnected from anti-racism efforts, which require a focus on racial equity and justice. Anti-racism should be embedded in the work of DEI; and DEI work is insufficient and frequently ineffective without an explicit commitment to anti-racism.

- Anti-racism efforts and actions will recognize, remedy, and prevent racism in the form of structural barriers, interpersonal mistreatment, and internalized stigma.
- We must prioritize increasing racial/ethnic diversity, i.e., demographic representation of underrepresented and marginalized racial/ethnic groups, as a necessary condition for achieving an anti-racist LSA. Efforts to advance equity and inclusion in the experiences and outcomes of our faculty, staff, student, and affiliated communities will be limited and incomplete if our campus community doesn't actually represent and reflect our state and national population demographics. This requires attention not only to recruitment efforts, but also retention and advancement of groups.
- An anti-racist LSA requires truth-seeking, challenging and changing the culture and climate – “we” (LSA members) create and/or reinforce many of the policies and procedures that we are trying to improve or change; and if “we” do not systematically call out and address what is happening within and across our units, it will be impossible to create meaningful change.
- Anti-racism means moving beyond fixing negatives (e.g., responding to discrimination) to building positives, i.e., an optimal ecosystem where community members of Color can connect and thrive and where White community members have a shared sense of value, investment, and accountability around creating a racially diverse, inclusive, equitable, and just environment.
- Anti-racism is addressing racism in both word and deed. LSA must confront and work to remedy the appearances and practices that alienate communities of color and community partners from the possibility of trust and full participation in U-M as a state university, e.g. superficial community engagement programs that don't include impacted communities in initial planning stages, continued investment in and support of “development” projects in Michigan cities without meaningful community input.
- Racism is a societal crisis, and advancing anti-racism as an LSA core value includes three types of crisis remedies: Relief (immediate actions), Recovery (short-term remedies), and Reconfiguration (fundamental, systematic, long-term changes). The work of creating and sustaining an anti-racist environment is courageously historically conscious, active, collaborative, deliberate, and on-going.

---

## Key Concepts and Definitions

The concepts and terms related to anti-racism (e.g., the term “anti-racism: itself, along with others such as “racism,” “whiteness,” etc.) can be defined and taken up in many ways. Below we make transparent the ways that we defined and used these terms for the purposes of our task force work and report.

**Racism** is the fusion of institutional and systemic discrimination, personal bias, bigotry, and social prejudice against Black people, Indigenous people and People Color in a complex web of relationships and structures that shade most aspects of life, and serves the function of upholding White supremacy. Racism limits the life chances and opportunities of BIPOC people, creates and maintains the hierarchical structure of Whiteness, and supports the internalization of beliefs of group dominance of White people and subordination of BIPOC people.

**Anti-Racism.** Anti-racism is the awareness of and active rejection of institutional, systemic and structural policies, practices and behaviors that create and maintain white supremacy. It is also the creation of new structures, policies, practices, behaviors, and relationships that undo their racist predecessors and the conditions that make them possible. As racist policies, practices, biases and behaviors exist in a complex web of relations, the work of anti-racism can be taken up by all, but is informed by group and individual power, status and context, and prioritizes futures in which Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) thrive. Anti-Racism is inextricable from efforts to dismantle ableism, classism, sexism, transphobia, and homophobia, as these structures are intricately connected in the maintenance of white supremacy and its attendant systems of hierarchies organized by the “normal,” the “normative,” and of course, the “superior.”

**Whiteness and White Privilege.** Whiteness does not refer to specific individuals within a particular racial group. Instead, it is the socially constructed idea of a White Race and a positionality in society by virtue of perceived color (White) at the top of the racial hierarchy, which positions white people as the standard for what is normal

and valuable and nonwhites as lacking morally, socially, culturally, and/or physically desirable characteristics associated with whiteness. The central positionality of whiteness produces white privilege, entitlement, superiority, and the ensuing effects of structural racism, interpersonal mistreatment, and internalized stigma.

White privilege refers to the collective unearned advantages, both historical and current, given to people based solely on their racial identification as white. These unearned advantages undergird White peoples' access to a range of rights, benefits, favor, and immunity, which results in their preferential treatment over People of Color.

**Structural/Institutional Racism** in the U.S. is the normalization and legitimization of an array of dynamics – historical, cultural, institutional and interpersonal – that routinely advantage whites while producing cumulative and chronic adverse outcomes for people of color. It is a system of hierarchy and inequity, primarily characterized by white supremacy – the preferential treatment, privilege and power for white people at the expense of Black, Latinx, Asian, Pacific Islander, Native American, Middle Eastern/North African and other racially oppressed people.

The university as an institution has its own political geographies that are interconnected with other political geographies and wherein we must work to see structural racism as the legitimation and codification of white supremacist ideas and behaviors into a system or network of policies, practices, and norms that work to routinely advantage White people and disadvantage BIPOC.

**Culture** includes the values, norms, and assumptions of our College organization; they are more often top-down (set by leaders via communications and reward structures, based on historical structures and influenced by the broader societal context) but continually reinforced at all levels of the organization.

**Climate** is a manifestation of culture; it includes individuals' and groups' perceptions and experiences of a setting or environment (e.g., what people observe, feel, hear in a setting). Climates can vary in different parts of an organization due to differences in local leadership and organizational structures and norms.

**Terms used to refer to racial/ethnic groups throughout report text:**

- *URM*: racial/ethnic minority groups categorized by federal government as historically underrepresented in U.S. higher education across fields and disciplines: Black, Latino/a/x, Native American, Native Hawaiian
- *non-URM People of Color*: racial/ethnic minority groups not categorized as historically underrepresented in U.S. higher education but that may be underrepresented in some fields/disciplines in U.S. higher education: Asian, Middle Eastern/North African
- *Students/Staff/Faculty of Color*: those identifying as Black, Latino/a/x, Native American, Asian, Pacific Islander, Native Hawaiian, Middle Eastern/North African
- *BIPOC*: Black, Indigenous, and People of Color
  - *Indigenous* refers to groups including those identifying as Native American, American Indian, Amerindian, Amerind, Indian, aboriginal American, or First Nation persons
- *APIA*: Asian and Pacific Islander Americans
- *MENA*: Middle Eastern/North African-identified individuals
- *Racially marginalized groups*: racial groups and communities that experience discrimination and exclusion (social, political and economic) because of unequal power relationships across economic, political, social and cultural dimensions.
- *People/Communities of Color*: individuals and groups made up members identifying as People of Color (Black, Latino/a/x, Native American/Indigenous, Asian, Pacific Islander, Native Hawaiian, Middle Eastern/North African)

---

## **Report Organization**

In the following report sections, we (a) first provide an overview of “key and cross-cutting recommendations” emerging from our task force work and analysis, including critical recommendations and cross-cutting themes such as accountability and climate. Next (b) are sections organized by different topic areas, e.g., undergraduate



enrollment and retention, graduate enrollment and retention, etc. For each topic section, we begin with an overview of our vision for an anti-racist LSA for that topic, followed by background context, then a table summary outlining challenges to that vision and recommendations for needed focus areas and steps for the next phases of LSA work on anti-racism.

- Note that we present the topic sections on student, faculty, and staff diversity first, given our contention that creating an environment that demographically reflects our state and nation is necessary for effectively advancing any other anti-racism work.
- We also note that the topic sections take up distinct, yet interconnected issues, so there is some intentional overlap in named issues and recommendation approaches. For instance, while there is a separate “climate section”, we also identify climate issues as an important area of focus within student focused sections and challenges related to student recruitment, enrollment, and retention.

## Section 3: Key and Cross-Cutting Recommendations

### Diversity & Demographic Representation as Necessary Condition for an Anti-Racist LSA:

1. LSA cannot realize the ideals of anti-racism if our College community is not representative of our surrounding communities and society; currently we fall well short of this goal. Thus, ***we recommend that LSA recommit to the goal of abundant representation (requiring increases) of African Americans, Latinx, Native Americans and Indigenous peoples, Asian Americans and Middle Eastern/North African peoples among its students, faculty, and staff*** (with metrics and benchmarks based on local, state, and/or national population data, disaggregated as appropriate) AND to a range of active recruitment and retention efforts and activities designed to meet that goal.
2. *Undergraduate admissions.* We recommend charging a workgroup to engage with the Office of Undergraduate Admissions (OUA) within the Office of Enrollment Management (OEM) around current U-M and LSA admissions policies to better understand the barriers to increased URM student enrollment at the recruitment, admissions, and enrollment stages.
  - a. Focus areas would include (a) how changes in standardized testing and high school curriculum requirements impact admissions and enrollment outcomes; (b) the curricular, financial, and perception barriers that restrict enrollment of students from the state's communities of color; and (c) the impact of programs such as the Go Blue Guarantee, Hail Scholarship, Wolverine Pathways (and other initiatives) on racial diversity in undergraduate enrollment.
  - b. The group should examine LSA's guidelines: (a) re-examination of LSA's admissions criteria preferences provided to OUA in order to consider potential biases or barriers that may inhibit enrollment of URM students to LSA; (b) explore how LSA's recruitment and financial aid resources might be better leveraged to increase URM enrollment (for in-state and out-of state students); and (c) consider in-state community and/or school preferences designed to increase enrollment of students of all races and ethnicities from the state's majority-minority and Indigenous communities.
  - c. The group should develop recommendations from information gathered for LSA's use in advocating for changes to university admissions policies designed to raise URM undergraduate enrollment levels to state and nationally-representative levels and to ensure a critical mass of students from Indigenous communities including but not limited to federally-recognized tribes. These recommendations must address the entirety of the admission process from increasing the numbers of URM applications to financial aid packages and matriculation rates for admitted URM applicants, to addressing climate issues that impact acceptance and matriculation.
3. *Graduate Students.* LSA should create a workgroup tasked with collaborating with Rackham Graduate School and departments to examine admissions criteria and processes and recommend strategies for addressing areas of inadequate diversity impact. Foci would include:
  - University Level Admissions and Recruitment*
    - a. Engage with Rackham to revisit criteria for the Rackham Merit Fellowship (RMF), created following the passage of Proposition 2 to help achieve student diversity in the context of the affirmative action ban. E.g., available data on what has been learned about criteria (outcomes, impacts) and about effectiveness of Rackham's policies for allocating RMFs to departments
    - b. Examine other university admissions policies that may undermine diversity goals (e.g., potential deterrent effects of required background checks on application/acceptance, etc.)
    - c. Leverage our College's position and influence to proactively advocate for changing university-level policies and practices that undermine DEI goals
    - d. Work with Rackham to establish pipeline programs that identify and provide research opportunities for URM undergrads with potential for PhD education in LSA departments, e.g., joining national programs such as the Mellon-Mays and/or McNair programs
  - Department Level Admissions and Recruitment*
    - a. Work with Rackham to examine the effectiveness of current recruitment programs for increasing graduate diversity in LSA departments (e.g., SROP, MICHERS); determine which LSA departments have had most success with these programs and draw on these departments' knowledge, models, and practices in sharing and extending to other LSA departments

- b. Create and/or make more visible available research opportunities in the College, in which URM undergraduates might gain experience.g., active training grants
  - c. Examine LSA departments' practices in applying RMF criteria in admissions processes, including expressed concerns about procedures for offering RMF fellowships to eligible waitlisted students, and addressing misperceptions that underrepresented students (or so called "diverse" students) are only eligible for RMF fellowships rather than "regular" departmental funding
  - d. Examine other department admissions and recruitment practices, including those from departments showing admissions and recruitment success in enhancing diversity. Share and encourage use of effective practices (e.g., holistic admissions review, strong recruitment weekend models), and actively discourage practices that contribute to low student diversity (e.g., privileging standardized tests despite empirical research showing test scores as poor predictors of graduate success).
4. *Staff Diversity, Retention, and Advancement:* LSA should create a workgroup - made up of Dean's office leadership and staff across units/departments - to engage in analysis of staff data and trends (demographics across roles, race and gender patterns in promotions, advancement, attrition).
- a. From this analysis, develop and implement a staff hiring, retention, and advancement plan that addresses the underrepresentation of staff of color across the college as well as in various staff leadership positions.
  - b. Given the size and complexity of roles and functions in LSA with regard to staff, this plan should also advocate for deep Human Resources staff expertise, experience, and capacity around DEI, including a dedicated HR DEI lead position.
5. *Faculty Diversity and Retention:* To improve faculty diversity, LSA should continue and build on promising models and practices for junior faculty hiring that have enhanced faculty diversity, AND more strategically and aggressively recruit senior faculty who can contribute to DEI. All departments should be required to demonstrate and document evidence-based strategies for increasing URM representation in applicant/candidate pools and equity-oriented evaluation and selection practices. To support faculty advancement, LSA should investigate race and gender bias in academic publishing and awards/recognitions to inform the development and implementation of equity principles and practices for evaluating scholarly impact across departments/disciplines. LSA should also refine processes for considering and recognizing faculty's many and varied DEI contributions for annual review and promotion and tenure. Creating clear pathways to leadership for faculty of color can also support retention, especially of senior faculty.
6. *Overcome Proposition 2 as a Barrier to Diversity:* Across efforts in staff, student, and faculty domains, address persisting misconceptions of Proposition 2 (affirmative action ban) that inhibit efforts and motivation to enhance student, staff, and faculty diversity. In addition to clarifying what is NOT permissible under the policy (e.g., hiring individuals because of their race or gender, or providing a financial benefit because of their race or gender), thoughtfully engage with departments/units about what they CAN do (e.g., explicitly focus efforts on increasing representation of URM and women in applicant pools; recruit by geographic location, field/topic areas, etc.).

### **Creating a Culture of Accountability & Partnership through Local Departments DEI Plans:**

7. Accountability was a cross-cutting theme. Key challenges observed were unevenness in LSA department efforts related to student, faculty, and staff DEI goals and outcomes and an overall lack of College-wide structures to incentivize and reward DEI efforts and outcomes across ALL departments. These challenges are critical ones, since much of the life and direction of the College (e.g., student curriculum and training; faculty hiring and evaluation; staff hiring and advancement) is driven at the department level. As such, *a key recommendation was requiring department/unit level DEI plans that include goals, strategies, and metrics related to students (undergraduate and graduate), staff, and/or faculty, as appropriate for the department/unit type/function.* Plans should:
  - a. specifically address structural racism within core practices across teaching, research/scholarship, and engagement/service domains
  - b. include strategies for improving department climate that prioritize changes to department processes and culture over improving interpersonal relations and individual affect/attitudes

- c. integrate evidence-based approaches for addressing race and gender bias in evaluation of scholarly impacts to counter disciplinary norms that explicitly and implicitly favor “white” scholars and forms of scholarship in ways that reproduce racial exclusions at the faculty and graduate student levels
  - d. address service inequities within the faculty and staff that result from excessive forms of “invisible labor” experienced by faculty and staff of color as well as women and LGBT+ faculty, as well as from joint appointments
8. College-level partnership, reinforcement, and support is also critical. LSA should provide (through an established DEI leadership infrastructure) on-going supports for departments as they develop, assess, and refine/improve their DEI plans, e.g., through developed informational guides, templates, and coaching, along with other educational, professional development, and financial resources needed to incentive and reward authentic department effort and advance departments’ success. LSA also should support a culture of accountability by linking approved department/unit DEI plans to valued departmental resources - such as budget and position/search requests, as well as recognitions/rewards to departments and department members for advancing DEI work. *The ultimate goal would be to support the creation of a “DEI learning community” across LSA departments, a community in which all view DEI as their responsibility; that draws on and leverages knowledge and expertise across departments for innovation and problem solving; where promising and successful ideas and models can be shared and adapted.*

### **Anti-racism in Curriculum (Race & Ethnicity Requirement and Beyond):**

9. *Revisit and revise the LSA Race & Ethnicity requirement.* These steps include building on recent evaluation of the requirement to refine the course requirement to better meet its intended goals and address current needs of student, faculty, and staff communities. (Consider suggested changes around renaming the requirement to reflect focus on anti-racism, requiring small class sizes to facilitate deeper faculty-student interaction, required instructor training on anti-racist pedagogy, creation of an interdepartmental anti-racism curriculum committee made up of expert faculty and staff, among other community suggestions).
10. Curriculum efforts should also extend beyond the one course requirement to infuse anti-racism content across the College curriculum, including specific content on understanding, identifying, and working to change systemic (not only individual) forms of bias.
  - a. Infusing anti-racism across the LSA curriculum also means taking inventory of department courses, co-curricular offerings, and pedagogical practices. In addition, taking action based on this inventory to better include and center perspectives, cultures, histories, and contemporary experiences of peoples/communities previously excluded from the discipline and/or aspects of the disciplinary tradition that promote white supremacy/privilege and treat racialized peoples/cultures as biologically or culturally inferior.
11. Engage the entire LSA community in a public dialogue on how race shapes policies and practices related to public safety, carceral logics, and law enforcement (including racialized and classed notions of “safety” and “security,” themselves; disparate and discriminatory policing and surveillance on campus; racially disparate criminalization of drug and alcohol use by students;; systems and cultures of sexualized violence; discriminatory admissions practices; DPSS’s relationship with various constituencies on campus; DPSS’s relationship to the Ann Arbor Police Department and how this relationship is mobilized to disproportionately criminalize communities of color.

### **College and Campus Climate Refined and Refocused:**

12. Climate challenges cross-cut every topic and population (staff, students, faculty) examined by the task force. The current LSA DEI plan includes attention to climate (mentioned numerous times); but its definition is unspecified, and the concept of climate is not linked explicitly to inequality. In future DEI planning, LSA should more clearly articulate and refine its working concept of “climate” (and associated climate goals) to focus on how individual and group lived experiences reflect systems of inequality, and focus interventions on those systems.

- a. In doing so, actively counter the common tendency (described in research on DEI and organizational processes) to place a primary or sole focus on positive or negative intergroup interactions among individuals or on individuals' feelings/affect (usually of majority/privileged group members) as the key/valued outcome or primary target of intervention.
- b. Climate examinations and action steps also should include the broad range of settings in which our community members operate - classroom, co-curricular, professional, and non-curricular/professional contexts and spaces that are racialized and gendered.
- c. While it is important to distinguish the unique experiences and needs of students, faculty, and staff in climate analysis and work, also consider linkages across the climate experiences of marginalized faculty, staff, and students, including experiences of safety and security.
- d. Across students, staff, and faculty, improve and/or clarify reporting mechanisms and processes for climate experiences such as discrimination and biased treatment.

### **Leverage and Mobilize Collective Power of Anti-Racism Efforts across LSA & Campus:**

13. The culture of decentralization within U-M and LSA can be a strength - allowing for autonomy and blooming of new ideas and initiatives. One of few downsides is that it can be hard for various related initiatives to know about and connect with one another. Bringing together research and practice efforts around anti-racism could innovate new ideas, catalyze collaboration, and create broader impacts. As such, *LSA should establish an infrastructure (e.g., anti-racism institute or collaborative) for connecting and leveraging existing and future anti-racism programs, including research initiatives and pedagogical and public programming*
  - a. This could include building on/partnering with the recently launched Provost's Anti-racism Initiative that includes faculty cluster hires and that charges NCID to develop an infrastructure that serves as a "connector" of campus scholarly and engaged anti-racism work. Such an infrastructure could help facilitate connections and collaborations among important College and campus initiatives led by LSA faculty and staff, such as the Carceral State Project, the R&E/Anti-racism course requirement, Semester in Detroit, the Intergroup Relations Program, etc. The infrastructure could also help spark new ideas and efforts that could engage LSA faculty, staff, and students around anti-racism topics. Newly hired LSA faculty (e.g., through anti-racism cluster search) could help lead/co-lead the new infrastructure.

In the following sections, we focus in more detail on specific topics - describing challenges and recommendations for action around: (1) *Undergraduate Enrollment and Retention*; (2) *Graduate Enrollment and Retention*; (3) *Faculty Diversity*; (4) *Staff Diversity*; (5) *Curriculum-R&E Requirement and Beyond*; (6) *College & Campus Climate*; (7) *Dismantling Carceral Practices and Policies*; (8) *U-M's Role in Urban and Tribal Communities in Michigan*; and (9) *Anti-racism and Responses to COVID-19*.

## Section 4: Undergraduate Student Enrollment and Retention

### *Vision for Anti-racism in Undergraduate Enrollment and Retention*

LSA's aspiration for advancing anti-racism requires our U-M undergraduate community to be reflective of our increasingly multiracial and multicultural society; and specifically reflective of the nation's African-American population (currently 13%), Latino/a/x (17%), Native American (1.6%) and Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander populations (0.4%). It should also be emphasized that Indigenous enrollment at U-M should reflect strong institutional relationships with Michigan's 12 federally-recognized tribes. The University's undergraduate enrollment goals should reflect both U-M's mission as a public institution and the demonstrated importance of critical mass if students of color are to thrive in the institution.

For more than a decade now, since the passage of Proposition 2, the racial and ethnic diversity of the U-M undergraduate student population has been woefully inadequate. When you include students who identify as 2 or more Races, the U-M undergraduate population in the Fall of 2020 was 5.00% African-American (Black), 6.97% Hispanic (Latinx), and 0.95% Native American . Of the students who identify as Black, 1,251 (3.99%) identify only as Black, while 315 (1.01%) identify as 2 or more Races including Black (but not with any of the Indigenous categories). Of the Native American students, 36 (0.11%) identify as Native American only, and 263 (0.84%) identify as part Native American. With the inclusion of Hawaiian students (93, 0.3%), the total number of Indigenous students is 392 (0.98%). The following table demonstrates how little progress the university has been able to make over the past decade in addressing the underrepresentation of African-American, Latinx, and Indigenous students despite the implementation of a number of well-conceived recruitment and retention initiatives/programs. While the overall growth of the URM undergraduate student population (to 13.22%) and the growth of Latinx student enrollment appear impressive at first glance, as a matter of percentages both remain less than half of their proportion of the total U.S. population (32% and 17% respectively). At their present rate of growth, Latinx and URM student enrollment will remain well below national population levels in 2030 and beyond. And the current situation is demonstrably more challenging for African-American and Native American enrollments as both have failed to keep up with the overall growth of undergraduate student enrollment over the past decade as well their proportions of the total U.S. population (13% and 1.6% respectively). Without significant new recruitment, admissions and retention initiatives that directly address the roadblocks created by both structural inequalities in K-12 education and Proposition 2, the university is destined to continue to fail to reach the critical mass of underrepresented students necessary to becoming an anti-racist institution.

**U-M UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT DEMOGRAPHICS RACE/ETHNICITY FY 2010-2020**  
**Number of students in Fall (% of total undergraduate students)**

	2010*	2015	2020	Percentage Change, 2010-2020
Total Undergraduate Enrollment	27,027	28,312	31,329	15.92%
Black Student Enrollment**	1,423 (5.27%)	1,414 (4.99%)	1,566 (5.00%)	10.04%
Hispanic Student Enrollment***	1,167 (4.32%)	1,300 (4.59%)	2,184 (6.97%)	87.15%

Native American Student Enrollment <sup>#</sup>	263 (0.97%)	247 (0.87%)	299 (0.95%)	13.69%
Total URM Student Enrollment <sup>###</sup>	2,891 (10.70%)	2,999 (10.59%)	4,142 (13.22%)	43.27%

Source: University of Michigan Office of the Registrar. Table compiled by Matthew J. Countryman  
\*2010 is the first year of the 2 or More Race Category and the first year that each undergraduate class had been admitted under Proposition 2 restrictions

\*\*Includes students who identify as 2 or more Races including African-American (not including any of the indigenous categories)

\*\*\*Students who identify as Hispanic can be of any race and are not included in any of the other census categories

#Includes students who identify as 2 or more Races including Native American

###In addition to Black, Hispanic, and Native American students, includes students who identify as Hawaiian and 2 or more Races including Hawaiian

Along with a robust demographic representation, an anti-racist LSA environment is one where all LSA undergraduates - including those from historically racially underrepresented or marginalized backgrounds - experience a climate in which they feel represented, included, and supported. Unfortunately, there is significant evidence (from university, college, and department climate surveys, department and community feedback, and other student reports of their lived experiences) that this is not happening. Students of color routinely report experiencing isolation or hypervisibility, interpersonal experiences of bias, microaggressions, and discrimination based in group stereotypes, among other stigmatizing experiences.

**Background: Challenges, Opportunities, and Key Recommendations**

What are the obstacles to this vision? What steps are needed to redress these obstacles?

The state ban on race-based affirmative action in admissions (Proposition 2) makes achieving the goal of critical mass of students particularly challenging. However, the affirmative action ban cannot and should not be the basis for setting reduced goals for racial diversity. Instead the university must commit to adopting aggressive, creative, and sufficiently-resourced strategies for overcoming the structural barriers and challenges to full-enrollment of students of color at the undergraduate level. Areas of action needed to address student experience must take a holistic approach, including academic departments (as majors, minors, in gateway classes, in curriculum etc.), student organizations, housing, and financial aid, among other areas and spaces. Below we highlight selected barriers and challenges (where we are now) and recommended foci and action steps toward achieving where we want to be - an anti-racist LSA community for our undergraduate students.

*(A) Admissions and Recruitment:*

Examples of key barriers and challenges we identified and prioritized include:

- Current ways of categorizing race, for example the 2 or More Race category and the lack of a Middle Eastern/North African (MENA) category, can obscure understanding of demographic patterns and leave some groups invisible within the demographic data
- The University's lack of stated enrollment goals
- The State of Michigan ban on racial preferences in Admissions (Proposition 2)
- University & LSA Admissions policies (standardized test requirements, carceral background checks, etc.) that may effectively limit demographic diversity in student enrollment
- Inconsistent LSA involvement in university recruitment efforts
- Financial Aid resources not targeted to increase racial diversity
- Proposition 2 contributes to the perception that UM is not hospitable institution for URM students

Selected key recommendations for addressing these challenges and barriers include:

- Disaggregate census category group data to better understand group-specific patterns
- Set appropriate goals for increasing URM/BIPOC representation in the short-term and longer-term; develop data-based answers to the following goal-oriented questions:
  - “What would it take to reach a goal of at least 25% URM students in 5 years?”, “Given differences in URM and BIPOC populations at state and national levels, what aggressive and feasible benchmarks and goals can we set for increases in different URM groups in 5 years? In 10 years?”
- Review LSA admissions criteria to identify barriers to increased URM enrollments in the college
  - Among the strategies that should be considered are holistic exploration of admissions requirements, admissions preferences for the state’s cities and/or urban public and tribal high schools and community colleges
- Benchmark successful URM recruitment programs nationwide
- Expand LSA involvement in successful UM k-12 recruitment and college readiness programs (Wolverine Pathways, etc.)
- Develop internal and external communications strategy to explain what is and what is not permitted under Proposition 2; proactively dispel persistent myths and misconceptions and share legally compliant strategies
- Engage college-wide discussion of the impact of Proposition 2 and possible approaches to seeking the restoration of affirmative action in admissions.

*(B) Retention:*

Examples of key barriers and challenges we identified and prioritized include:

- Racial group disparities in retention, academic experiences, and post-graduation pathways
- Financial challenges that disproportionately impact URM students
- Negative peer climates and interactions in classrooms, labs, fieldwork
- Uneven diversity climates across academic units/programs
- Many LSA units have little incentive to prioritize DEI efforts/create more inclusive climates for URM students
- Exclusionary (by race and social class) climates within undergraduate student organizations

Selected key recommendations for addressing these challenges and barriers include:

- Compile data on URM retention within LSA, with a specific emphasis on first gen BIPOC student experiences and the impact of financial challenges on URM retention
- Identify campus spaces and best practices that contribute to positive experiences for URM students
- Identify high leverage, critical campus spaces and time points for anti-racist education, training, and socialization practices that contribute to the positive experiences of BIPOC students
- Identify and promote inclusive pedagogy practices that create inclusive classroom cultures and that facilitate URM student success
- Examine normative academic practices that contribute to unwelcoming academic environments for URM students
- Promote anti-racist and inclusive practices within both academic units and student organizations

*(C) Cross-cutting Challenge - Department Level Accountability:*

A cross-cutting area of barrier and challenge is that LSA departments and department faculty are uneven in their willingness to take on proposed structural and cultural changes to advance DEI and anti-racism. Furthermore, there is low accountability and few incentives for all departments to prioritize and act to enhance DEI. One key recommendation for addressing this challenge is a requirement for all departments to develop DEI plans with appropriate goals, actions, and outcome metrics on which they report annually. These plans should include a



**specific focus on undergraduate students** (as appropriate to the unit's mission) and efforts to enhance diversity (representation) and equity and inclusion outcomes for their undergraduate community, e.g.:

- Department contributions toward successful recruitment of diverse student majors
- Positive major retention and completion and honors participation
- Decreasing/eliminating any racial disparities in the above outcomes
- Efforts to engage faculty around enhancing DEI practice/skill, such as participation in inclusive pedagogy professional development offerings
- Infusion of inclusive pedagogy and/or DEI content across dept courses, curriculum, and/or co-curricular offerings
- Positive climate outcomes
- Rewards, recognitions and incentives provided to faculty for inclusive teaching, advising and mentoring efforts and impacts

LSA should partner and support departments in developing and advancing their DEI plans and goals; for example, LSA leadership should:

- Provide guides, principles, and templates for department plans; work with departments to tailor plans in ways that reflect and are appropriate for their disciplines and programs
- Provide on-going supports (incentivizing resources for positive efforts and outcomes, education, coaching) to help build capacity and support department work to advance anti-racism in the diversity of our undergraduate community, as well as their equitable access to high quality, inclusive, and supportive learning and social environments

Finally, it is important to note that for some recommendations, LSA oversees and controls policies and practices that could be changed or revised; in contrast, other recommendations relate to policies/structures not under LSA's control so would require LSA to partner with other university or community units/offices and/or require LSA to use its leverage and influence to advocate for change.

## Section 5: Graduate Student Enrollment and Retention

### ***Vision for Anti-racism in Graduate Enrollment and Retention***

An anti-racist College and campus for graduate students is one in which

- student diversity is represented across disciplines,
- the contributions of students of color are recognized and valued,
- the metrics for academic, research, and professional success are aligned with the priorities and values of students of color (e.g., supporting communities of color, engagement with the community)
- students of color are involved in department and college decision-making
- invisible (and visible) systems do not disadvantage students of color
- students of color feel they can bring their whole selves into their curricular, co-curricular, and surrounding community spaces
- students of color are treated with respect and not as tokens or stereotypes
- students of color witness faculty and staff of color being treated with respect and not as tokens or stereotypes
- the UM/LSA community is committed to the success of graduate students of color
- all students, faculty, and staff are expected to contribute positively to a culture of diversity, equity, inclusion, and anti-racism, and these expectations are signaled explicitly in department norms, policies, and processes (including reward systems)

Even more so than for undergraduates, LSA and LSA departments have direct control over who is admitted to its graduate programs; LSA departments also have uniquely close and up close engagement with the subsequent day-to-day academic and research development experiences of graduate students (socialization, training, mentoring). As such, advancing anti-racism in graduate education admissions, recruitment, and cultural practices is a critical imperative and action space for LSA and LSA departments.

Along with our obligations to graduate students themselves, an anti-racist investment in graduate students is critical to an anti-racist academy. So much of undergraduate classroom (and research) experience is influenced by interactions with graduate student instructors and researchers; as such the diversity and culture of graduate students makes a tremendous impact. Graduate students are also a population that changes on a faster timescale than faculty, so there is the potential to more quickly affect change and influence the future of the academy, in terms of its racial make-up and culture.

### ***Background: Challenges, Opportunities, and Key Recommendations***

To achieve this vision, we must

- Increase representation
- Reduce/remove interpersonal racist experiences, promote respect
- Dismantle structural systems of oppression, both visible and invisible
- Increase psychosocial, scholarly, and career support
- Foster belonging and inclusion, create welcoming climate

Based on 2020 data, of the 2656 total graduate students in LSA, 14.5% (n=386) identify as URM, based on registrar's categories of *Black*, *Hispanic*<sup>1</sup>, *Native American*, *Hawaiian*, and *two or more races/URM*<sup>2</sup>. (All are

---

<sup>1</sup> The use of term, "Hispanic," here instead of Latinx is based on registrar's office category labels and definitions, which are based on U.S. census categories.

<sup>2</sup> The "2 or more races category was instituted in 2010 (with subcategories for URM and non-URM). Prior patterns suggest that some of the "two or more more races/URM" students would have been previously categorized in the Native American and Black categories, as all students identifying as Hispanic - regardless of multiracial status - are categorized in the Hispanic group. But, even accounting for this, the numbers within and across these groups are still very low compared to state and national populations.

U.S. citizen or permanent resident students, including DACA students). When disaggregating these numbers, we see 4.2% (n=112) Black students, 8.3% (n=221) Hispanic students, .003% (n=8) Native American students, .02% (n=45) two or more races/URM students, and 0 Hawaiian students. Among non-URM students of color<sup>3</sup>, students categorized as Asian (U.S. citizen or permanent resident) represent 5.5% (n=147) of graduate students, and those identifying with two more races/non-URM reflect 1.6% (n=44) of graduate students.

Further, when looking over the past decade (since 2010), the numbers of URM students have increased over the past 10 years, with Hispanic (Latinx) students increasing at the greatest rate and Black students remaining fairly flat. In contrast, Native American, Native Hawaiian, and Asian students have not increased appreciably over this period. [For more information on student breakdowns, see ethnicity reports on the U-M registrar's site here: <https://ro.umich.edu/reports/ethnicity>].

While these data paint a stark picture of overall LSA graduate student diversity, we know that students of color are not distributed evenly across programs; some departments have been more active and have had more success in recruiting talented students of color AND in mentoring and supporting them to doctoral degree attainment. (For instance, within social sciences it is of note that our Departments of Sociology, Political Science, and Psychology have been in the top 10 groups of departments in the country within their disciplines with regard to URM PhD recipients.)

These data naturally lead to several key questions and recommended focus areas:

- What are the historical, structural, and cultural barriers around admissions and recruitment that inhibit departments from building strong and racially diverse student cohorts, cohorts that include significant representation from URM and BIPOC backgrounds? [This includes the common barrier of units not engaging in active recruitment efforts based on the misperception or unfounded excuse that “the students of color aren’t out there”.]
- What can we learn from the departments that have had more success in enhancing and maintaining student diversity that could be integrated into the practices and structures of other departments? For instance:
  - What recruitment practices, models, and “pipeline” programs and pathways do these departments use or take advantage of to support student diversity and equity in success?
  - What equity- and inclusion-oriented processes and practices do they use in admissions?
  - What structures and norms for student mentoring and support have they instituted?
- What structures need to be in place - at department and College levels - to ensure that equitable and inclusive practices are used across ALL departments in ways that improve student diversity and success outcomes?

Below we highlight selected barriers and challenges (where we are now) and **example key recommendations** for foci and action steps toward achieving where we want to be - an anti-racist LSA community for our graduate students. With regard to LSA's roles in needed action steps, we recognize and note that for some recommendations, LSA oversees and controls policies and practices that could be changed or revised; in contrast, other recommendations relate to policies/structures not under LSA's control so would require LSA to partner with other university or community units/offices and/or require LSA to use its leverage and influence to advocate for change.

---

<sup>3</sup> Currently data are not collected on MENA students. Despite efforts such as the *We Exist* and *MENA Box* campaigns there has been institutional inertia in addressing this issue. Addressing this omission is one of the task force's cross-cutting recommendations for advancing anti-racism for students, staff, and faculty.

## 1. *Admissions and Recruitment:*

Example key barriers and challenges we identified and prioritized include:

- URM enrollments are largely stagnant, with some variations between racial and ethnic groups
- URM enrollments vary widely across departments and programs.
- Census-based racial and ethnic categories that can obscure understanding of group patterns, leaving some demographic groups invisible
- Lack of clear goals for student racial diversity
- Admissions policies and practices that contribute to the lack of student diversity (e.g. standardized test requirements that don't reflect empirical research or Rackham data and recommendations)
- Lack of clarity about criteria for Rackham Merit Fellows (RMF) criteria as well as how those criteria are implemented at the department level
- Lack of incentives for active recruitment of URM students
- Uneven participation across departments/programs in outreach/recruitment programs and practices

Selected key recommendations include:

- Disaggregate URM group data to understand group-specific patterns and to develop action plans tailored to individual groups and disciplines/graduate programs.
- Set an overall goal of 25% URM graduate enrollment in 5 years as well as more specific goals tailored to individual groups and disciplines/graduate programs.
- Review process for allocating RMFs across LSA departments and identify potential improvement areas
- Study impact of RMF criteria on admission practices at the departmental level
- Review departmental practices for allocating RMFs (e.g., how waitlist is used, whether departments view RMFs as for URM" students and "regular" slots for non-URM students)
- Conduct review of LSA admissions criteria and practices used at department levels for potential biases or barriers that inhibit or contribute to URM enrollment
- Ensure that departments are clear on legal parameters of admissions (i.e. what is and what is not permissible under Proposition 2)
- Review resource investments needed to increase diversity (supports for active and successful recruitment)
- Examine critical features of recruitment-focused programs; examine which departments have used programs with most success; improve active LSA participation and recruitment across departments, including the Summer Research Opportunities Program (SROP, natural and social sciences) and MICHHERS (humanities)
- Consider ways to better leverage our own campus undergraduate programs (UROP, M-STEM, etc.) to create more pathways to U-M/LSA graduate studies for U-M undergraduates
- Review lessons learned from Bridges to Doctorate programs (in selected natural sciences departments and one humanities department) for increasing representation of marginalized groups in LSA PhD programs
- Support/expand department-based recruitment weekend visitation programs that have been most effective
- Create College-level partnerships with Minority Serving Institutions; identify those LSA departments and individual faculty members that have established positive, high quality relationships
- Provide resources to send faculty and students to recruitment conferences and networks, e.g. California Forum for Diversity & Grad Education (CFDGE), and Society for Advancement of Chicanos/Hispanics and Native Americans in Science (SACNAS)
- Reward successful initiatives to recruit and mentor URM grad students by individual faculty/staff/students and departments

## 2. *Retention:*

Examples of key barriers and challenges we identified and prioritized include:

- Racial group disparities in retention, academic experiences, financial resources, etc.

- Negative peer climates and interactions in classrooms, labs, fieldwork
- Unevenness across departments/programs in climate and efforts to create and maintain equitable and inclusive environments, promote positive student experiences
- Low accountability (or incentives) tied to how effective departments are in recruiting, training, and retaining graduate students
- Lack of DEI support for GSIs, with explicit attention to anti-racism and inclusive pedagogy
- BIPOC students asked disproportionately to take on DEI work that is not credited or recognized and can divert students from research/progress to degree
- Potential racial disparities in professional preparation/career transition experiences for BIPOC students

Selected key recommendations include:

- Resources and supports to address financial challenges that disproportionately impact BIPOC students, especially those from less economically advantaged backgrounds (e.g. housing, scholarships)
- Review data on racial/ethnic patterns of retention for LSA graduate students and allocation of resources (e.g., special fellowships and awards for URM and BIPOC students)
- Conduct systematic review of extant graduate student reported data (e.g., climate data, Rackham program review and other survey data) to consider the resources and supports critical to LSA BIPOC students' persistence
- Identify the critical spaces, interaction types, and actors that contribute to a positive experiences for BIPOC students
- Increase departmental accountability for graduate student experiences and outcomes, including DEI outcomes
- Identify normative disciplinary practices that may have unique negative consequences for climate and experiences of marginalized graduate students
- Consider College-wide affinity groups to support BIPOC students in departments with low racial/ethnic diversity
- Improve GSI training and professional supports around DEI, incorporate more anti-racism and inclusive pedagogy content focused on supporting both BIPOC and White GSIs
- Develop ethical principles and recommended practices for recognizing, rewarding, crediting, and/or compensating graduate students for contributions to/work for LSA and/or departmental DEI initiatives.
- Examine existing Rackham and department-based professional developmental resources for how well they are serving BIPOC students
- Review content of professional development supports with focus on how they could more explicitly engage both BIPOC students' identities and cultures and anti-racism awareness and competency building activities and exposures for all students

### 3. *Cross-cutting Challenge - Department Level Accountability:*

As highlighted in the prior section, a cross-cutting area of barrier and challenge is that LSA departments and department faculty are uneven in their willingness to take on proposed structural and cultural changes to advance DEI and anti-racism, including within graduate education and their graduate student communities. This resistance or inaction is reinforced by low accountability and few incentives for all departments to prioritize and act to enhance DEI in this area. One key recommendation for addressing this challenge is a requirement for all departments to develop DEI plans with appropriate goals, actions, and outcome metrics on which they report annually. These plans should include a **specific focus on graduate students (as appropriate to the unit's mission) and efforts to enhance diversity (representation) and equity and inclusion outcomes for their graduate community**, e.g.:

- Successful recruitment of diverse student cohorts, including representation of URM/BIPOC students
- Positive climate outcomes
- Positive student retention, completion, career placement
- Decreasing/eliminating racial disparities in the above graduate outcomes
- Efforts to engage faculty in enhancing DEI practice/skill, such as inclusive pedagogy professional

- development or mentoring workshops focused on graduate student education and development
- Infusion of inclusive pedagogy and/or DEI content across dept graduate courses, curriculum, and/or co-curricular offerings
- Rewards, recognitions, and incentives for faculty inclusive teaching and mentoring efforts and impacts at the graduate level

LSA should partner and support departments in developing and advancing their DEI plans and goals; for example, LSA leadership should:

- Partner with Rackham to support development of appropriate metrics for outcomes and success, e.g., Rackham regularly provides all departments data on their recruitment, student progress/completion, and placement outcomes, disaggregated by URM, gender, international students
- Provide guides, principles, and templates for department plans; work with departments to tailor plans in ways that reflect and are appropriate for their disciplines and programs
- Provide on-going supports (incentivizing resources for positive efforts and outcomes, education, coaching) to help build capacity and support department work to advance anti-racism in the diversity of our undergraduate community, as well as their equitable access to high quality, inclusive, and supportive learning and social environments

## Section 6: Faculty Diversity

### ***Vision for Anti-racist Faculty Environment in LSA and U-M***

An anti-racist faculty space is one in which

- faculty diversity is represented across disciplines
- the contributions of faculty of color are recognized and valued
- the metrics for professional success are aligned with the priorities and values of faculty of color (e.g., supporting students of color, engagement with the community)
- faculty of color are involved in decision-making at all levels
- Invisible (and visible) systems do not disadvantage faculty of color
- faculty of color feel they can bring their whole selves into the workplace
- faculty of color are treated with respect and not as tokens or stereotypes
- the UM/LSA community is committed to the success of faculty of color
- all faculty, staff, and students are expected to contribute positively to a culture of DEI and anti-racism, and these expectations are signaled explicitly in hiring, evaluation, and reward processes

### ***Background: Challenges, Opportunities, and Key Recommendations***

To achieve this vision, we must

- Increase representation
- Reduce/remove interpersonal racist experiences, promote respect
- Dismantle structural systems of oppression, both visible and invisible
- Increase psychosocial and career support
- Foster belonging and inclusion, create welcoming climate

***(A) Recruitment and Hiring Issues.*** Faculty of color, particularly those from URM backgrounds, are woefully underrepresented in LSA, generally and especially in senior ranks. For example, in 2018, among LSA tenure track faculty, 13% were URM faculty (6% URM women, 7% URM men) and 13% were Asian faculty (5% Asian women, 8% Asian men). Looking by rank, these proportions are higher at the assistant professor rank (7% URM women, 8% URM men, 10% Asian women, 10% Asian men) than at full professor rank (5% URM women, 5% URM men, 4% Asian women, 7% Asian men). To address this lower diversity at higher ranks, a special focus on senior hires is needed. Further, senior faculty can help mentor and support junior scholars and augment the administration pipeline. In addition, continued hiring at both the assistant professor level is needed to increase overall faculty diversity.

*---Take Advantage of Faculty Hiring Programs.* With regard to junior faculty, LSA has made strides in enhancing faculty diversity by participating in DEI-focused programs like the [UM President's Postdoctoral Fellowship Program](#) (PPFP) and in developing and launching the [LSA Collegiate Fellows Program](#) (LCF). [E.g., the LSA-focused Collegiate Fellows program has resulted in 37 hires over 4 years; to date 33 have entered or will enter the tenure track (with 3 others to be evaluated for tenure track before/by fall 2021). The Fellows are demographically diverse (90% BIPOC, 60% URM, 70% women). These program outcomes are unmatched by any other comparable program in the country.]

Compared to efforts at the junior level, LSA has been relatively less strategic and proactive in focused faculty diversity efforts at the senior level. Concurrent with the work of this task force are new campus initiatives such as the provost's anti-racism faculty cluster hiring initiative. We encourage LSA efforts and planning to use such opportunities to take aggressive and strategic action to hire senior faculty whose scholarly work focuses on topics of racism, racial inequality, and racial justice.

*Beyond Special Programs and Initiatives.* While the noted programs and initiatives have and can continue to contribute to faculty diversity in important and significant ways, *they were never designed or intended to be the sole mechanisms for enhancing faculty diversity in LSA departments.* These programs were intended to complement and augment department hiring efforts. That is, in all junior faculty, senior faculty, and open rank searches, departments should have DEI hiring goals and strategies that guide them in being intentional in encouraging strong and diverse applicant pools and building equity-oriented evaluation and selection processes, to allow for the possibility of high quality URM and BIPOC faculty hires that otherwise would be excluded. DEI should be a core value in all faculty hiring processes.

---*The Importance of Data Disaggregation.* In advancing diversity hiring goals, LSA-specific hiring and projection data should be evaluated in disaggregated form - by racial/ethnic groups, by rank, by disciplinary divisions, and by departments - to determine group-specific inequity in hiring and develop focused solutions. Additionally, gender must be considered across these categories to achieve equity for women of color. The potential knowledge to be gained by such a disaggregation approach is illustrated in examples below using available faculty data.

*EXAMPLE 1:* For instance, LSA data below indicate low percentages of URM faculty, especially in the Natural Sciences division and somewhat in the Humanities division; and the lower URM faculty percentages at full professor rank is seen across divisions (although we note an increase in the % of URM faculty at associate rank relative to assistant and full ranks for Natural Sciences and Social Sciences). Low representation among Asian women is seen especially among tenured ranks across divisions, and among Asian men among tenured ranks in Humanities and Social Sciences divisions.

**Percentages of URM and Asian<sup>4</sup> Faculty in LSA Divisions**

	% URM women	% URM men	% Asian women	% Asian men
<b>Humanities</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>
Assistant	10	10	14	12
Associate	7	6	6	2
Full	3	6	3	3
<b>Natural Sciences</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>13</b>
Assistant	2	4	12	11
Associate	0	10	5	10
Full	1	4	3	12
<b>Social Sciences</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>
Assistant	10	10	7	9
Associate	13	17	5	5
Full	9	7	6	3

*EXAMPLE 2:* A 2020 report from the U-M Office of Research indicates that:

- Based on FY19 data, of tenure-track, research-track, and clinical track faculty at U-M, 4.5% (n=203) are Black, 4.1% (n=199) Latino/a/x, and 0.03% (n=15) are Native American. *[Notes: Latino/a/x faculty are concentrated more heavily in the research track, while Black and Native American faculty have little representation in the research track. LSA does not have clinical track appointed faculty.]*
- LSA is home to 33% of the Black faculty at U-M across tracks (n=67). Of those, 57% are appointed in 5 LSA departments (DAAS, Sociology, Psychology, Women’s and Gender Studies, and History).

<sup>4</sup> Note: here, HR data collected for “Asian” includes Asian and Pacific Islander/Native Hawaiian. One of our task force’s cross-cutting suggestions is the disaggregation of groups’ data to make visible the presence and experiences of different POC groups.



- LSA is home to 38% of the Latino/a/x faculty at U-M across tracks (n=76). Of those, 59% are appointed in 5 LSA departments (American Culture, Economics, Psychology, Romance Languages and Literature, and Sociology).
- LSA is home to 60% of the Native American faculty at U-M across tracks (n=9). Of those, 56% are appointed in 2 departments (Psychology and American Culture).

These data examples indicate that low racial/ethnic diversity is a university-wide issue, and from one perspective, LSA is faring better than a number of other academic units on campus with regard to representation of URM faculty. At the same time, the examples make clear that LSA's faculty diversity with regard to URM groups (and race-gender groups) is still low and more concentrated in certain ranks and in a small number of LSA departments and disciplines. In contrast, there is much less racial/ethnic diversity in other ranks and departments/disciplines. There also is imprecision in reporting representation and trends for some racial/ethnic groups (e.g., how current HR data categorization and aggregation practices do not distinguish Pacific Islander/Native Hawaiian from Asian or MENA-identified faculty<sup>5</sup> from White-identified faculty).

Taken together, the two examples highlight the need to provide a precise picture of the status of LSA faculty diversity by disaggregating further to achieve equity and using this information to inform hiring goals and actions and accountability around those goals and actions.

**(B) Evaluation, Advancement, and Promotion.** Among junior faculty who left U-M voluntarily (2011-2018), the most common reasons offered were insufficient mentoring and/or professional development, lack of recognition, and performance related expectations and evaluations. Therefore, LSA actions must focus on recognition (e.g., nomination for high prestige professorships and awards), mentoring, and evaluation processes.

*Revise Evaluation Processes.* Recent work suggests that scholarship in the center of the field (with “center” based on historical consensus in the discipline) is seen as more valuable and important than scholarship in subfields that are considered to be on the margins. This epistemic exclusion, or subfield bias, is theorized to be a result of both disciplinary biases regarding the qualities of “good” scholarship and prejudice towards marginalized groups who are more likely to work on the margins because of their social identities and personal experiences. These biases can thwart fair evaluation and need to be addressed to reduce racist evaluation processes.

In addition to strategies to reduce prejudice, there are important considerations that can lead to changes in evaluation processes that reflect disciplinary biases:

- Many disciplines have norms about the qualities of rigorous scholarship (e.g., objective, apolitical/value-free, generalizable). However, these are rooted in historical factors, including that academia was developed around the values of White men.
- In many fields there are mainstream journals and presses considered “top” or prestigious. However, scholars working on the margins may publish in specialized outlets appropriate for their work and through which they are most likely to receive expert feedback and informed peer review from top scholars in their specialty areas. Unfortunately, committee members may question the legitimacy of such publications or discount their records as less competitive even when it meets the threshold for a strong record.
- Metrics like journal impact factors favor scholarship published in mainstream outlets and work in broadly researched topic areas. Better indicators of quality include evaluations of expert readers or committee members’ assessment based on their knowledge of the field. Additionally, committee members might consider other important and appropriate alternative metrics of impact such as use of their scholarship to inform public policy, general readership or class adoption of their work, technological advances or development related to their scholarship, or improvements in community outcomes tied to their work.

**(C) Inclusion and Retention.** ADVANCE data indicate that URM faculty leave at higher proportions relative to their representation in LSA. Furthermore, among tenure-track faculty in LSA (AY2015-2019), 70% of URM faculty hired replace URM faculty who have left, and 63% of Asian faculty hired replace Asian faculty who have left. Therefore, it is critical to increase the retention of racially marginalized faculty in order to change the overall composition of LSA. Across campus, URM faculty report more bias and exclusion, and less voice and influence, which predict lower job satisfaction and thoughts of leaving. Among faculty of color who left U-M voluntarily

---

<sup>5</sup> Currently data are not collected on MENA faculty. Despite efforts such as the *We Exist* and *MENA Box* campaigns there has been institutional inertia in addressing this issue. Addressing this omission is one of the task force’s cross-cutting recommendations for advancing anti-racism for students, staff, and faculty.

(2011-2018), a negative climate was one of the two most commonly offered reasons. Therefore, inclusion is also a critical factor in faculty retention.

*Create greater equity in faculty salaries.* Given the data on LSA composition by division, it is important that faculty salaries in LSA divisions and units with more racially marginalized faculty be comparable to those with fewer racially marginalized faculty. For instance, if faculty of color are primarily found in a limited number of disciplines (as supported by institutional data), and those disciplines are those in which salaries are comparatively lower than others, then this is not simply a divisional/disciplinary difference; it is also a racial equity issue.

*Review practices around joint appointments.* Faculty jointly-appointed across LSA departments/programs may have unique challenges compared to non-jointly appointed faculty:

- Jointly-appointed faculty often do the same service as singly-appointed faculty members in each of their budgeted units. Therefore, service demands may be greater for them.
- Because much of the service done by racially marginalized faculty is invisible service (e.g., meeting with students of color, additional mentoring demands, community service), jointly-appointed faculty members of color may be particularly likely to be doing invisible service in multiple units.
- Faculty who are jointly-appointed may be working at the intersection of multiple fields. This may create additional challenges for their scholarship (e.g., learning to speak to multiple audiences to publish in multiple disciplines) and requires they meet evaluation standards in fields where norms may differ.

*Create pathways to leadership for racially marginalized faculty.* Given the previously noted finding that senior faculty members leave U-M voluntarily due to lack of leadership opportunities, retention of faculty of color may be increased by creating more pathways to leadership. These could include: development of leadership learning communities, opportunities to participate in leadership development programs, and leadership mentoring, among other opportunities. In addition, greater transparency from unit leaders around leadership appointments can open more opportunities to those without close personal and professional connections to their leaders.

From our analysis, we summarize below selected **Key Recommendations** to advance anti-racism in the domains of faculty recruitment/hiring and retention::

1. *Recruitment & Hiring:*

- Create database with disaggregated group data for benchmarking and accountability in faculty hiring
- Continue and strengthen active recruitment and hiring at junior AND senior levels
  - Draw on extant faculty diversity and anti-racism literature to develop LSA-wide guidelines and principles to support departments in developing active faculty diversity recruitment plans
- Continue and expand the LSA Collegiate Fellows Program and participation in the U-M Presidential Postdoctoral Fellowship Program in number and ranks, and across departments

2. *Evaluation, Advancement, & Promotion*

- Investigate race and gender bias in academic publishing and awards/recognitions to inform development and implementation of equity principles and practices for evaluating scholarly impact
- Refine and institutionalize processes for considering faculty's DEI contributions for annual review and promotion & tenure

3. *Inclusion & Retention:*

- Conduct salary equity analyses and use findings to address racial/gender pay inequalities
- Create developmental supports for and clear pathways to leadership for faculty of color

4. *Cross-Cutting Challenge: Department Level Accountability:*

- Create more department-level accountability for faculty DEI outcomes through required department DEI plans, with College partnering and support. These plans should include a **specific focus on faculty** (as appropriate to the unit's mission) and efforts to enhance diversity (representation) and equity and inclusion outcomes for their faculty community, e.g.:
  - Require departments to include criteria related to DEI in hiring and evaluation (e.g., diversity statements in hiring, DEI impact statements in promotion & tenure processes)
  - Expand current inclusive hiring trainings; build in assessment and accountability structures
  - Reward departments for quality efforts and outcomes in diversity hiring and retention goals

- LSA leadership should:
  - Provide supports such as guides, principles, and templates to support department planning
  - Collaborate with units like ADVANCE, NCID to create programming on inclusive faculty hiring that extends and builds on current training to emphasize identifying and addressing biases embedded in *systemic processes*
  - Include a follow up process to determine how/whether departments are applying training/education into department processes
  - Provide on-going supports (incentivizing resources for positive efforts and outcomes, education, coaching) to help build capacity and support department work

We note that for most key recommendations, LSA oversees and controls policies and practices that could be evaluated, changed, or revised. However, some recommendations (such as faculty DEI contributions and promotion and tenure) relate to policies/structures not fully under LSA's control so would require LSA to partner with other university or community units/offices and/or require LSA to use its leverage and influence to advocate for change.

## Section 7: Staff Diversity

### ***Vision for LSA Anti-Racist Staff Environment***

An anti-racist staff space is one in which

- staff diversity is represented across units, departments, and programs
- the contributions of staff of color are recognized and valued
- the metrics for professional success are aligned with the priorities and values of staff of color (e.g., supporting and engagement with the community)
- staff of color are involved in decision-making at all levels in the organization
- invisible (and visible) systems do not disadvantage staff of color
- staff of color feel they can bring their whole selves into the workplace
- staff of color are treated with respect and not as tokens or stereotypes
- the UM/LSA community is committed to the success of staff of color
- all staff, faculty, and students are expected to contribute positively to a culture of DEI and anti-racism, and these expectations are signaled explicitly in hiring, evaluation, and reward processes

An anti-racist LSA would require a diverse staff that are supported with a sense of inclusion through all stages of the employee life cycle (attraction, recruitment, onboarding, development, retention, and separation). Achieving this first and foremost requires attention to demographic diversity in LSA staff, specifically the representation of staff from racial/ethnic minority backgrounds, generally, and as distributed across position roles and ranks. Currently we fall short of this goal:

### ***Background: Challenges, Opportunities, and Key Recommendations***

**LSA STAFF DEMOGRAPHICS RACE/ETHNICITY FY 2015-2019**  
**Number of staff (% of LSA staff)**

	<b>FY2015</b>	<b>FY2016</b>	<b>FY2017</b>	<b>FY2018</b>	<b>FY2019</b>
<b>American Indian or Alaska Native</b>	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (0%)	1 (0%)	3 (0%)
<b>Asian</b>	37 (3.8%)	42 (4.2%)	41 (3.8%)	52 (4.5%)	50 (4.2%)
<b>Black or African American</b>	72 (7.5%)	72 (7.1%)	84 (7.8%)	86 (7.5%)	92 (7.6%)
<b>Hispanic or Latino/a/x</b>	39 (4%)	43 (5.1%)	48 (4.5%)	59 (5.2%)	59 (4.9%)
<b>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</b>	1 (.10%)	1 (0%)	1 (0%)	2 (.2%)	2 (.2%)
<b>Two or More Races</b>	16 (1.7%)	20 (2%)	23 (2.1%)	26 (2.3%)	23 (1.9%)
<b>White</b>	771 (80%)	846 (83.8%)	913 (85.1%)	913 (79.7%)	931 (77.4%)
<b>Unknown</b>	16 (1.7%)	14 (1.4%)	14 (1.3%)	12 (1.0%)	10 (.08%)

<b>International</b>	13 (1.3%)	113 (11.1%)	15 (1.4%)	23 (2%)	33 (1.9%)
<b>TOTAL</b>	964	1010	1073	1145	1203

NOTES:

- Data drawn from U-M Office of Budget and Planning.
- Currently MENA data not collected; there has been significant community activism around this issue and advocacy for inclusion of MENA identification in staff, student, and faculty data collections.

The above data indicate the overall diversity related to race/ethnicity in LSA (representation of BIPOC, including historically underrepresented groups, compared to White people) is low, with latest available data showing White staff making up 77.4% of LSA staff. While the overall staff size of LSA has increased over the past several years, the diversity has not. Some groups - such as Native American, Native Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander have not been represented at all over the past 4 years of available data (and likely beyond). This warrants urgent and immediate action. Similarly, other underrepresented groups are represented at low, stable levels. Black staff are not representative of the state or national populations of Black Americans; and while Latinx staff reflect the state Latinx population, the representation is low from an absolute perspective and does not reflect national demographics. Across all groups of color for which we have available data, representation is low compared to populations we would expect to recruit at a public university with a mission of serving the state, nation, and world, and the public good.

It is the case that variations between units/departments and amongst different employee groups are substantial, and for some units, numbers are too small for statistically significant comparisons on a unit-by-unit basis. *However, we cannot let that be a barrier for examining our staff data in rigorous and creative ways (quantitatively and qualitatively) to help us in interrogating processes that result in our hiring and retention outcomes and that can help us improve those outcomes.*

Without a staff that better reflects the racial/ethnic demographics of our state, we will always be limited in advancing goals of equity and inclusion. And achieving greater staff diversity necessitates a focus on systemic processes, not only individual and interpersonal processes. For example, we note that a majority of efforts in LSA's DEI Strategic Plan over the past years have focused on diversity knowledge and values, such as diversity trainings that build DEI awareness, knowledge, and competencies; and DEI educational and community-building events and resources. While these efforts are critical and a valuable part of an intellectually and socially engaged community and climate around DEI and should continue, we also recommend a redoubling of efforts focused on systemic processes and practices related to hiring, evaluation, promotion, and retention. These processes should be transparent such that staff community members are able to understand how DEI and anti-racism are built into our processes, and that our processes uphold and reflect the values we espouse.

Addressing systemic processes should include attention to specific structures, policies, practices, and interaction norms that contribute to documented racial inequalities in staff climate experiences. Across campus (including LSA), staff climate reports are significantly more negative for staff of color compared to White staff, e.g., Staff of Color have greater likelihood of experiencing discrimination in their work environment, more negative views of opportunities to advance and thrive in their work roles. (See for example, [Climate Survey | Diversity, Equity & Inclusion | University of Michigan](#)).

To support action and accountability around anti-racism in our systemic processes, we recommend adding more staff capacity for advancing DEI and anti-racism within the dean's DEI leadership team, specifically a team member with background expertise in DEI and Human Resources processes. We note and acknowledge the current LSA DEI plan and activities for FY20, indicating that for the first time, there is a "full DEI team", consisting of the Associate Dean of DEI and Professional Development, DEI Manager, and DEI Coordinator.

There also is a DEI-GSSA and Dean's Fellow, each contributing approximately 50% effort to the College's DEI work. This change is laudable and in the right direction. The proposed new HR-focused role would complement this team and not overlap with other roles as we understand them. Instead, this role would add capacity, consultation, and enhance HR capacity for engaging DEI and infusing DEI into all HR relevant roles and processes across LSA units.

Along with campus experiences, community issues such as a lack of affordable housing near campus and areas surrounding campus/Ann Arbor uniquely impact staff and disproportionately impact staff from racially and socioeconomically marginalized backgrounds. (This impacts faculty employees too but especially lower paid staff). The high costs of housing are coupled with [racially restrictive housing policies](#). Subsequently, a proportion of our staff cannot fully benefit from the resources of the city in which they work. Furthermore, the less diverse neighborhoods surrounding campus are, the less attractive they are to prospective and current staff of color, thus undermining recruitment and retention goals. Unfortunately, this type of inequality is a [not uncommon phenomenon](#) in towns/cities surrounding highly selective universities. Other higher education institutions - [including in Michigan](#) - have developed programs and approaches to support employees' ability to purchase housing near campus. Such programs have been shown to benefit employees, and the presence of these employees serve to enhance local community diversity and development. LSA (and the broader U-M) should explore, support, advocate for, and contribute to real efforts to provide support and access to local housing options and opportunities for its staff.

Below we summarize selected barriers and challenges and **example key recommendations** of foci and actions for addressing barriers and challenges to advancing anti-racism for LSA staff. We note that for some recommendations, LSA oversees and controls policies and practices that could be changed or revised; in contrast, other recommendations relate to policies/structures not under LSA's control so would require LSA to partner with other university or community units/offices and/or require LSA to use its leverage and influence to advocate for change.

#### *1. Cross-Cutting Recommendation: Supporting Equity and Accountability across Units*

Example key barriers and challenges we identified and prioritized include:

- DEI issues related to staff and human resources - including hiring, evaluation, development, and advancement - are immense, especially in a unit as large as LSA and, as such, require specialized knowledge
- Current ways of categorizing race (tied to federal requirements) can obscure understanding of racial group patterns of representation, making some groups invisible
- Low accountability or incentives for all units and departments to prioritize and act to enhance staff diversity and a culture of equity and inclusion

Selected recommendations to address these challenges include:

- Create NEW LSA HR Staff Position (with specific expertise/commitment to DEI in HR - consult/train college); role should include explicit understanding, charge, and approaches related to anti-racism
- Create a stronger staff database for benchmarking, transparency, and accountability with disaggregated data on staff roles, positions, and salaries to understand inequalities in representation and advancement opportunity
- Conduct analysis of URM and BIPOC staff, hiring retention and promotion trends; disaggregate URM and BIPOC group data to understand group-specific patterns to inform tailored actions/solutions
- Enhance unit/department-level accountability for staff DEI outcomes through required unit/department DEI plans, with College partnering and support. Plans should include a **specific focus on staff** (as appropriate to the unit's mission) and efforts to enhance diversity (representation) and equity and inclusion outcomes for their staff community. Units/departments should be supported by LSA leadership in developing their DEI plans, e.g., resources, educational, developmental, and other relevant supports

## 2. Recruitment & Hiring:

Example key barriers and challenges we identified and prioritized include:

- Representation of URM and BIPOC staff uneven across LSA divisions and departments and across staff ranks/roles
- Unevenness in active recruitment and hiring practices and transparency across units
- High housing costs inhibit prospective and current staff from living near campus (undermining both recruitment and retention goals)
- Michigan Proposition 2 has led to misperceptions that inhibit staff recruitment for diversity (e.g., that we cannot make all efforts to have strong racial/ethnic minority representation in staff applicant pools)

Selected recommendations to address these challenges include:

- Use improved staff data to take proactive steps to hire more staff from racially underrepresented, marginalized groups at all position rank/levels
- Drawing on extant organizational diversity and anti-racism literature, develop LSA-wide guidelines and principles to support LSA units/departments in developing active staff diversity recruitment strategies as a part of their unit DEI plans, which all units would be required to demonstrate/submit prior to approvals for searches or hires; plans should include components such as but not limited to:
  - Recruitment/evaluation training requirements across all units; expanded beyond individual implicit bias processes to include biases *embedded in systemic processes*
  - Recruitment training should clarify legal parameters and affirmative action policy (Proposition 2) to support legal compliant strategic planning and action for recruitment
  - Consideration of merits and feasibility of innovative approaches such as cluster hiring
- Explore and proactively advocate for and contribute to efforts to support affordable housing programs or options for staff

## 3. Inclusion & Retention:

Example key barriers and challenges we identified and prioritized include:

- URM staff (at U-M and in LSA) report more negative climate experiences, including more bias/discrimination experiences and fewer perceived opportunities for thriving and advancement
- Lack of systemic and regularized structures to create climates of belonging and professional growth can contribute to attrition, generally, and particularly among staff of color

Selected recommendations to address these challenges include:

- Create standardized professional development supports to transition, onboard new staff across units; create norms and incentives for supervisors across all units to offer and promote staff development
- Conduct LSA salary equity analysis to determine the nature and extent of racial salary disparities for LSA staff; use this information to take steps to create greater equity in staff salaries across LSA units
- Clearly define and make transparent promotion/reclassification structures
- Create more (and transparent) career pathways and trajectories for which BIPOC staff have equitable access, including developmental supports and mentoring to support these career pathways
- Conduct analysis of recognitions, awards, honors for staff to examine potential disparities across race, gender, units, etc.
- Include recognitions for individual staff DEI work and accomplishments in performance evaluations
- Create/strengthen reward structures for units that advance staff diversity and invest in DEI development for their staff
- Support professional and affinity staff communities for networking and to enhance climate and sense of belonging

## Section 8: Curriculum (Race & Ethnicity Requirement and Beyond)

### ***Vision for Anti-racism in LSA Curriculum***

We aspire to an LSA commitment to equity-focused pedagogies that address the experiences of URM and historically marginalized students throughout the LSA curriculum. This means including the contributions of scholars from marginalized groups in core curriculum (e.g., works included and assigned in core courses to signal that marginalized scholars' work as foundational or central in a discipline/field), and classrooms should be spaces where marginalized students feel included, respected, and not tokenized. For their academic spaces, academic units should be expected to implement strategies that address marginalization and promote inclusion for all students.

### ***Background: Challenges, Opportunities, and Key Recommendations***

In that spirit, we felt it important to approach recommendations about the curriculum knowing that they have larger implications than the Race & Ethnicity Requirement alone will accommodate. The charge to address anti-racism in our curriculum cannot/should not be reduced to addressing the Race & Ethnicity requirement alone. Anti-Racist pedagogy is not only about content but about teaching practice and process (Kishimoto 2018). The Race & Ethnicity requirement should be an important part of anti-racist pedagogy in LSA, but it should also be just that, one part.

It bears repeating that the aim of the R&E requirement is to support students' critical thinking around race as it emerges in daily life. It also intends to help them build competencies to dismantle systemic racism. The requirement, however, allows space for content from multiple disciplines, focusing on various points in history, in different geographic locations to meet this goal. So it is incumbent upon us to think about the ways in which all of our disciplines address race, and how we can infuse conversations about racism, be they explicit or implicit, into every course.

As a liberal arts college, our commitment to providing holistic and rigorous courses means that we wish to provide that for all of our students, at all levels of their academic career. We believe, then, that anti-racist pedagogy can and should be practiced by all instructors, and should engage all students. It is not pedagogy that is the role and responsibility of one specific group of students or faculty - namely BIPOC students and faculty - but for all. It should be incorporated into the curriculum at all levels of undergraduate and graduate teaching and learning. We all share the responsibility, and the benefits, of thoughtful anti-racist practice (Hagopian et al., 2018-U of W).

Anti-racist pedagogy requires significant investment at both the departmental and college level. Indeed other institutions have found ways to support students, staff and faculty in their efforts to engage anti-racist pedagogy, knowing that that investment is a necessary one, and beneficial to the academic community and beyond. (See examples of [General Education Curriculum | College of Arts & Sciences - University of Pennsylvania](#), <https://lsadvising.berkeley.edu/degree-requirements#uc>).

We recognize that there has been a long-time struggle (including some triumphs) to institute anti-racism course requirements in U.S. universities (e.g., see [Adding ethnic studies into college curricula has long been controversial, but is this moment different?](#)). It is important to keep in mind the historical moment that shapes our current recommendations. Because of this, we know that the recommendations will challenge us and push us to think differently about race and racism and how it's approached in the curriculum across disciplines.....indeed it should. We also know that a deep investment and engagement in anti-racist pedagogy will provide students, staff and faculty with the tools to address challenges that racism and white supremacy bring up in our fields/disciplines, department and classrooms.



**Selected Key Recommendations.** Revisit and revise the LSA Race & Ethnicity requirement. This should include building on recent evaluation of the requirement to refine the course requirement to better meet its intended goals and address current needs of student, faculty, and staff communities.

- Consider suggested changes around renaming the requirement to reflect focus on anti-racism, requiring small class sizes to facilitate deeper faculty-student interaction, required instructor training on anti-racist pedagogy, and creation of an interdepartmental anti-racism curriculum committee made up of expert faculty and staff.
- Curriculum efforts should extend beyond the one course requirement to infuse anti-racism content across the College curriculum, including specific content on understanding, identifying, and working to change systemic (not only individual) forms of bias. Infusing anti-racism across the LSA curriculum also means taking inventory of department courses, co-curricular offerings, and pedagogical practices.
- Departments should receive assistance from LSA in the development of additional course content that address (a) perspectives, cultures and/or histories of peoples/communities previously excluded from the discipline and/or (b) aspects of the disciplinary tradition that promote white supremacy/privilege and/or (c) treat racialized peoples/cultures as biologically or culturally inferior.
- LSA should also incentivize all instructional faculty to complete anti-racist pedagogy training in order to develop a fully inclusive classroom climate across the entire LSA curriculum (e.g., offering additional credits for instructors doing anti-racist teaching or R&E courses; credit for creating new courses and/or engaging in substantive updates of courses to integrate anti-racism content, etc.)
- The LSA Promotion & Tenure and Annual Review criteria should be revised to include substantive recognition for inclusive and anti-racism pedagogy as valued and particularly challenging areas of teaching.

## Section 9: College and Campus Climate Issues

### ***Vision for Anti-racism in LSA Members' Climate Experiences***

We note that climate issues overlapped with ALL other sections of this report focused on enhancing student, faculty, and staff diversity and infusing anti-racism principles and approaches into the curricular, professional, College, campus, and community life of LSA members. The topics and issues we name across sections are not mutually exclusive and distinct. For example, the student diversity and retention challenges and recommendations outlined in sections 4 and 5 are inextricably related to the ways we create inclusive or non-inclusive climates for students of color across curricular and non-curricular spaces; our ability to improve and optimize practices for recruiting a diverse staff as recommended in section 6 is tied to the climates that staff routinely experience, including racial group disparities in the nature, quality, and positivity of these experiences. Similarly, the themes and recommendations outlined in sections 10-12 (focused on dismantling carceral practices and policies, U-M's roles in urban and tribal communities, and anti-racist COVID-19 responses) all implicate the potential role of our campus and College climates as promoting or inhibiting human, inclusive, and equitable policies, norms, practices, and interactions. This section does not seek to replicate content from the other sections, but instead focuses on the concept of climate itself and how we can better define, frame, assess, and act on it in ways that support anti-racism work toward systemic change.

*What should an anti-racist climate of LSA reflect?* A place where all can experience “identity safety”: all feel they belong and can be successful in their environments and experience a shared value of inclusion across curricular, co-curricular, professional, campus residential, and affiliated community contexts.

**This requires structures, policies, norms that create and maintain settings and conditions** allowing for:

- feeling of voice: that one can speak up and share concerns
- felt influence: that one can influence what and how things are done
- ability to raise concerns about racism, inequality and be heard and believed
- respect for others' cultural values
- physical safety being respected and valued as a whole person

### ***Background: Challenges, Opportunities, and Key Recommendations***

*What do we mean by climate?* The concept of **climate** includes individuals' and groups' perceptions of a setting or environment (e.g., what people experience, observe, feel, hear in a setting; what they feel is “normal” or “typical” about the ways that things happen, how decisions are made, and how people interact). While conceptualizations of organizational climate can vary, all emphasize that the climate of a setting is multidimensional. These dimensions include perceptions related to: the nature and quality of intergroup relations; the extent that different groups in the setting experience equal status; demonstrated institutional-level value and support for diversity, equity, and inclusion, among other dimensions. These perceptions are also influenced by another important dimension - the historical legacy of the institution, e.g., the presence, absence and treatment of different groups; positions, stances, policies, and actions that the institution has taken with regard to diversity, equity, inclusion, and justice. Climates can vary in different parts of our College and campus as an organization due to differences in local leadership and organizational structures and norms across units and spaces.

Extant higher education literature aligns with our own [U-M climate data](#) indicating that racially minoritized students, faculty, and staff at predominantly White universities report more negative climate experiences (e.g., feelings of exclusion or devaluation; lower sense of community and belonging; experiences and/or observations of discrimination, microaggressions, biases, and/or stereotype-based interactions directed toward people of color; skepticism around institutional values and commitment to DEI) than do their majority counterparts. Organizational and educational research demonstrates that such climate perceptions negatively impact a variety of adjustment outcomes for students, staff, and faculty - performance and productivity, motivation and morale,

academic or job satisfaction, well-being, and persistence and attrition, among other areas of impact. While the consequences of such negative climate experiences are heightened for members of minoritized communities, experiencing negative organizational climates has deleterious effects on performance, motivational, and well-being outcomes across all groups. Thus, negative racial climates can undermine the health and vitality of our College and academic institution as a whole.

It is important to emphasize that the climate individuals and groups experience in our College environment are a manifestation of the environmental **culture** - which includes the values, norms, and assumptions of our College and campus as an institution *as embedded in structures, policies, and practices*; they are more often top-down (set by leaders via communications and reward structures, based on historical structures and systemics and influenced by the broader societal context) but continually reinforced at all levels and spaces of the organization. Culture also includes the privileged/rewarded ways of being that are often taken for granted but that shape how the institution responds to community members who represent different ways of being.

--For example, the concept of meritocracy is a core cultural value in the academy; but the concept can be defined and taken up in ways that favor particular metrics of “individual achievement” and “potential” that do not take into account structural inequities in educational access that lead to those individual metrics looking systematically different across demographic or identity/status groups. Those metrics and the chosen approaches for evaluating them also might exclude or obscure understanding of merits, strengths, and expressions of potential present in many minoritized communities of color. Consequently, we may be less prepared and able to recruit and support a critical mass of talented students from some communities of color (including those from low-income communities/backgrounds) due to both admissions barriers and prospective students' **climate perceptions** that our campus does not value students like them. Further, the underrepresented and minoritized students of color who do enter our campus and College are more likely to experience **climates** of racial tokenism, isolation, and stereotype-based treatment due to their numerical minority status.

--As another example, a core cultural value in the academy is intellectual pursuits and innovation, which are not objective concepts - although they are often presented as such in ways that advantage some groups and disadvantage others. For instance, within fields and disciplines particular forms of intellectual work and innovation may be valued more than others (e.g., “basic science” over “applied” science and scholarship, more concrete forms of problem solving, or community-engaged forms/methods of scholarship). Similarly, certain topics or scholarly foci are viewed as central to the canon and discipline, while others (e.g., those focused on minoritized populations or addressing social inequalities) are viewed and treated as on the margins as reflected in core curriculum and scholarly evaluation, recognition, and reward structures. The lesser valued forms and topics of knowledge are often disproportionately represented by researchers/scholars/instructors of color and from minoritized backgrounds (faculty, staff, and students). Consequently, those researchers/scholars/instructors are more likely to experience **climates** where they feel devalued as knowledge makers and intellectual contributors, have a lower sense of community and belonging in the discipline/field, and perceive fewer opportunities for thriving, recognition, and advancement in their fields/roles/positions compared to others.

--A final example of connections between culture and climate is the physical environment. Research highlights the negative psychological impacts of institutional symbols that counter an institution's purported DEI values (such as only white men being represented in featured portraits and images of important people across campus; buildings with names or other visible markers associated with racist histories or racist individuals without acknowledgement). These cultural symbols can contribute to **climate experiences** of a hostile environment for people of color and one that reaffirms negative stereotypes (e.g., about intellectual ability and accomplishment) - and in ways that can undermine the educational and professional experience of all community members.

In all of these examples, we highlight how individuals' perceptions and experiences of climate are tied to structural, systemic, and social processes that reflect their organization's cultural norms. As such, our

intervention focus should be on those structural, systemic, and social norms, NOT on changing the individuals experiencing negative climates or simply helping them figure out how to navigate inequitable settings more effectively. For instance, it is not uncommon for mentoring interventions - for students, staff, and faculty - to emphasize helping individuals traverse or “build resilience” in current systems but give little attention to addressing and changing the environmental conditions that individuals are being asked to traverse or build resilience against.

*What are some obstacles to an anti-racist LSA climate?*

- Implicit and explicit biases deeply embedded in interpersonal, structural, and systemic processes at every level of our College organization; requires examination and action at all of these levels
- The current LSA DEI plan includes attention to climate (mentioned numerous times); but its definition is fairly unspecified, nor is the concept of climate linked *explicitly* to processes and structures of inequality
- A tendency to focus on individual attitudes and perceptions as the primary focus of climate interventions
  - Biases and inequalities embedded in structures and systems should be the primary focus of interventions, not only individual-level attitude or implicit bias change. (Robust research examinations show that individual level interventions on attitudes alone are of low or limited benefit to systemic change; and even attitude change effects are quickly fleeting, etc.).
- Challenges in understanding how to use and act on climate information/data effectively
  - Many organizations conduct a climate survey as a response to climate challenges but are uncertain about how to use the data for strategic actions
  - Conducting climate surveys or other forms of data/input gathering is not a DEI outcome in itself; these efforts should be the start of a multi-step action process; often action processes fail to clearly or precisely link individual- and group-reported perceptions and experiences of climate assessed in climate surveys to the structural and social systems that lead to those perceptions and experiences
- Need for additional processes for allowing fair and actual reporting of climate concerns
  - Some community members (across staff, faculty, and students) view current reporting structures as incomplete or limited in allowing confidential reporting with retribution possibility and reporting around the day to day experiences that fall short or formal policy transgressions

Below we summarize **example key recommendations** for approaches to improving climate based in anti-racism principles. For some recommendations, LSA oversees and controls policies and practices that could be changed or revised; in contrast, other recommendations relate to policies/structures not under LSA's control so would require LSA to partner with other university or community units/offices and/or require LSA to use its leverage and influence to advocate for change.

- Anti-racism is critical to a positive College climate and should be made an explicit and integrated part of our institutional mission, starting with university and College mission statements. The new [LSA Mission, Values, and Action Statement](#) references inclusion and systemic change as values and action areas, an important and positive update following College work over the past year. But, the statement could also be more explicit in naming DEI as values, and racism as a barrier and anti-racism as a needed action area.
- In future DEI planning, LSA should clearly refine its working concept of “climate” (and associated climate goals) to better reflect its multidimensionality and to focus on how individual and group lived experiences and perceptions reflect systems of inequality. Then focus interventions on those systems. In doing so, actively counter the common tendency (described in research on DEI and organizational processes) to place a primary or sole emphasis on positive or negative intergroup interactions among individuals or individuals' feelings/affect (usually of majority/privileged group members) as the key/valued outcome or target of intervention.
- Review and enhance existing metrics for a more equitable and inclusive climate (including and beyond the current U-M climate survey approach) and methods of tracking progress on achieving climate goals at regular intervals, and in a manner that is accessible to the College community.

- Climate examinations and action steps should include the broad range of settings in which our community members operate - classroom, co-curricular, professional, and non-curricular and professional contexts and spaces that are racialized and gendered. While it is important to distinguish the unique experiences and needs of students, faculty, and staff in climate analysis and work, particular focus should also be placed on linkages across the climate experiences of marginalized groups of faculty, staff, and students, including experiences of safety and security.
- Provide opportunities for bidirectional communication between College leadership (at central dean's office and department/unit levels) to share information about climate, actions, and progress with students, faculty, staff, and other affiliated stakeholders.
- In the teaching/learning domain:
  - Partner with and leverage university resources for classroom teaching to create a robust suite of professional development resources for instructors to support them in cultivating inclusive and equitable climates in curricular environments - inside and outside of the classroom. These resources might include the LSA Inclusive Teaching subcommittee, CRLT Players, Program for Intergroup Relations, Comprehensive Studies Program, Services for Students with Disabilities, among others.
  - Provide more intensive and focused supports for faculty/instructors (workshops, individualized coaching or consultation) to support positive classroom climate, including effectiveness in addressing bias incidents in the classroom and enhancing quality of faculty-student and student-peer engagement inside and outside of the classroom. These supports should promote instructors' awareness of their own potential biases, AND how to use this awareness to develop practices and structures for creating more inclusive environments, as experienced by students.
- Provide supports to department/unit leaders for the development of standards, expectations, mechanisms of accountability, and avenues for training and support for the establishment of inclusive and equity organizational climates (in classrooms, labs/research groups, mentoring relationships, etc.). Provide rewards/recognition and incentives for departments/units that are working actively and effectively to improve climate experiences across groups within their units.
- Support a culture of DEI and anti-racism by creating communities of practice and learning around different areas or domains of DEI/anti-racism work for improving the College climate, made available to staff, faculty, and students.
- Along with examining and addressing policies and practices that impact climate experiences of minoritized groups, address climate as manifested through the physical environment, for example:
  - Actively encourage university-wide consideration of building names and naming processes
  - Engage in a mapping project of LSA buildings to examine how physical contexts (symbols, pictures/portraits, etc.) reflect broad representation and DEI/anti-racism values; e.g., Do they reflect our values and goals for a diverse community? Do they honor or uphold individuals or values that support DEI or that are counter to DEI and anti-racism?
- Across students, staff, and faculty, improve and/or clarify reporting mechanisms and processes for discrimination and biased treatment. Consider new College-based structures; for example, working in coordination with university HR units and processes, develop a system for adjudicating claims of racial abuse, bias, etc.; such a system might include a College-wide committee.

## Section 10: LSA and Efforts to Dismantle Carceral Practices and Policies

### *Vision for Anti-racism in LSA - LSA's Important Role in Dismantling Carceral Practices and Policies*

As a Task Force, we have been charged with providing recommendations to Dean Curzan on how LSA can become a more ant-racist college. Informed by a subcommittee of the Task Force working specifically on how the university supports racialized practices of criminalization and the carceral state, itself, we have considered and highlighted how prevailing orientations to “safety” and “security” and specific policies and practices assume carceral logics -- “ the variety of ways our bodies, minds, and actions have been shaped by the idea and practices of imprisonment—even for people who do not see themselves connected explicitly to prisons” (Rochester Decarceration Initiative) -- and therefore further institutional and structural racism.

[We are aware that there are several key recommendations within the current LSA DEI Plan document that -to our knowledge, based on report outcomes-have yet to be advanced or achieved. Some of these issues are currently being considered by the central administration and have long been projects of scholar-activist programs and student organizations, including the Carceral State Project, the Prison Creative Arts Project, Students of Color Liberation Front, and the Graduate Employee Organization.]

### **Background: Challenges, Opportunities, and Key Recommendations**

**Fundamental to the success of each of the following recommendations is a College and University administrative commitment to educating the public about research-based rationales and imperatives for revisiting and redefining widely accepted notions of the relationship between the criminal justice system and “safety” and “security.”**

1. LSA should support the charge of the Provost’s Task Force on Public Safety to examine policing’s “inherent structural racism that subjects people of color to abuse and physical harm.” Specifically, LSA should encourage its students, staff and faculty to engage with the Task Force on the following questions raised in the LSA DEI strategic plan and systematically disseminate existing research and/or commission new research that will answer questions that arise as the Task Force carries out its work in response to community input. LSA should widely publicize relevant information and findings so that this information can inform the public as they consider the possibilities and imperatives for fundamental transformations in the relationship between the university and the carceral state. Our efforts to dismantle structural racism have suffered as a result of inattention to critical knowledge that already exists about the relationship between racism and carceral practices as supported by institutions of higher education. The following questions will lead us to the existing knowledge necessary to educate local and surrounding communities about the stakes of illuminating these connections.
  - a. How do we assess the dynamics of surveillance and its impact on campus, community, and police relations? What does our social location, identity, and historical community experience with criminal surveillance practices have to do with the knowledge we bring to bear on this assessment?
  - b. What education/conversations are required for the community to understand the logics and benefits of disarming law enforcement? Fears abound; informed, substantive conversations are necessary.
  - c. What other harmful surveillance practices affect our campus and surrounding communities at interpersonal and institutional levels?
  - d. How can we divest from policies and practices that criminalize our students, staff, and faculty, especially Black and Latinx communities?
  - e. How can we make it known and matter to those who are unaware or indifferent that students, faculty, and staff of color suffer increased levels of police scrutiny and even harassment, on campus and off?
  - f. How do policing practices have a differential impact on students, faculty, and staff from communities in which a police presence has been historically threatening and who are differentially impacted and implicated in the recent police killings of Black people that are part of this historical violence?

2. LSA should initiate a public history project on the history of policing at UofM beginning with the decades before the university had its own armed police force. This campaign should address both the reasons for the establishment of the armed force and the breadth of opposition to the creation of the force that existed at the time. The campaign should draw on the many campus voices--including but not limited to the Black Student Union's 2013 #BBUM campaign--that have provided critical testimony over the years on the track record on the campus police. Among the questions that the project should address are:
  - a. What was the relationship between UM and the Ann Arbor Police Department when campus police were founded? How did students of color communities respond to establishing of the campus police?
  - b. Has the campus police served as an effective buffer between UM student communities and the AAPD?
  - c. In the more than 30 years since the campus police department was formed, has the presence of an armed police force on campus improved security on campus for UM's various constituencies?
  - d. Does the historical record validate the need for an armed police force on campus?
  - e. What alternatives are there to an armed campus police force? Are there comparable universities that rely on unarmed security forces? What has their track record been?
3. LSA should form a work group comprised of student, faculty, and staff to develop proposals to divest from and defund the campus police, i.e. to identify funds and areas of responsibility currently carried out by armed police officers that can be transferred to campus social service and community organizations with trained civilian personnel who can support practices of safety and security that don't rely on criminalization and the carceral state. In short, resources from these divest and defund efforts should be reinvested in community-defined and community-centered projects that -- to borrow language from the Movement for Black Lives -- prioritize the "education, health and safety of Black people, instead of investments in the criminalizing, caging, and harming of Black people." Leadership of this work group should include the undergraduate student organizations that effectively protested last summer's Student Ambassadors program, faculty and graduate students associated with the Carceral State Project and other critical prison studies scholars on campus, as well as staff who wish to participate.
4. LSA should publicly advocate for the entire university to "ban the box" and all questions related to previous interactions with the criminal justice system on all student and employment applications. As this important policy change is considered at all levels of university administration, research about the falsely accepted notions that "the box" ensures safety and security for our campus community should be consulted and disseminated to the public.
5. LSA should develop a proactive recruitment program for incarcerated eligible students and spearhead the revival of credit-earning courses and degree programs for incarcerated students, given Congress' December 2020 restoration of Pell grants for the incarcerated. Approximately 64% of people in state and federal prison will now be eligible for federal student aid. The University of Michigan is far behind other universities who have prioritized the granting of college credit and degrees to incarcerated communities.
6. LSA should develop proactive recruitment and retention programs for formerly incarcerated students and employees. It is not enough to "ban the box;" the College should make sincere and supported, informed efforts to welcome these communities to the university and to support and retain them.
7. Guided by an informed and sustained engagement with the visions and practices afforded by abolitionist approaches to anti-racism and carceral issues, LSA should engage the entire LSA community in a public dialogue on policies and practices related to safety, security, criminalization, and punitive orientations to social problems and institutional problems,, including policing and surveillance, drug and substance use, mental health resources, sexualized violence and the cultures and institutions that sustain it, admissions, and relations between law enforcement and university and surrounding communities.
8. LSA should elaborate institutional and departmental goals of diversity, equity, inclusion and justice that prioritize critical discussions of safety and security over vague references to "climate issues," "campus

climate,” and “campus culture.” Our university campus is part of larger, extended communities and institutions shaped by the social inequalities that manifest in particular ways that are inextricable from the injustices pervading our surrounding communities and broader society. Solutions to these injustices cannot be envisioned or implemented without this broad, critical view.

9. LSA should consider that its spatial and community purview is comprised not only of classrooms, curricula, undergraduates, graduates, faculty, and staff career pathways. The College should help our community focus on the fact that our community spaces include the hallways, kitchens, community areas, that host student, faculty, and staff interactions. The current LSA strategic plan neglects the reality that LSA is connected across many spatial contexts and includes many social structures and dynamics other than those explicitly connected to educational missions or confined to the experiences of specific populations (undergraduates vs. graduates; staff vs. faculty).
10. Because students navigate public settings under disparate structures of power and racialized structures of surveillance, they are an important source of knowledge for how LSA and the university can work to abandon carceral logics. Student-centric frameworks for defining campus safety will help administrators leverage the underutilized critical knowledge about the day-to-day behaviors, norms, and values that facilitate public unsafety on campus in several primary areas that disproportionately affect students. Of these, drug and substance use and systematic sexual violence are two areas that the College should examine for how carceral logics inform notions of “safety and security” in gendered, classed, racialized and ableist ways such that students may actually be left unsupported, unsafe, and insecure.
11. Demarginalizing the subject of place in the DEI Strategic Plan helps reveal how the intersection of DEI, campus safety, and social justice directly informs administrative regulation of student life beyond the classroom into residential and recreational life. By focusing on the complex spatial decisionmaking required to navigate day-to-day transitions, we highlight the social and spatial inequality generated by structural racism. Establishing goals designed to relieve moments of cognitive stress in BIPOC students’ as they navigate transitions between public and private space is one example of a student-centered, bottom up, anti-racist approach to institutional DEI strategy.
12. Administrators should understand that the racialized and gendered experiences of the student, faculty and staff body are variable. Students, faculty and staff are not monolithic in their institutional needs for diversity, equity, and an inclusive curricular and extracurricular campus culture. Administrators responsible for shaping DEI policy and programming do so directly and indirectly through the design of campus structures, and the social identities that give them meaning. As a result, administrative beliefs about race, gender, sexuality, class and ability influence campus climate through more than programming and policies.
13. A student-centered, bottom-up approach to anti-racism recognizes that place is an active agent in community culture; what is pushed to the background in the current DEI plan should be foregrounded for the sake of students in particular. When place is considered an active agent in campus culture, power becomes obvious as a missing component of top-down, goal-oriented approach to diversity, equity, and inclusion. By defining goals in the DEI plan for students one way, and goals for faculty and staff another way, LSA uses its language power to unknowingly reproduce harmful spaces for BIPOC students, faculty, and staff.
14. Since students are more likely than faculty and staff to spend more time on campus, the DEI Plan must account for ways students and faculty engage with each other in those roles **beyond the classroom**. These interactions **beyond the classroom** can sometimes appear irreconcilable with the lessons put forth by DEI coursework. Because the current DEI Plan marginalizes place in favor of programming and policy support, education is incorrectly presented as the only medium for social change. Counteracting structural racism however, is not an issue of the mind alone; countering structural racism at the institutional level requires a commitment to using education holistically, which means educating in an environment where the body and mind are safe. In order to create an environment where education is holistic, power must be made explicit in



the DEI strategic plan, rather than implicit. For example, inclusion, equity, support and retention are the most commonly used words in the DEI plan, yet they are only applied within each category - not across - which means efforts to retain undergraduates are disconnected from efforts to retain graduates, faculty, and staff. Thus while the “undergraduate and graduate, faculty and staff” category headings are neat and descriptive, they do not tell us anything about the nature or quality of the relationship between the categories.

15. If we cannot read the LSA DEI Strategy Plan and understand the nature or quality of power between undergraduates, graduates, faculty and staff in the classroom context, we cannot believe the DEI Plan adequately informs the conduct of the community beyond classroom. From an anti-racist perspective, the future of DEI is not and should not continue to be compartmentalized to the classroom, career and curricular context, but instead expanded to the residential and recreational contexts.

*Toward an Abolitionist Approach.* The above recommendations represent important steps toward advancing anti-racism in LSA and our university. However, recommendations that solely and specifically address issues of police funding, governance and oversight would neglect the complex nature of racialized, gendered, classed, ableist foundations of the university and how our students, faculty, and staff are impacted by these foundations. Anti-racism is necessarily anti-carceral, and a commitment to anti-carceral approaches to organizing institutions and relations is, furthermore, abolitionist in scope and scale. “Abolition means a world where we do not use prisons, policing, and the larger system of the prison industrial complex as an “answer” to what are social, political, and economic problems. Abolition is not just an end goal but a strategy...” (Abolition Now: Ten Years of Strategy and Struggle Against the Prison Industrial Complex, Critical Resistance, 2008 AK Press). If our goal is to critically improve the lives of students, staff and faculty on U-M’s campus, we must first recognize that the current policies created to promote safety and respond to harm at the University do little to actually accomplish these goals. Moreover, these policies take racialized and gendered harm and violence for granted and risk fundamentally reproducing this violence and harm when they are discussed in isolation from diverse, equitable, inclusive, and social-justice oriented educational targets. The University as an institution must confront the histories and practices that maintain and support carceral logics.

- [Note: We understand why these groups are often distinguished this way. Indeed, our report also includes sections based on constituency groups as means of acknowledging some unique experiences, contexts, and challenges that circumscribe the group members’ chances for thriving and success; but across the report we also attempt to identify and name connections across these groups and the cross-cutting issues that affect our campus and campus-connected communities. In this case, we are both noting the need to extend the focus on undergraduate, graduate, staff, and faculty groups to include spaces beyond our proximal campus contexts, AND in the examination of all groups to extend our definitions and goals around addressing negative “climate” experiences to explicitly include inequalities of safety.]

This task force believes an abolitionist approach to anti-racism recognizes that diversity, equity, and inclusion are inextricably bound up within the context of campus safety and security. This approach recognizes the silence around extra-curricular conversations of diversity, equity, and inclusion and offers an opportunity for creating more holistic conversations. If we can shift away momentarily from programming and policies as the only pathways to DEI progress, what becomes possible?

*Definitions of/Approaches to Safety at U-M Ann Arbor.* Our recommendations to LSA is that it take steps towards becoming fundamentally anti-racist by engaging in the hard conversations that interrogate the fundamental belief structures governing policies and practices that take harm and violence for granted. Instead, LSA should move toward disrupting violence and harm through expansive definitions of DEI and antiracism that target climate, career, curriculum, *and corporeal* support. Imagining new ways to redesign places in LSA, not just programming and policies is an important first step. As such, we recommend that LSA administrative leadership use the following guiding questions to develop a place-positive DEI goal:

- (A) *How is the goal addressing the intersection of DEI, campus safety, and social justice?*
- (B) *How does the goal address informal and formal codes of policing, programming, and policy from the perspective of place?*
- (C) *How will this goal create a new, creative, and inclusive transversal space to counter structural racism?*

## Section 11: U-M's Role in Urban and Tribal Communities in Michigan

### ***Vision for Anti-racism in LSA's Role in Urban and Tribal Communities in Michigan***

U-M's involvement in urban and tribal communities should be conducted in conjunction with key stakeholders, in accordance with the highest ethical standards, and with the goal of supporting and strengthening those communities. Put another way, U-M involvement in urban and tribal communities should not profit, in a broadly defined way, the institution in ways that disadvantage local residents, particularly poor and working-class residents, or weaken local community-led institutions.

### ***Background: Challenges, Opportunities, and Key Recommendations***

#### Core Values:

- U-M should seek not to profit from or otherwise advance gentrification processes that reduce housing options for poor and working-class residents or shift power and/or wealth away from longtime residents.
- U-M's urban and tribal community-engagement strategy must be focused on building relationships of trust with local institutions and residents.
- True community partnerships involve activities that are determined/driven by the needs of the community, not only (or primarily) the interests/needs of the university. This includes goals related to community development and uplift, as well as youth educational development, postsecondary/college access and recruitment.
- The treaty that ceded the land to U-M promised to educate the treaty tribe's future generations. U-M has not done its part to fully uphold this promise. Our university must address this history and acknowledge it as a reason to rectify our relationship with tribes and the low numbers of Indigenous students.

#### Key Recommendations:

1. LSA should develop and implement - in conjunction with the Office of Enrollment Management, Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (which oversees the Wolverine Pathways Program and the Center for Educational Outreach), and the Comprehensive Studies Program - a comprehensive strategy for identifying, recruiting, enrolling, and students from high schools that serve Michigan's urban and tribal communities. In particular, LSA should develop and implement admissions preferences for high-achieving graduates of these schools that comply with the state's ban on racial preferences in admissions.
2. LSA should proactively participate and show leadership in university efforts to create a framework and set of principles for engaged work and collaboration in local communities, which should be socialized to LSA faculty, staff, and students working in community settings in research, practice, service, or other collaborative work. Examples include the President's/Provost's *Task Force on the Future of U-M's Engagement in Detroit*, in which LSA members were leaders and contributors based on their extensive experiences and exper Detroit and communities of color in Detroit.

We are deeply cognizant of concerns expressed by engaged scholars (e.g., former U-M professor George Sanchez, Julie Ellison, Tim Eatman and others in works focused on the roles of universities in public and community settings) that universities have often turned to community engagement programs as a substitute for affirmative action/racial diversity in admissions. In other words, they have focused on sending privileged students into low resource urban communities to provide service (and to learn about people different from themselves) rather than bringing students from those communities to campus as students. With the declines in African-American and Indigenous enrollments at U-M since the passage of Proposition 2 banned the use of affirmative action in higher education admissions in Michigan, it is all the more essential that every university engagement with the state's urban and tribal communities be explicitly linked to efforts to increase the number of students from those communities enrolled on the Ann Arbor campus. And, we must do so in a way that addresses the contemporary needs of tribal and urban communities.

Consider examples such as those below:

- The DAAS-supported Gender Consciousness Program (GCP) is a model program in which U-M students return to their high schools in Washtenaw and Wayne Counties to coordinate leadership development and college readiness workshops for high school girls. GCP is an example of a “wrap-around” program that combines social and academic support with opportunities for students to stay engaged with their home communities. This model could be shared with other departments across LSA for collaboration and/or adaptation.
- The U-M Wolverine Pathways (WP) program also has a comprehensive strategy working with students, parents/caregivers, schools/teachers, and other community leaders. As of fall 2020, this college pipeline program for middle and high school students enrolled 649 scholars of whom 86 graduated in 2019–20 (its third cohort), with all 86 matriculating scholars being admitted to selective colleges nationwide, a majority enrolling at U-M campuses. WP also conducted its first on-campus summer institute for 11th-grade scholars; hosted Remote Summer Camps for its eighth, ninth and 10th graders; and developed a near-peer mentoring program that connects WP scholars with U-M undergraduates.
- It is noteworthy that individual faculty from LSA departments have been actively engaged in supporting these WP scholars and the program (from hosting capstone academic/research experiences to campus/lab visitations, among other efforts). Furthermore, a few LSA departments have partnered with the WP program (an exemplar is Film, Media, Television’s production boot camp that provides exposures and applied experiences across many domains related to media scholarship and professional practice). A promising next step would be to develop a more systematic College wide partnership with the WP program to allow for faculty and departments to contribute academic/research experiences and other exposures and encouragement to support students’ development as well as their successful program completion and recruitment to U-M and LSA departments.
- The Semester in Detroit and the Detroit Urban Research Center are two examples of U-M programs that seek to collaborate with and contribute to local institutions, rather than simply study them. Too often, U-M educational and research initiatives are perceived to be engaged in extractive or “drive-by” practices whereby local communities and residents are treated as solely as subjects for study and there is no effort to collaborate with local organizations or contribute to the health and well-being of local communities. As such, particular emphasis should be placed on developing partnerships with urban and tribal schools that serve simultaneously to strengthen schools and communities and to increase U-M student recruitment from those communities in ways that align with the goals and objectives of those communities.

## Section 12: Anti-Racism and COVID-19 Impact Responses

### *Vision for Anti-racism in LSA responses to COVID-19 (and related disparities)*

“There has been much discussion about the disparate impact COVID-19 has had on communities of color and other marginalized populations. This reaches into higher education where struggles for racial equity had already taken a toll before the pandemic arrived” (USC Pullias Center for Higher Education).

Given the context and time frame for our task force work (starting in Fall 2020), it would be impossible not to acknowledge and include the topic of the COVID-19 pandemic. It cannot be disputed that COVID-19 has impacted and created strain in the lives of individuals, families, communities, and institutions globally. In our own campus and College communities, we continue to struggle to address the needs of students, staff, and faculty who are personally impacted directly or indirectly - physically, financially, and emotionally. Furthermore, the impacts of COVID-19 have disproportionately impacted the lives of people of color. In fact we have seen COVID-19 both create and exacerbate racial disparities in health (and physical, mental, and emotional well-being), educational and occupational access and thriving, and socioeconomic stability.

What then would anti-racist COVID-19 response look like for LSA? They are responses that reflect:

- Knowledge and awareness of how COVID-19 intersects with racism, e.g.,
  - disproportionate impact of COVID-19 on communities of color; how health care racial disparities affect members of the LSA community; how COVID-19 impacts have had unique and/or disproportionate impacts based on multiple identities or statuses of race/ethnicity, gender, LGBTQ status, disability status, career stage, parent/caregiver status, etc.
- Responsive practices informed by this awareness (e.g., flexibility around cameras in remote classes for students, empathy around work progress and deadlines)
- Clear, explicit, and supportive communication about new norms (normalizing struggle and how everything takes longer, given the additional demands and strains created by COVID-19 and the current racial unrest and crisis)
- Flexibility in workload adjustments, understanding around family care demands
- Recognition and support of additional DEI teaching/training, programming, and informal mentoring and care demands of staff and faculty, work disproportionately taken on by members of marginalized communities in service of members of marginalized communities
- Recognition of different and shared support needs for different constituencies (students, faculty, staff, AND marginalized group members within these constituencies); examples include:
  - Inequalities in family- and community-related caregiving roles, demands, and supports across faculty, students, staff
  - Inequalities in access to personal, health, and/or well-being/mental health supports across faculty, students, staff
  - Student impacts (inequalities in access to resources, courses, progress to degrees)
  - Staff impacts (inequalities in access to resources, decisions about work roles and location/structures)
  - Faculty impacts on research and teaching (inequalities in supports, evaluation implications)

### ***Selected Key Recommendations***

Below we summarize **example key recommendations** for LSA responses to the COVID-19 pandemic and crisis for our LSA community of students, staff, and faculty that would reflect anti-racist principles. For some recommendations, LSA oversees and controls policies and practices that could be changed or revised; in contrast, other recommendations relate to policies/structures not under LSA's control so would require LSA to partner with other university or community units/offices and/or require LSA to use its leverage and influence to advocate for change.

- Expand knowledge building and awareness efforts around the unique and disproportionate impacts of COVID-19 on communities of color, including impacts from those across multiple identities/statuses, e.g., race/ethnicity, gender, LGBTQ+ status, disability status, career stage, parent/caregiver status
- Provide on-going and consistent communications of support; acknowledging current conditions as non-normal and normalizing impacts on productivity, e.g., “everything takes longer”; “giving benefit of doubt that everyone is doing the best they can in work/performance”
- Encourage, normalize, and destigmatize use of existing mental health resources
- Continue supports for students that address inequalities across demographic groups, such as emergency funding and technical support
- Continue work with LSA units (departments, Opportunity Hub, Advising, student organizations, etc.) to support students in co-curricular and professional activities that are also resume-building; ensure equitable access to these activities across student demographics groups
- Encourage workload flexibility and adjustments during pandemic to support *essential* activities that BIPOC faculty and staff are taking on (teaching, service, mentoring, public engagement)
- Recognize *additional* service demands on faculty and staff resulting from the pandemic
  - e.g., acknowledge and build in supports for staff and faculty work time spent on DEI training and programming in response to the pandemic and to racial unrest due to police violence against Black and Indigenous communities and increases in racist and xenophobic discourse and acts/crimes
  - Explicitly encourage COVID-based tenure clock extensions for junior faculty when needed
- Support effective documentation of COVID-19 impacts for faculty review and evaluation (annual review, 3rd year review, promotion & tenure)
- Conduct needs survey of staff
- Help clarify rationale for university COVID-19 related policies and practices that may be confusing to community members
- Help identify university COVID-19 related practices and policies experienced by LSA community members as non-supportive; bring to attention of central leadership and advocate for change

It is heartening to note that since the time our task force commenced and completed this report, LSA already has been working to address and implement steps related to many of our recommendations to support our student, staff, and faculty communities. We also emphasize that awareness/understanding of the pandemic impacts is still emerging because the pandemic is on-going. As such, we encourage continued action and continued attention by LSA administrative leadership to longer term impacts of the pandemic - including racial group disparities in these impacts.