# Equity And Inclusion Committee

Final Agenda: **Dec. 6, 2022, 9:00AM – 11:00AM**  
Join Zoom Meeting

<https://gvsu-edu.zoom.us/j/95691758900?pwd=RzdYKzhEemR6K3RMZnpQTGNId3MwZz09>

Meeting ID: 956 9175 8900

Passcode: 849496

**Chair: Joel Wendland-Liu**

## Membership:

| **Voting Members** | Attendance |  | Attendance |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Elizabeth Arnold (CLAS, W2023) | X | Jiyeon Suh (CLAS W2025) | X |
| Craig Clay (Padnos, W2025) | X | Anna White (Libraries W 2025) | X |
| Alisha Davis (CHP, W2023) | X | **Ex-Officio Members** |  |
| Genevieve Elrod (KCON, W2024) | X | Ed Aboufadel (AVP Provost’s Office) | X |
| Daisy Fredericks (CoE, W2024) | X | B. Donta Truss (VP Enrollment Development |  |
| Alycia LaGuardia-LoBianco (CLAS, W 2024) | X | Takeelia Garrett (Student Ombuds/Dean of Students) |  |
| Josita Maouene, co-chair (CLAS, W2025) | X | Jesse Bernal/Marlene Kowalski-Braun (AVP I&E) | XX (both) |
| Jennifer Marson-Reed (CCPS, W 2024) | X | Dana Munk (Pew FTLC): | X |
| Jennifer Pope (SCB, W2024) | X | Mychal Coleman/designee (AVP Human Resources) |  |
| (Student senate): TBD |  | Semogano, Masego (GSA rep) | X |

## Announcements:

1. Minutes for Nov. 22 meeting: Alycia LaGuardia-LoBianco
2. Keep alert for upcoming meeting changes
3. Documents for Dec. 6 meeting in Blackboard (and to be send with final agenda)

## Agenda:

9:01: Meeting Starts

1. Approval of the agenda.
   1. Brief discussion of possibly changing meeting time/day for next semester to accommodate Provost meetings. Ed suggested polling the committee for good times to meet next semester; will have to let ECS know of any big changes. Joel will send out a poll next week.
   2. Motion to approve minutes: Jen P. Second: Anna W. Unanimously approved.
2. Approval of the minutes from the Nov. 22, 2022 meeting.
   1. Changes: correct spelling of “Alisha”; list of what defines ‘teaching’ given by the Graduate Council, not College of Business
      1. Motion to approve with changes: Jen P. Second: Genevieve E. Unanimously approved.
3. Update on Accessibility Report review. Joel
   1. Joel gives updates: Pam Wells from the Registrar is checking on the size and accessibility of classrooms; Joel reached out to HR and Enrollment and is waiting to hear back. Joel will share a review of these recommendations (as a report for ECS) next semester.
4. ECS memo on documenting relationships revision to share. Revised recommendations for discussion.
   1. Joel summarizes: Initial memo drafted March 2021 with report on relations with FTLC and DEI and the recommendations that came out of these discussions; wording of the memo confused ECS and UAS; so it was split it into a report (discussed last time, which has been submitted to SHORE) and a second memo consisting of the recommendations (considered here).
      1. Discussion of possible changes to the memo:
      2. Change to recommendation d to “promote value of inclusive teaching” and add link (Ed’s suggestion); add second link to EIC website (from Josita’s comment)
      3. Add a little more justification for each recommendation (Ed); for example, item C (“Improve outreach to adjunct faculty about Title IX resources”) implies that current outreach is not sufficient as is; a better wording might be to “review” current outreach and address as necessary.
      4. On item E (“Solicit feedback from faculty to inform FTLC on faculty professional development needs”), Jen P. asks if this is all that is being recommended; Joel clarifies that our discussions with Dana on FTLC lead us to want to get a broader, more representative sample of feedback on this issue (how faculty use FTLC resource with regard to equity and inclusion specifically). Dana suggests asking unit heads for feedback to help address the sample problem. Joel clarifies that this may be some combination of item E and F (“Enlist unit heads to communicate FTLC resources to unit faculty.”), but the bigger point is to encourage broader participation, especially from those not already incorporating equity and inclusion in their teaching.
         1. Acknowledge that there is a barrier of incorporating these changes into existing workload (Josita), and that this is yet another reason we should make sure workload distribution id equitable (Jen P.)
         2. Joel suggests adding this point as a separate recommendation—to look at how to adopt equitable teaching practices without excessively overburdening workload. He will add this point (along with other changes discussed), write another draft, and circulate with the committee in January.
5. Temporary subcommittee on service workloads. Charge to EIC:

6. Equity in Faculty Service Loads

Review faculty service loads and make recommendations toward increased equity. Consider service loads by number of years at the University.

SHORE Log: 1289-2022

1. Joel reviews the charge and some of the suggestions that have come out of our last few discussions: we might 1. Review policies across university, colleges, units. 2. Update existing language, or 3. Ask units or colleges to amend annual review processes to raise the service bar for senior faculty (though there are problems with consistent enforcement of such a policy). Joel’s suggestion is to ask one or two people to review our discussions in minutes, gather suggestions, write them up to offer to ECS (though open to other suggestions).
   1. Discussion: The handbook has language to protect untenured faculty, but no specific recommendations for tenured faculty. Dana points out that we should recognize faculty member’s unique strengths (not everyone is suited to, or wants to, lead a faculty governance committee) as well as breadth and depth when considering what counts for service later in one’s career. Dana also notes that ageism is a relevant factor here.
   2. Joel clarifies three issues: 1. Dana’s suggestion of expanding the variety of types of service, 2. The perception that senior faculty are not doing as much service as is expected; 3. Untenured faculty end up with pressure on them to do more than is expected (by the guidelines). Dana notes that affiliates do a lot of service in some departments, and that we should do away with the notion that there is *one* way to improve one’ service—faculty governance leadership. What counts towards service should reflect a range of skills and interests.
   3. Joel and Liz notes that unit head preference plays a big role here—some unit heads may have very high or specific expectations on service such that whatever one’s does, they may not be meeting those expectations. Liz also notes the power imbalance between unit head and department members.
   4. Dana emphasizes that facult of color, LGBTQ+ faculty, and other underrepresented faculty do a lot of additional service, including mentoring or advising of students (“hidden labor”), and we should find a way to document it so it is recognized as service and the important work it is. Jen P. notes that itt would make sense to start a subcommittee to start working these issues out.
   5. Jennifer M-R: We’re missing the bigger point that we are burnt out and there is just more service overall; we need some pressure on admin to pull back on service expectations. There is meaningful service that we do, but we need a collective voice not just about service being more equitable, but about the fact that we are just doing too much.
   6. Alisha: Adding to the point about faculty of color and hidden labor—another part of this is that we take on more service to prove value within the department, when others can take on less. Josita also notes a recent example in which a woman of color was overlooked for service.
   7. Joel notes that there are a number of recommendations here that can be written up, and that we need a mechanism of assessment (rubric, guidelines) that we can be compared against rather than comparing to other colleagues, which may help ease some of the pressure to do more. Dana suggests a “sliding scale” that is flexible with regard to what activities count as, say, service or teaching in a given case. Again, we should recognize different skill sets and interests
   8. Suggestion of some systematic rubric, since not every department has this (Josita); Joel explains how the ‘checklist’ system works in his department and that this provides some protection, even if it does not fix all of the equity issues or eliminate the pressure; we should be valuing a broader range of service requirements than currently count
   9. Dana suggests eliminating the “exemplary” category. This would not only relieve some of these pressures and comparisons one another, and would mean everyone were satisfactory.
   10. Anna notes that a rubric might not work well in the library since some library jobs are very different from each other; assessed on “professional effectiveness” rather than teaching, so scholarship and service looks different than for faculty in other colleges; so a universal rubric suggestion may not work in this case. Joel asks (later) if a unit/college specific rubric, rather than a universal rubric, would address this issue, which allowed faculty to determine what goes in those categories, would that solve the issue? Anna will check with department.
   11. Alisha notes that faculty of color in her college get the least amount of merit increases despite sitting on the most committees; LIFT evaluations are inconsistent and we know these are unreliable; so, despite the point system, we still do not get exemplary. And this has downstream impacts on salary and retirement. Dana adds that women tend to have to work longer to build retirement accounts (due to the pay raise with full professor). Need to look at the deeper systemic and historical issues behind all this. Alisha notes that Jen M-R mentioned summer pay; 9 month faculty are not getting retirement pay during the summer months—further inequity.
   12. Jennifer MR: Only so many people can have the exemplary status, in a department where everyone is a high achiever. This is an *institutional* issue because the university only allows a set number of exemplary status in a department.
   13. Dana recommends that we recommend an ECS/UAS committee to discuss these issues further. Joel proposes to follow Dana’s suggestion and recommend back to ECS that this issue is addressed by a task force (e.g.) (rather than an EIC subcommittee) but with some of our suggestions, including: implementing faculty designed, unit-appropriate rubrics that allow faculty to be judged against a standard rather than against each other; to consider removing exemplary; look into measuring other forms of service that may be nontraditional. Anna notes that this should be applied to unit head review (not just peer review). Jowl will draft and circulate a proposal.
2. Given the time, the committee decides that we do not need to meet as subcommittees this time. Josita presents two questions to committee regarding the EIC website:
   1. 1. Should we have a report page on our website? (to report bias incidents, etc.). Alisha notes that we can mention bias reporting but link out to whichever entity handles these.
   2. 2. Should we have a contact page on our website? (for questions, concerns, etc.). Anna notes that other committees just list the current members and contact info—that could replace a contact page and still get us any information that faculty want to share.
   3. Josita previews website; asks that other send any suggestions around resources or useful links. Alisha suggests linking to the Inclusion and Equity Institute (internal facing site “for Lakers” with upcoming trainings).
3. Mid-year report and plan of work for Winter. Joel
   1. Joel reviews midyear report. Recommend that we delay for one academic year a review of the DEI-A framework (final charges, point 5). Alisha notes if we delay this, we might not be able to have a say in it. Connected to network of advisors.
   2. Joel notes the concern is that we just won’t be able to get to everything. Josita notes that this is not uncommon in previous years, and we just report this; not something to worry about. Perhaps a priority list would be helpful. Joel will remove the point about asking to remove (5).
4. No subcommittee reports or breakouts this week.
5. Announcement:
   1. Next meeting: January 2022 (?): zoom link in outlook; clarify that there is no meeting 12/20/22
   2. Other announcements?
   3. Good and welfare?
6. Adjourn at 10:54am; moved by Jen P.

Meeting Documents to review (in Blackboard in the “December 2022 Documents” file).