Equity And Inclusion Committee

Draft Agenda, March 16, 2021 9:00AM – 11:00AM

<https://gvsu-edu.zoom.us/j/98637905460?pwd=ZjNVYVVqM3FzRkhxWVZTMFhrbHN0dz09>

Chair: Jon Jeffryes

Minutes: Anne McKay

Meeting Documents to review (in Blackboard in “March 16” file):

* February 2021 Draft Minutes
* Draft EIC Recommendation on Teach-In

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Voting Members** | Present | Joshua Sheffer (CCPS, W 2021) |  |
| Elizabeth Arnold (CLAS, W2023) |  | Joel Wendland-Liu (BCOIS, W2023) |  |
| Caitlin Callahan (CLAS, W2022) |  | Thomas Willey (SCB, W2021) |  |
| Alisha Davis (CHP, W2023) |  | **Ex-Officio Members** |  |
| Jon Jeffryes, co-chair (UL, W2022) |  | Ed Aboufadel (AVP Provost’s Office) |  |
| Nabeeh Kandalaft (Padnos, W2022) |  | B. Donta Truss (VP Enrollment Development |  |
| Josita Maouene, co-chair (CLAS, W2022) |  | Takeelia Garrett (Student Ombuds) |  |
| Anne McKay (KCON, W2023) |  | Marlene Kowalski-Braun (AVP I&E) |  |
| Lisa Perhamus (CoE, W2021) |  | Dana Munk (Pew FTLC) |  |
| Anal Shah (CLAS, W 2021) |  |  |  |
| Alexys Neal (Student Senate) |  | Julian Sanders  (Student Senate) |  |

Proposed Agenda

1. Approval of the agenda (5 minutes)
2. Approval of the minutes from February 2021 (5 minutes)
3. Old Business
   1. EIC Recommendation for Teach-In
      1. Does the committee wish to discuss further?
      2. We’ll need a move and vote for approval to move forward.
   2. Diversity Report for ECS
      1. Any interest in partnering on drafting?
      2. Plan for producing following the same lines of EIC recommendation
   3. Network of Advisors for Racial Equity Update – Alisha
   4. Update on literature review working group -- Joel
4. New Business
   1. Input provided to FPPC
      1. Business conducted over email between meeting. Recap findings and further discussion to send on to FPPC
         1. A rubric of qualifications should be developed for each hiring position that is used to measure and record each candidates qualifications. The rubric should include a requirement that the candidate be able to discuss how they understanding teaching to diverse student experiences and identities, how they engage with students one-on-one who come from diverse backgrounds.
         2. I have heard from many faculty of color that their T/P meetings were run differently than their White counterparts. They were scrutinized much more heavily than their White colleagues, some of which, had less scholarship and service than they did. How can we equalize the process so that it is done fairly and equitably?
         3. As an untenured faculty member, I'm concerned about adding policies related to inclusive teaching practices in the personnel review process. I want to be held accountable. Yet I am not especially confident that my senior colleagues have the background to evaluate critically my efforts related to equity and inclusion in the classroom. First, I would prefer that there were more training opportunities related to equity and inclusion that would engage all levels of faculty. I would then have a greater sense of trust in a personnel process that considers these issues.
         4. There should be a stricter enforcement of inclusion advocate policy that requires a person be selected randomly or through HR from outside the college in which the hiring committee is situated.
         5. Contract renewal and tenure/promotion in the unit. If the chair and the faculty based on the recommendations (e.g., salary recommendations) towards contract renewal show that the candidate might be in difficulty, after the first year of teaching, and that the candidate may have issues with the evaluations and the relationships with colleagues due to a minority id or " cross-sectionality", aka, race, gender, mental health, ethnicity, language, etc. , a 'care' commission should be constituted to support the candidate until contract renewal. The 'care' commission should include a mentor (either inside or from FTLC), the colleague that visited the class for developmental feedback and the candidate. Together they will address 'sensitive topics': the candidate's mental health, their perception of the tenure process, the students and the colleagues and transmit the perception of the department towards the junior faculty, their role, their obligations, the history of the department with "problematic cases", in order to put in place support solutions. The commission will report to the Chair the plan put in place for year 2 and 3. The Commission will meet monthly to discuss the progress and adjustments. If the department fail to observe this, the candidate can ask FTLC and a colleague to create the 'care' commission.
            1. Under University policy, 4.2.10.7 Unit personnel action.

A. Even if the unit has a report that addresses issues, concerns and questions, an agenda must be sent with the questions, concerns and issues that will be discussed during the meeting.

B. Unit meeting and Vote

The candidate should not be advised to sign the waiver for their participation to the preliminary discussion because it is a 'social norm' in the department. If the candidate waves their right to participate, the 'care commission' will represent the candidate.

If new information or issues are raised, the 'care commission' shall determine whether they warrant the recalling of the candidate.

* + - 1. I’m curious to see personnel policies evaluated for how they might reinforce white supremacy culture (<https://www.thc.texas.gov/public/upload/preserve/museums/files/White_Supremacy_Culture.pdf>) and see how policy might be rewritten to be more inclusive

1. Announcements and Updates
2. Adjournment