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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Implementation Team for the Recommendations of the Commission on Academic Excellence and Equity (ITCAEE) was formed on May 31, 2012 by Interim Provost Bruce McCombe. He charged this group “to review and discuss the recommendations of the CAEE, to determine which are appropriate for implementation and how best to implement them, and to develop a timeline for this process.”

The Implementation Team reaffirmed the conviction of the Commission on Academic Excellence and Equity (CAEE) that an inextricable link exists between excellence, equity, and inclusion, and took this belief as foundational in its deliberations. The Implementation Team based its course of actions squarely on the recommendations of CAEE, but explicitly broadened the scope of its work to include students and staff, as well as faculty. Inclusion objectives were also viewed as going beyond issues of gender and race alone, to reflect the diversity of our community more broadly, in such areas as (but not limited to) sexual orientation, disabilities, and veteran status.

This report presents the findings of the Implementation Team, which comprise the following action items:

- Establish a senior leadership position focused on equity and inclusion, specifically a Vice Provost or Vice President (henceforth VPEI), to plan, coordinate, and monitor the efforts to institutionalize the culture of equity and inclusion university-wide.

- Establish a Council for Equity and Inclusion reflecting the pervasive scope of the university-wide efforts in fostering equity and inclusion and to support the VPEI across the broad spectrum of stakeholders.

- Provide a staff line and resources to address the collection and reporting of accurate employee data and to connect different information systems to increase the information and transparency of such data.

- Refine the faculty mentoring program to enhance its effectiveness;

- Institute and consistently communicate and implement policies that actively support and enhance work/life balance to match what is commonly offered at other AAU research public universities, as listed in the body of this report;

- Incentivize and make additional resources available to units for the recruiting and retention of faculty, students, and staff for underrepresented minorities.
In addition, the Implementation Team recommends that effective policies be designed and communicated regarding the following two areas:

- Procedures governing the review of renewal/non-renewal recommendations along the path to tenure, and especially at the penultimate stage of review prior to tenure, should receive further study and development, to result in a process that provides greater uniformity and more information to the Provost’s office on such decisions.

- Investigate new approaches, networks, and resources for facilitating partners of new faculty candidates with finding career opportunities in the regional economy.
1. Background and Charge to the Implementation Team

The Commission on Academic Excellence and Equity (CAEE) was formed by then Provost Satish K. Tripathi and the Faculty Senate on April 10, 2009 and charged to examine data, policies, and practices that bear on faculty recruitment and career paths, in order to identify barriers that may impede faculty success. The commission completed its work in December 2011. Its final report of this commission, entitled “In Pursuit of Academic Excellence: Equity Across Diversity,” was shared with faculty in 2012 and a list of its recommendations is available at the web site http://www.buffalo.edu/provost/commission-on-academic-excellence-and-equity.html. We refer the reader to this source for the final report of the CAEE, which contains an extensive discussion of the evidence the Commission examined in the course of its deliberations.

The CAEE report was the culmination of a long process of analysis and careful deliberations conducted by a highly capable team of dedicated commission members, and brought to final closure under the leadership of Commission Chair and Professor of Law Athena Mutua. In his message to the UB community, Interim Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs Bruce McCombe summarized the key findings of this report, endorsed its broad recommendations, and promised to follow up with specific implementation steps. These steps included the formation of an Implementation Team to evaluate “the recommendations that involve changes in university practices, policies, and personnel.”

The Implementation Team for the Recommendations of the Commission on Academic Excellence and Equity (CAEE) was formed on May 31, 2012 by Interim Provost McCombe. The members of this group are listed on page 2 of this document. Below, we will refer to this group as the Implementation Team or ITCAEE. Four members of this group, namely Professors Mary Bisson, Athena Mutua, Teresa Quattrin, and Vice Provost Lucinda Finley also served on the original Commission.

In stating the charge to the group, the Interim Provost wrote:

As you know, the CAEE has completed its research and analyses of data, policies, and practices related to faculty success, and has submitted to me its final report, “In Pursuit of Academic Excellence: Equity Across Diversity”; I have shared it with the campus community…. One of our goals as a university community is to eliminate obstacles and barriers, so that all UB faculty, regardless of gender/race/ethnicity, can excel and flourish. With that in mind, I have formed an implementation team, whose role is to review and discuss the recommendations of the CAEE, to determine which are appropriate for implementation and how best to implement them, and to develop a timeline for this process.

2. The Implementation Team: Objectives and Process

In his statement of May 1, 2012, Interim Provost McCombe wrote:
I fully share the Commission’s emphasis on the extricable connection between diversity and excellence, and I am committed to make UB a true leader in its practices and policies for achieving equity across diversity.

The conviction that there is an inextricable link between excellence, equity and inclusion, faithfully reflects the spirit guiding the original CAEE report. This belief also guided the deliberations of the Implementation Team and informed the findings of this report.

The work of the Implementation Team was purposely based on the recommendations given in the CAEE report cited above. The Implementation Team also took note of the fact that while a good part of the CAEE report focused on faculty issues, the Commission also felt that the spirit of its recommendations should extend to students and staff. The Implementation Team specifically advocates broadening the inclusion objective to students and staff. UB is overdue for a cultural change and needs to send a clear and persuasive message to its entire community – faculty, staff, and students.

Other than an expansion of the inclusion categories to include students and staff as well as faculty, the inclusion objectives should extend beyond issues of gender and race alone, to reflect the diversity of our community more broadly, in such areas as (but not limited to) sexual orientation, disabilities, and veteran status.

The objective of the team was to make recommendations which would:

- Establish a senior leadership position focused on equity and inclusion;

- Enhance and make available demographic data about faculty and staff in order to optimize the effectiveness of inclusion measures and processes and to ensure that the results of such measures were public and transparent;

- Develop and further faculty mentoring and evaluation to optimize the prospects for positive renewal and tenure decision – while ensuring that data are collected and analyzed regarding the reasons faculty members separate from the university; and

- Develop and establish guidelines for improved faculty work/life balance for all members of the university community.

On August 24, 2012, the Implementation Team met with Provost Charles Zukoski to receive and discuss its charge. The group met regularly during the Fall 2012 semester and held an interim meeting with the Provost on November 28, 2012 to discuss progress to date and the projected outline of the final report.
3. Creation of Leadership Position and Council for Equity and Inclusion

The Implementation team firmly believes that excellence at the University at Buffalo (UB) requires a strong and unwavering commitment to the promotion of diversity, inclusion, and cultural competence. In the past four years, we have witnessed how other universities have moved to make this part of their strategic plan for achieving excellence. Such excellence will only be achieved if equity and inclusion efforts are explicitly incorporated into UB’s strategic planning efforts, mission and goals. It follows that planning and execution of efforts to promote equity and inclusion must be considered a responsibility of every member of UB’s senior leadership team.

The Final Report of CAEE makes recommendations for UB to create a Vice President or Vice Provost, along with a Council, to address barriers to faculty success, especially those barriers relative to equity in gender and race (see Appendix A - “Summary of Comments – VP & Council References”). A senior-level administrator responsible for equity and inclusion efforts across the entire university community is standard practice among other AAU universities; it remains an area of excellence that UB has not yet achieved.

Our major implementation recommendation is twofold: the creation of a Vice Provost or Vice President for Equity & Inclusion, supported by a Council on Equity & Inclusion. In what follows, we refer to this position as VPIE. We stress the importance of forming the Council in addition to the VPEI position in view of the extended coverage of the inclusion objectives as detailed below.

The need for a Vice Provostial/Vice Presidential position emerged from the following considerations:

- The university’s strategic directions & goals should incorporate diversity and inclusion in a visible way from the highest level of administration possible;
- The CAEE originated from faculty issues;
- The incumbent of the newly formed Office must have faculty experience and credentials;
- S/he must work effectively with the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, as well as Graduate & Undergraduate Education;
- S/he must be able to engage effectively with faculty, as well as staff and students;
- S/he must understand the broader context of the University and be able to work with extant offices such as Equity, Diversity and Inclusion; Employee Assistance Program; or Student Life;

Cultural competence is the ability to interact with individuals of various backgrounds and cultural identities in an effective way. The term originated in the medical field, as understanding patients’ cultural traditions, mores, and behaviors can be critical in effective medical care. It has expanded into other fields (social work, for example, has standards for cultural competence in practice) and can be viewed as an essential educational objective in many fields and areas of study. The degree of cultural competence of a faculty or staff member, or a student, can also determine how effectively that person communicates with international members of our community or those from underrepresented groups in the US.
The VPIE should have access to both the President and the Provost with a reporting structure that would maximize the impact of this position on inclusion and equity across the university.

The need for a **Council** to support the VPIE resulted from the following discussion points:
- Creates a broad-based body/voice that sends a message to the entire University community; more effectively addresses a cultural campus-wide shift;
- Allows broader participation and seeks input from a range of relevant stakeholders whose activities need to be coordinated;
- Avoids the isolated voice of a single professional (i.e., the VPEI);
- Allows for greater neutrality than a single person; avoids perception of conflict of interest;
- Determination and execution of initiatives and policies will be more effective;
- Consensus will be more easily accomplished with actual representation from constituencies;
- Enables a clearer reporting structure for current multiple groups, many of which are “invisibly” housed inside “parent” offices.

The **charge** to the VPEI and the Council on Equity & Inclusion would include the creation of:
- Programs & practices that promote diversity & inclusion; identify gaps in policy & efforts;
- Long term policy & planning issues; strategic directions & goals;
- A supportive environment; changed campus climate;
- Effective communication with all segments of the university community;
- Education & guidance of the entire campus community;
- Campus vision for equity & inclusion; develop action items;
- Measurable performance indicators;
- Periodic reports (annual or other);
- Methodology to examine formal & informal processes & structures that inhibit success;
- Pipeline of undergraduates who proceed to graduate school and faculty positions;
- Working groups, sub-committees, and/or task forces to address—singly or in concert—the following:
  - Efficacy of implementation;
  - Awards for best practices;
  - An updated website;
  - Faculty issues; student issues; staff issues;
  - Teaching & learning;
  - Civic engagement;
  - Research;
  - Recruitment & retention;
  - Campus life;
  - Pipeline; lifetime connections;
  - LGBT (or LGBTQ) equality;
  - Racial/Ethnic diversity;
  - Status of women;
  - Disability awareness and increasing access;
  - Narrative, collecting experiences;
  - Curriculum review & course creation.
The composition of the Council on Equity & Inclusion should reflect a broadly representative cross-section of the University:

- Academic divisions;
- Professional schools & Medical Center;
- Administrative functions & staff;
- Students – both graduate & undergraduate;
- Alumni.

Appendix B provides sample missions, goals, and charges for Councils of Equity, Inclusion, and Diversity at other academic institutions.

Two items generated significant discussion regarding the position of VPEI. The first point regards the title of the position. While the Implementation Team was unanimous in the belief that the leadership position for equity and inclusion should be highly placed and visible within the UB leadership team, some members felt that a Vice Presidential title is required to suitably empower the position, to send a strong signal to the university, to ensure a direct reporting line to the President, and to effect the desired impact. Such a bold move was made by the University of California-Berkeley appointed its first Vice Chancellor for Equity and Inclusion. However, a majority of the members of the Implementation Team were satisfied with the Vice Provostial title. All agreed that, immaterial of the specific title, the VPEI should be regularly included in strategic planning efforts with the UB President and the cabinet. Additionally, to be effective, the VPEI needs to have access to Vice Presidents and deans.

Prompted by this discussion, Craig Abbey conducted a review of how the function of “Chief Diversity Officer” is structured in other AAU Public universities, and what title is given to such a position. The results of this informative benchmarking appear in Appendix A. Overall, these results show that the title of Vice-Provost appears with the greatest frequency. The Implementation Team views the final decision on the exact title of the VPIE and the reporting structure to rest with the UB President and Provost.

The second point regards the background and experience base expected of the VPEI. Here, the Implementation Team was sensitive to two different perspectives. As this individual would regularly weigh in on matters that relate to faculty, a strong academic background and standing would be desirable. In matters regarding promotion and tenure, for example, the background and experience of a full professor would be helpful. On the other hand, the scope of responsibilities of the VPEI, as defined above, extends considerably beyond faculty matters alone. This suggests that broader exposure to all aspects and challenges of inclusion for staff and students, as well as faculty, would be valuable. We do not think that these two perspectives are incompatible. We believe that the challenge of bridging the two is the task of the search committee for VPEI, and that it can be informed by examining the profiles of individuals who hold equivalent positions (in terms of scope) at other universities. Appendix A should provide a good starting point for such an examination.
4. Mentoring, Work-Life Balance, and Path to Tenure

In response to feedback from faculty members, Chairs, and Deans, and after reflecting on experiences with the implementation of the Mentoring Policy adopted based on the Commission’s recommendation, the Implementation Team recommends some modifications of that Mentoring Policy. These modifications will, in our judgment, improve the effectiveness of mentoring tailored to the needs of individual faculty members and to different disciplines, and should enhance the success of implementing the mentoring program. We recommend that the requirement for an annual contract between Mentor and Mentee be eliminated, and instead propose the following:

**Role of Mentor:** the assigned faculty mentor should provide regular oral guidance and feedback about research, teaching, and career/life balance, and in addition should, on an annual basis, provide written feedback to the mentee. This written feedback should focus on areas of strength and areas for suggested improvement, including specific suggestions to help the faculty member achieve their goals for maintain strength and for improvement. The annual written feedback should be kept in the department so that it can be referred to guide subsequent mentoring.

In addition to the formal mentoring from the assigned mentor, departments and schools are strongly encouraged to offer additional forms of mentoring that are tailored to the needs of their faculty and disciplines. Examples of additional mentoring activities include group meetings and workshops on relevant career and work/life balance topics; structured feedback on grant proposals or manuscripts from individuals who are expert in the research area or funding source; and other programs or activities that faculty may suggest as useful to their career development.

An assigned mentor may be from a department other than the department of the mentee, when interdisciplinary work and areas of expertise make someone from outside the home department more suitable as a mentor.

In all other respects we endorse the existing mentoring policy. For instance, training workshops should be offered; mentors assigned, etc. Because the Mentoring Policy was reviewed and adopted by the Faculty Senate, in order to change it these recommendations should be referred to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee for review and appropriate action.

**Work/Life Balance**

UB’s policies and practices are not in many respects commensurate with work/life balance support provided by other AAU Research Universities. Some of this variance is due to legal constraints; for example, New York State does not currently provide paid family and medical leave. There are, however, creative ways to deal with this lack – including by implementing practices and policies offered by many other universities. At UB, practices vary from unit to unit. For example, one school, the Law School, has a formal policy granting course reduction to faculty who have just had or adopted an infant. No other school or college at UB has such a formal policy, but some departments negotiate this informally for those who ask, while others do
not. Another example is that some departments proactively work with faculty to implement Presidential sick leave if the faculty member does not have sufficient leave accumulated to cover the period of pregnancy disability; others are not proactive, with the result that some faculty members never learn about this option.

The Implementation Team supports the Commission’s recommendation that UB should have central policies and practices that are consistently communicated and implemented, and that these policies and practices should be enhanced to match what is commonly offered at other AAU research Universities. We recommend that the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs be charged with developing proposed policies, consistent with law, regulation, and contract, in the following areas in keeping with the general principles stated below:

1) “Active Service Modified Duties (ASMD)” for tenured and tenure track faculty. Since the job of ladder faculty consists of teaching, research, and service, the mix between these three can be altered and still amount to full time work. When a ladder faculty member has or adopts an infant, is faced with a significant family illness situation, or needs to devote significant time and attention to an elder care situation, s/he should be able to have modified duties that accommodate these demands on her/his schedule. For example, the teaching or service load can be reduced so that the faculty member can maintain a productive research program. Several departments or schools have informal practices of doing this for faculty on an ad hoc basis; others do not. Only one school – the Law School – has formally adopted a reduced teaching load policy for faculty who have or adopt a child. This formal policy should be centrally adopted and uniformly applied across UB.

Questions to explore include whether this ASMD concept should extend to non-ladder faculty, especially when their job consists of primarily or exclusively of teaching? How can one make this concept work for clinical medical faculty, who have patient loads and on-call expectations? Should there be central resources available to help the resource-challenged departments implement this, such as funds to help with course instructor replacements?

2) Presidential sick leave shall be given to any faculty member who has a child but does not have sufficient accumulated sick leave to have a paid maternity leave (for example, a faculty member who is in her first year of service at UB).

3) Course scheduling and faculty meeting scheduling should accommodate child day care/school schedules/elder care needs, such as day care pick ups. In other words, to the extent possible, faculty meetings should not be held first thing in the morning or later in the afternoon.

4) If a faculty member is scheduled to be on sabbatical or research leave but a childbirth/adoption/family illness/elder care need arises during what would have been the sabbatical/research leave period, the sabbatical/research leave period should be adjusted so that FMLA leave does not intrude on the sabbatical time.
5) Consistent central policies should be instituted about adjusting new appointment start dates, or using summer “research associate” type of appointments, to qualify new faculty for health insurance and benefits sooner than 42 days after the start of the fall semester, to reduce the COBRA and other significant cost burdens that face our new faculty who face a gap of a few months between the end of their previous appointment and the start of their UB benefits. Each year, some new UB faculty with children or with personal health issues or maternity wind up facing an unanticipated and costly burden when they find out they are either temporarily uncovered or have to pay vast sums for COBRA coverage precisely when they are between jobs, without income, and facing relocation expenses.

6) New faculty spouses/partners who wish to find a job in the regional economy need and should have access to improved central support or assistance. Options to explore include contractual arrangements with executive search/hiring/relocation firms in the area who will actively assist. No such expertise exists within UB’s HR Department.

Path to Tenure

In its executive summary, the CAEE report called for the university to “develop a policy in which a department or school’s penultimate review is subject to a substantive right of review” (page xii). This statement is further clarified in the body of the report (p.61) as follows: This review would occur only if a candidate elected such a review after being non-renewed. In other words, this recommendation was not meant to require a full substantive provostial review of all ladder faculty at the fourth year; but rather a review of a candidate's file, who was denied continuing engagement, if the candidate sought the review.

In its deliberations, the Implementation Team supported the notion of some form of review in the Provost’s office of contract renewal recommendations for tenure track faculty – at least for the penultimate stage of review before tenure (in most units is the 4th year review, but considerable variance seems to exist across units and individual cases). Reasons cited for this include: (a) insuring that non-renewal decisions are based on appropriate criteria and on consistent processes across units; (b) providing an opportunity to provide mentoring advice and feedback to departments about what more may be needed to enhance the tenure chances of those who are renewed; and (c) enhancing the ability of the Provost’s office to track the path to tenure of tenure track faculty and to ascertain where constructive intervention and support for departments and faculty may be needed.

The Faculty –Staff Handbook provides that reappointment recommendations prior to tenure should be based on periodic review of progress and that documentary evidence of the review should be submitted to the Provost along with the change in status form. At a minimum, this documentation should consist of a current CV and a letter of evaluation written by the Dean to the Provost (see Art. III, Sec. II.B.2.b). Currently, these requirements are rarely followed. A Subcommittee of the Implementation Team recommended that these Handbook requirements be followed.
For those faculty who are recommended for non-renewal, the Faculty-Staff Handbook currently provides that the faculty member may obtain review by the Provost “only if the incumbent can provide clear and convincing evidence that the decision is a result of bias or serious procedural error, or some violation of law, contract, or SUNY policy.” [Art. III, Sec. II. B.2.c.]

The Subcommittee of the Implementation Team supported the CAEE recommendation that there should be an automatic review of non-renewal recommendations by the Provost’s office, and proposed some procedures for implementing such a process. These recommendations generated considerable discussion by the Implementation Team and no final agreement was reached on the specific procedural steps to recommend. The Implementation Team concludes that this topic—the procedures governing the review of renewal/non-renewal recommendations along the path to tenure—should be the subject of further study and development.

5. Recruitment and Retention

The Implementation Team proposes the following actions in the area of recruitment and retention of faculty.

1. Educate chairs of departments and search committees on best practices in recruiting underrepresented minorities (including racial, ethnic, and gender minorities).

   We understand that the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs has already taken steps in this direction. We recommend that the information regarding best practices extend beyond recruiting techniques to offer strategies for presenting the regional community as a welcoming place for the underrepresented minority candidate. The question is how to incentivize chairs to respond to these educational efforts. We recommend positive incentives such as those illustrated in item 2 below.

2. Make extra resources available to units for the recruiting of underrepresented minorities.

   (a) These resources could come from the Provost or the deans. Extra resources should be provided to units attempting to recruit underrepresented minorities. We recognize that because of efforts by many universities to enhance minority recruitment, extra incentives may need to be offered to attract them to UB. These could include such monetary incentives such as pay, travel and relocation costs, and set-up.

   (b) Make extra faculty lines available for successful recruitment of underrepresented minorities. Since the pool of minority candidates is often small, it may be difficult to find qualified minority candidates whose research coincides exactly with the research area intended in the search. If departments that hire candidates from underrepresented minorities can be assured of an extra line for recruitment more directly in the intended
research area, they may more willing to make the minority hire as well. Lines must be sequestered at the provostial or decanal level to provide the extra line. We understand that this is likely an expensive or contentious issue. Possibilities of abuse may arise. But this is the single best mechanism which has been shown to increase minority hiring.

3. Provide resources for partner accommodation.

Partner accommodation is an important and powerful tool in attracting the best faculty and staff to the university. Our objective of building excellence requires that we use this tool effectively. The Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs and some deans have been particularly active in negotiating faculty lines for this purpose. While partner accommodations may arise in all hiring decision, there is particular concern that this may have greater impact on the recruiting of women and minorities.

In many cases, one finds that the relevant partner may be looking for a non-academic position, for example in local industries or K-12 education. It is useful to have networks and resources, such as contact names from these sectors of the community, to help chairs and candidates look for suitable positions for such partners.

6. Data Requirements

The Commission on Academic Excellence and Equity (CAEE) Implementation Team reviewed the challenges identified in the CAEE report regarding receiving accurate data on faculty demographics, tenure status and historical trends. The CAEE report states in part, “…the University would benefit from coordinating data collection or having the end-users of data and the schools work with HR and IA to develop systems that ensure the information is as accurate as possible.” During the presentation of the CAEE report by Professor Mutua to the UB leadership team, the need for better integration of data sources was specifically stressed by then Provost Satish K.Tripathi.

The Implementation Team fully agrees with the recommendation in the CAEE report that the University should devote sufficient resources and attention to the provision of accurate employee data. A university cannot assess what it cannot measure, and meaningful measurement requires adequate and accurate data support. There are a number of factors that present challenges in securing accurate employee data, including decentralized and inconsistent applications of titles, as well as the limitations of existing data systems.

As part of UB’s ongoing obligations and commitment to ensuring diversity and inclusion, tracking and measurement of faculty and staff demographics will be critical. While various campus offices track and use employee data (for instance, the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, Institutional Analysis, and the Office of Equity, Diversity and Inclusion), the Implementation Team views University Human Resources as the prime custodian of employee data. The Assistant Vice President for Human Resources has therefore been consulted by the Implementation Team for feedback and information. The Implementation Team has learned that Human Resources has been examining and implementing improvements to its data systems. This process should, to the extent possible, incorporate the identified needs for reports and tracking.
Because the ultimate responsibility for maintaining data rests with Human Resources, it is important that UB provide Human Resources with sufficient staffing, support and funding for the data collection and reporting required to proceed effectively. The CAEE Implementation Team therefore has set forth the following action item:

- The provision of a staff line and funding for a dedicated HRIS/data systems (“Data Support Analyst”) position within Human Resources to ensure that complex interactions run smoothly, to provide accurate data and reports to university departments, and to connect systems where possible to increase productivity throughout HR and university-wide. The Data Support Analyst would ensure that any changes or modifications to HR systems incorporate the ability to track faculty status and changes in appointment, such as promotion, tenure clock stop due to family leave, and receipt of tenure. The Data Support Analyst is responsible for ensuring the accuracy of data reporting. A suggested job description and list of anticipated campus data needs is provided in Appendix C.

The Implementation Team understands that the demographics data mentioned above will have multiple users and uses. In fact, the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, the VPEI, and EDI readily come to mind as users. To ensure that the data collected will meet the requirements of these different users, it may be useful to create a subcommittee of the Council for Equity and Inclusion focusing on data needs. Such a subcommittee can report to the VPEI and a cabinet-level position such as the Vice President for Finance and Administration.

7. Items for Immediate Action

Early in the course of its deliberations, the Implementation Team identified certain items as ready for immediate action. The items listed below are taken from the list entitled “immediate recommendations” in the original CAEE report. (Note: The letters match those used in the original CAEE report, the descriptions reflect the discussions of the present team).

(A) Annual release of tenure data to Faculty Senate: Currently, the data reported to the Faculty Senate is presented in aggregate form and care is taken to keep the identity of the candidates for promotion or appointment confidential (an imperative). This report should be augmented by the two categories (gender and race) by drawing on HR data where such information is available (and left blank otherwise).

(B) Awards gateway: We recommend the creation of a central web site that lists key awards of note for UB faculty and staff. Initially, the site should list all SUNY and UB award winners (current and retired employees). Over time, this list can be enhanced with other significant awards. Initially, this is best done at the decanal unit level, because each unit is most familiar with the awards of note in the fields housed by the unit. A subset of the unit awards, selected based on the prestige and selectivity of the award would be reflected at a central site.

(C) Leadership pipeline with diversity focus: We recommend that constant and sustained attention be given to attracting, mentoring, and retaining a diverse group of faculty members with a view towards creating a diverse leadership pipeline and a richer set of options in succession planning. While no immediate changes in policy or practice are recommended, this objective should receive due attention at all levels of leadership.
Note: We propose that self-studies be conducted by units on this topic. This would allow a decanal unit to measure and monitor success towards this goal.

(D) Tenure review advocate policy (CAS model): We believe that the model from CAS can be extended to the rest of the university. Essentially, this would require each candidate to select an advocate in advance of the processing of any case for promotion (need to specify level). Care should be taken to implement this in such a way as to avoid excessive bureaucracy.

8. Conclusion

The original Commission on Academic Excellence and Equity (CAEE) started its work nearly four years ago. The submission of the present implementation report occurs more than 13 months after the presentation of the final CAEE report. During this period, which spans nearly five years, other AAU public universities have taken significant steps to make the broad area of inclusion, diversity, and equity more central to the overall academic mission of their institutions. It is time for UB to make this part of the university’s strategic priorities.

The Implementation Team has made every effort to remain faithful to the spirit guiding the CAEE Report. For this reason, it has closely followed the recommendations of that report in drawing up the present action items for implementation. With this report, we believe that the focus should shift decisively from further study and deliberations to taking action.

The charge to the Implementation Team included the development of a timeline for its recommendations. We believe that the initial steps for implementation are adequately outlined in this report and urge the Provost to lose no time in taking these steps. Foremost among these are creating the office of VPEI and instituting the Council for Equity and Inclusion. The need to establish both the VPEI position and the Council is intensified by the expanded inclusion of students and staff in the implementation objectives. We ask that these be formed without further delay. The VPEI and the Council can then proceed to jointly champion, plan, and coordinate the active dissemination of the culture of inclusion, equity, and excellence throughout the University at Buffalo. Once put in place, the VPEI and the Council can jointly address the challenges UB will face as it launches the implementation process, and provide leadership in extending the scope of the original CAEE report beyond faculty to include students and staff.
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APPENDIX A

The “Chief Diversity Officer Function” at AAU Public Institutions

This appendix compiles information on the function of the Chief Diversity Officer (CDO), or the office that most closely resembled its function, in 34 AAU Public Institutions. The compilation was focused on two issues: (a) the position of the CDO within the administration and its reporting structure, and (b) the specific title used for this position. The notes that follow provide detailed information on both issues and also identify three different structures that appeared to be prevalent across the 34 institutions.

GENERAL REMARKS

- Data collection focused on programs and advocacy function
- Institutions used different terms for this function
  - diversity, inclusion, intercultural, multicultural, equity, minority affairs
- No two institutions setup the same way
- Compliance function frequently housed in separate organization
- Position titles vary widely by institution

Only 8 institutions used the title “Chief Diversity Officer”
GENERIC ORGANIZATIONAL MODEL

The organizational structure varies across different institutions studied. As expected, the reporting structure and job titles found will also vary accordingly. Below we show a generic organizational structure, and in the pages that follow, we identify four common structures (models) used in the institutions examined.
The Vice Presidential Model

The structure for this model is shown below. The following seven schools follow this model.

• Indiana University-Bloomington
• University of Texas at Austin
• University of California-Berkeley
• University of Oregon
• University of Virginia
• University of Washington
• Georgia Institute of Technology
The Vice Provostial Model

The structure for this model is shown below. The following 16 schools follow this model.

- Iowa State University
- North Carolina-Chapel Hill
- Penn State University-University Park
- Purdue University
- Rutgers University
- Texas A&M University
- The Ohio State University
- University of California-Davis
- University of California-San Diego
- University of California-Santa Barbara
- University of Colorado-Boulder
- University of Iowa
- University of Kansas
- University of Maryland
- University of Minnesota-Twin Cities
- University of Wisconsin-Madison
Deputy to Vice Provost or Vice President Model

The structure for this model is shown below. The following six schools follow this model.

- The University of Michigan-Ann Arbor
- University of California-Irvine
- University of California-Los Angeles
- University of Florida
- University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
- University of Pittsburgh
The Senior Advisor Model

The structure for this model is shown below. The following four schools follow this model.

- Michigan State University
- Stony Brook University
- University of Arizona
- University of Missouri-Columbia
**Titles Found**

The following is a list of distinct titles found at the AAU Public Institutions examined in this study.

- Associate Vice Chancellor for Diversity, Equity, and Academic Policy
- Assistant Executive Vice Chancellor and Director of the Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity
- Assistant Provost and Associate Director for the Office of Equal Opportunity and Access
- Assistant Vice President for Inclusive Excellence
- Associate Executive Vice Chancellor
- Associate Provost for Academic Personnel and Chief Diversity Officer
- Associate Provost for Diversity
- Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, Director, Office of Institutional Diversity and Equity
- Associate Vice Provost for Academic and Faculty Affairs and Senior Director for Institutional Equity
- Chief Diversity Officer
- Chief Diversity Officer and Associate Vice President
- Chief Diversity Officer and Associate Vice President
- Director of Diversity Outreach
- Director of the Office of Diversity and Affirmative Action
- Director, Multicultural and Diversity Affairs
- Director, Office of Affirmative Action, Diversity, and Inclusion
- Director, Office of Employment Equity
- Director, Organization and Human Resources Consulting
- Senior Advisor to the President for Diversity and Director of Office of Inclusion and Intercultural Initiatives
- Vice Chancellor
- Vice Chancellor
- Vice Chancellor of Equity, Diversity and Inclusion.
- Vice President and Chief Officer for Diversity and Equity
- Vice President for Diversity and Community Engagement
- Vice President for Diversity, Equity, and Multicultural Affairs
- Vice President for Equity and Diversity
- Vice Provost for Equity and Inclusion
- Vice President for Institute Diversity
Vice Provost and Chief Diversity Officer
Vice Provost and Chief Diversity Officer, Division of Diversity, Equity & Educational Achievement
Vice Provost for Diversity & Equity
Vice Provost for Diversity and Vice President for Minority Affairs
Vice Provost for Diversity and Chief Diversity Officer
Vice Provost for Diversity and Multicultural Affairs and Chief Diversity Officer
Vice Provost for Educational Equity
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>CV or Bio Sketch</th>
<th>Additional Info</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University Bloomington</td>
<td>President</td>
<td><a href="http://www.diversity.gatech.edu/about/about-dr-ervin.htm">http://www.diversity.gatech.edu/about/about-dr-ervin.htm</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina A&amp;T State University</td>
<td>President</td>
<td><a href="http://equity.psu.edu/vice-provost-unequal-opportunity-and-access">http://equity.psu.edu/vice-provost-unequal-opportunity-and-access</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California-Berkeley</td>
<td>President</td>
<td><a href="http://www.multicultural.ufl.edu/about/mboswell_r.html">http://www.multicultural.ufl.edu/about/mboswell_r.html</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ohio State University</td>
<td>President</td>
<td><a href="http://www.msu.edu/about/thisismsu/docs/SELBio.pdf">http://www.msu.edu/about/thisismsu/docs/SELBio.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Texas at Austin</td>
<td>President</td>
<td><a href="https://www.utexas.edu/diversity/27_03/02.shtml">https://www.utexas.edu/diversity/27_03/02.shtml</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California-Davis</td>
<td>President</td>
<td><a href="http://www.oeod.uci.edu/staff.htm">http://www.oeod.uci.edu/staff.htm</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin-Madison</td>
<td>President</td>
<td><a href="http://equity.psu.edu/vice-provost-unequal-opportunity-and-access">http://equity.psu.edu/vice-provost-unequal-opportunity-and-access</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota-Twin Cities</td>
<td>President</td>
<td><a href="http://www.mississippi.edu/about/ohio-state/aaddeo/index.html">http://www.mississippi.edu/about/ohio-state/aaddeo/index.html</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University</td>
<td>President</td>
<td><a href="http://equity.psu.edu/vice-provost-unequal-opportunity-and-access">http://equity.psu.edu/vice-provost-unequal-opportunity-and-access</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania State University</td>
<td>President</td>
<td><a href="http://www.washington.edu/diversity/biography.html">http://www.washington.edu/diversity/biography.html</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
<td>President</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ohio-state.edu/~dema/MarltonrshallBio.pdf">http://www.ohio-state.edu/~dema/MarltonrshallBio.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

Sample Charges of Councils for Equity and Inclusion

Brandeis University: Provost’s Steering Committee on Diversity Issues

The Provost’s Steering Committee on Diversity sponsors a variety of activities and events designed to increase internal capacity to serve as effective stewards for diversity at Brandeis.

Subcommittees: (1) Narratives (collecting experiences of students/faculty/staff), (2) Curriculum Review (adding courses where necessary to diversify the educational experience), (3) Diversity Texts (? No explanation)

Brown University: (1) Advisory Council on Diversity, (2) Diversity Advisory Board, (3) Committee on Faculty Equity and Diversity

1. The Advisory Council on Diversity shall consist of the President, ex officio, and no fewer than fifteen other members. Members shall be appointed by the President for staggered terms of three years each, beginning July 1 and ending June 30. A chairperson shall be designated annually by the President. The Council shall consider long-term policy and planning issues, strategic directions, and efficacy of implementation concerning issues of diversity and programs and practices that promote diversity, inclusion, and fair treatment of all members of the community, in keeping with the mission of the University.

2. The Diversity Advisory Board is a broadly representative, deliberative group that meets to consider matters that concern the campus community especially with regards to diversity. Its mission concerns the well-being of the community—its capacity for collegiality and the pursuit of the commonweal while preserving an excellent education for all students.

   The goals of the Committee shall include, but not be limited to the following:

   a. To work with and advise the Associate Provost and Director of Institutional Diversity and other senior officers as appropriate concerning the promotion of diversity and the development of a welcoming and inclusive campus climate.
   b. Identify ways to educate the community about diversity and provide guidance for dealing with community issues.
   c. To develop an effective means of communication about diversity issues with all segments of the community.
Membership
The membership shall consist of the Associate Provost and Director of Institutional Diversity; the Vice President for Campus Life and Student Services; a minimum of three faculty members; a minimum of two undergraduate students, two graduate students and two medical students; and a minimum of four staff members. Members shall serve staggered two-year terms.

3. The Committee on Faculty Equity and Diversity (CFED) shall represent the Faculty in personnel issues such as compensation, benefits, leaves, equity, diversity and advancement.

Carnegie Mellon: Diversity Advisory Council

The Diversity Advisory Council was created by President Jared L. Cohon in 2000 to assess the status of diversity at Carnegie Mellon, study the issues and challenges associated with increasing diversity at the university, prepare short- and long-term recommendations that focus on the needs of many constituencies throughout the university community, and assist in the implementation of those recommendations.

The DAC has several working groups to focus on subsets of diversity issues, including the following:

Faculty Issues; Staff Issues; Student Issues (undergraduate and graduate); University Culture and Climate Issues

The working groups each had a three-year plan. In year one (2000), they defined the problem. In year two (2001), they studied the problems and issues and developed reports with specific strategies. And in year three (2002), they began implementing the strategies outlined in their reports. The DAC has issued yearly Annual Reports and reports from the individual working groups to track progress and challenges. These reports can be found on the Report Data page.

Cornell University: University Diversity Council

The Executive Committee of the Council is co-chaired by the President and the Provost. It meets several times each year to review and revise diversity goals and strategies for the campus.

A Working Group of the Council meets monthly. It is responsible for identifying opportunities and implementing strategies. The Working Group also holds frequent public meetings, which provide critical opportunities to engage with campus and local communities.

Indiana University: Chancellor’s Diversity Cabinet

The Chancellor’s Diversity Cabinet received its charge from Chancellor Bantz, December 4, 2003 to identify how we can double our achievements in diversity. Achievements in diversity have focused on the 13 diversity goals designed to achieve our Campus Vision For Diversity.
Since 2004 our focus toward doubling diversity has been to strengthen the campus wide commitment and leadership through the distribution of best practices via annual campus conferences on diversity and the establishment of a “Good Works” resource of all the good diversity work occurring at IUPUI.

Additionally we have continued to focus and improve our approach to assessment, planning and performance measurement which garnered a 2006 City of Indianapolis Mayors Award.

» Cabinet Members

An Integrated Doubling Approach

In January 2004 a Doubling Diversity Committee of the Diversity Cabinet was formed which included members of the Diversity Cabinet and each of the chairs of the other three Doubling Taskforces. The Doubling Diversity Committee met throughout Spring 2004 and engaged members of the other taskforces to ensure that as each taskforce responded to its charge they would advance the campus vision of diversity. As a result, each Doubling Taskforce (Teaching & Learning, Civic Engagement, Research) included objectives and strategies designed to advance the campus vision for diversity.

Since 1999, the following activities have occurred to advance university diversity goals:

1999: Campus Climate Study Conducted
2000: Established Chancellors Diversity Cabinet
2000: Began Annual Reporting of the State of Diversity at IUPUI
2002: Established Vision For Diversity
2003: Established Diversity Performance Indicators & Specific Action Items
2003: Established Taylor Awards
2003: Launched Diversity website
2005: Held First University Conference on Diversity
2005: Held IUPUI Campus Conference on Diversity
2006: Held Campus Meeting To Discuss Development of A Campus Planning Framework for Diversity
2006: Completed "Achieving Diversity Report" (Institutional Snap Shot)
2007: IUPUI Black Student Union initiative
2008: The IUPUI Office of Diversity, Equity, & Diversity is established with a new Assistant Chancellor for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion
2009: Renovations started for new IUPUI Multicultural Center
2010: Multicultural Success Center grand opening in renovated Taylor Hall space"

Iowa State University: University Committee on Diversity

The Advisory Committee on Diversity Program Planning and Coordination (ACD) began meeting in April of 2007, and the name was changed to University Committee on Diversity in December 2010.
The purpose of the committee is to “assess the effectiveness of diversity efforts on campus, identify gaps in university diversity policies and efforts, develop new policies and initiatives as necessary, and ensure that units across the university are meeting diversity objectives.” This group meets monthly and also holds regular meetings with the chairs of the diversity committees of the various colleges and units on campus to collaborate and share information. We also meet with invited guests from the university and the Ames community to discuss our common interests in regard to diversity.

Johns Hopkins: Diversity Leadership Council

Our mission is: Recommend and promote policies, programs and other initiatives that will attract and retain a diverse mix of faculty, staff and students

Examine formal and informal structures and processes that inhibit Johns Hopkins Institutions from being more inclusive and recommend changes that foster greater inclusion

Promote and support diversity awareness education campus-wide

Support the personal growth and development of all individuals in the University

Establish a liaison with Baltimore community leaders to encourage greater community involvement by various divisions of the Johns Hopkins Institutions

Massachusetts Institute of Technology: Faculty Diversity Council, Council on Staff Diversity and Inclusion

MIT Council on Faculty Diversity Charge: To ensure MIT’s continued pre-eminence in research, and to continue to offer the best possible education to our exceptional and diverse student body, the MIT Council on Faculty Diversity will work with the faculty, departments, schools and the senior administration to help the Institute aggressively promote faculty diversity. These efforts will work to establish a sustained institutional environment that will attract a diverse faculty that reflects the students we educate.

The Council is to consider all aspects of faculty development:

- Tracking the number of women and minority students through undergraduate and graduate schools, to post-doctoral associate positions and finally to faculty positions.
- Designing programs and policies to increase their number and to promote retention.
- Examining policies and processes for faculty hiring within MIT, and making recommendations on how to improve faculty searches and recruitment of women and minority candidates.
- Creating programs and policies that are sensitive to the need to balance an academic career with a family life.
- Establishing an open and inclusive environment for a diverse faculty that promotes involvement in leadership throughout MIT.
The Council on Staff Diversity and Inclusion is an advisory body charged with encouraging and informing efforts to utilize the diversity of MIT’s staff to advance the work of departments, laboratories, and centers. The diversity of staff includes racial, cultural, demographic, cognitive, and technical characteristics.

The Council on Staff Diversity and Inclusion provides a forum for identifying sharing, and implementing effective diversity management programs and practices; encourages new programs and practices; and recognizes successful efforts. It also identifies and suggests ways to address problems and concerns related to equal employment opportunity and works to create synergy among faculty, staff, and student diversity management efforts. The Executive Vice President and the Vice President for Human Resources are the Council’s executive sponsors.

Northwestern University: University Diversity Council

The University Diversity Council (UDC) is responsible for addressing a wide range of diversity and inclusion-related issues and is comprised of faculty, students, staff, and alumni. It oversees five working groups with specific diversity/inclusion objectives. The working groups are Academics/Education, Faculty Recruitment and Retention, Campus Life, Pipeline, and Lifetime Connections. The Council will also report annually to the University community on the status of diversity and inclusion efforts at Northwestern.

Ohio State University: University Senate Diversity Committee

In 2008, the University Diversity Council became a subcommittee of the University Senate Diversity Committee. The Council convenes annually to review and analyze diversity plans submitted by academic units. The Council is co-chaired by Georgina Dodge, Office of Minority Affairs, and Valerie Lee, Department of English.

Penn State: President’s Equity Commissions

The Commission on Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Equity (CLGBTE); the Commission on Racial/Ethnic Diversity (CORED); and the Commission for Women (CFW) are advisory bodies to the Penn State President on matters that pertain to equity concerns at Penn State. While the commissions focus on their own specific areas of interest, they also collaborate on common equity issues as they arise.

The Commission on Racial/Ethnic Diversity commits to lead and actively support university-wide diversity initiatives that foster teamwork, collaboration and communication among various racial and ethnic constituencies in order to ensure inclusion, equal opportunity, and success for underrepresented/underserved communities and community members of Penn State and the surrounding areas.

The Commission for Women serves as an advisory group to the President of the University on the status of women at Penn State, advocates for women’s concerns, and recommends solutions.
Since 1981, the Commission for Women has identified areas of concern for the women employees and students of Penn State. It is a forum for exchanging ideas that can translate into improved practices to support women at Penn State.

Its membership represents every employment category: faculty, exempt and nonexempt staff, technical service and administrative, as well as graduate and undergraduate students. The President appoints the members of the commission as an advisory group to recommend policies and programs to enhance the University’s working and learning environments.

Specifically, the Commission for Women:

Assesses and reports on the status of women at Penn State;

Examines and makes recommendations about issues that affect women employees and students, including workplace and classroom climate; recruitment, advancement, and retention; professional development and recognition; mentoring; maternity and child/elder-care policies; salary equity; personal safety and sexual assault awareness; intercollegiate athletics;

Collaborates with departments/organizations in support of gender-equity initiatives;

Recognizes and celebrates the contributions and achievements of women at Penn State.

Created in 1991, the Commission on Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Equity is an advisory group to the President. The purpose of the Commission is to improve the climate for diversity within Penn State by specifically addressing issues affecting the welfare of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) members of the University community.

The Commission serves to improve the climate for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender members of the Penn State community through examination of current policies and practices and through the initiation and promotion of programs which will result in a more equitable and supportive environment. This is accomplished through our current standing committees and through the initiative of ad hoc committees for special topics.

Princeton University: Diversity Council

In 2008, the University formed the Diversity Council, a group that advises the offices of the provost and executive vice president on diversity-related matters. The council is co-chaired by the vice president for human resources and the vice provost for institutional equity and diversity.

Building upon the report of a campus-wide Diversity Working Group held in 2004-2005 and the 2006 Perspectives on Diversity survey, the council (1) recommends and promotes policies, practices and programs that foster effective participation in a diverse and inclusive community; (2) examines formal and informal structures and processes that impede or facilitate progress toward diversity goals and recommends changes; and (3) identifies strategies and approaches to raise awareness and sustain dialogue.

Rutgers University: President’s Council on Institutional Diversity and Equity
The President’s Council on Institutional Diversity and Equity was created by President Richard L. McCormick in 2008, and charged with actively monitoring the university’s progress in diversifying its faculty and senior administration. The council provides guidance to chairs and deans regarding best practices in faculty hiring, retention, and campus climate and community and makes recommendations to President McCormick and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs Philip Furmanski regarding proposals submitted under the President’s Faculty Diversity Cluster Hiring Initiative.

Texas A&M: Council on Climate and Diversity

The Council on Climate and Diversity was formed in 2007 and charged to provide counsel to the President and the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academics on all ways of attracting and retaining culturally diverse students, faculty, and staff to Texas A&M University, and to strengthen, sustain, and promote our diversity efforts in support of Vision 2020 goals.

This Council will maintain this charge with the additional specific charge to aid the Vice President and Associate Provost for Diversity (VPAPD) in planning appropriate assessment and evaluation of units defined as: colleges/schools (10), libraries (1), branch campuses (2), divisions of Student Affairs, Finance, Facilities, Computing and Information Services (4), Athletics (1), President-executive staff and support staff (1), and the Executive Vice President’s units not previously listed (1), for a total of 20 units (See Appendix 3). Eleanor M. Green, Dean, College of Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Sciences, has accepted the invitation to serve as Chair for a two-year term during the calendar years 2010 and 2011.

University of Arizona: Community Diversity Advisory Councils

The UA President’s Community Diversity Advisory Councils strengthen relationships between the University and the diverse communities within the State of Arizona by serving as a communications conduit and by developing mutually-beneficial partnerships. The Community Diversity Councils are advisory in function.

Council Members:

- Serve as ambassadors from the University to the Southern AZ community and beyond (e.g., prospective employees and students, etc).
- Advise the President about issues from respective communities including, but not limited to: needs, perceptions of the University, and awareness of University resources/programs.
- Act as a sounding board for the President.
- Support the UA’s Strategic Directions.
- Help the University develop partnerships to serve Arizona communities.

Background

Former UA President Peter Likins established the Community Diversity Advisory Councils in 2002 to get feedback on community issues that impact the University of Arizona (UA) from
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stakeholders that have traditionally been marginalized in higher education. He created the following six Advisory Councils:

African American Advisory Council
Asian Pacific American Council
Disability Advisory Council
Hispanic Advisory Council
LGBTQ Advisory Council
Native American Advisory Council

UC Berkeley: Chancellor’s Advisory Council on Campus Climate, Culture and Inclusion

CHARGE:

Provide ongoing evaluation of campus climate conditions, practices and policies;

Suggest measures that will support the goals of inclusion and community, especially including measures reflecting promising practices from elsewhere in the University of California system and the nation;

Coordinate its analyses, recommendations and other work with related efforts of any UC Berkeley entities created by faculty, staff, students, or neighboring communities;

Fulfill other campus-specific responsibilities identified by the Chancellor;

Respond to queries and suggestions from the UC President’s Council on Campus Climate, Culture and Inclusion; and

Report annually to the public on information about its activities and other items the Council or the Chancellor deem appropriate.

UC Davis: Campus Council on Community and Diversity

Mission

The Campus Council on Community and Diversity is an advisory body to the Chancellor and the Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor. The overarching responsibility for the Council is to provide both campus leaders and the campus community with advice concerning ways to strengthen and maintain the bonds of community at UC Davis. In particular, the charge includes providing advice on:

- Actions required to ensure that our students, faculty, staff and administration better reflect the richness of California’s ethnic and cultural diversity.
- Strategies to ensure that the environment of UC Davis is welcoming and inclusive of the cultural differences and knowledge bases of all Californians and, indeed, of all people of the world
Goals:

- To develop a strategic plan for diversity and community for the campus
- To assure that recruitment and selection processes of faculty and staff develop strategies for increasing and sustaining the diversity of our campus community
- To create opportunities for fostering and maintaining community (Amplifying Community Project) within the Deans/Vice Chancellors’ units
- To develop strategies for increasing the pipeline of undergraduates who proceed to graduate school and then on to faculty positions
- To increase the communication from the Council out to the campus at large

UC Irvine:  Advisory Council on Campus Climate, Culture and Inclusion

Mission:  To monitor and assess the campus climate and make recommendations to campus leadership for further improvement consistent with our values.

Vision:  To be an active and trusted inclusionary body that connects with members of our community.

Goals  (Revised July 8, 2010)

- Further strengthen our campus climate of respect, civility and mutual appreciation.
- Foster community building and engagement through inclusion.
- Facilitate constructive discussion and act as a conduit to action for individuals and groups to promote inclusiveness among the campus community.
- Generate innovative thinking and offer solutions to assist in the resolution of campus climate issues.
- Promote the identification and sharing of best practices that promote diversity and tolerance.
- Act as a resource for collecting information on campus climate. This includes supplementing existing channels for collecting information about current tensions, dissatisfactions and conflicts.
- Reinforce campus resources that serve as venues for campus community members to air their thoughts, opinions and ideas.
- Create an inventory of campus climate data and develop metrics to aid confident decision making.

University of Chicago:  Diversity Leadership Council

The Diversity Leadership Council (DLC) was appointed by President Robert Zimmer in September 2007 as part of recommendations arising from the Provost’s Initiative on Minority Issues. We represent a group of senior administrators from a broad cross-section of the University, including academic divisions, professional schools, the Medical Center, and administrative functions, who are deeply committed to fostering a diverse and inclusive campus community.

Purpose
The DLC was established on the premise that the diversity of our nonacademic staff is one of the University of Chicago’s greatest assets; that the diversity of the City of Chicago has helped make the University into the world-class institution it is today; and that our success in achieving our core academic mission depends on recognizing and contributing to diversity in all aspects of campus and community life.

The DLC serves as an advisory body to the President and Officers of the University, and as a mentor and resource to academic and administrative units. Our focus is to help ensure that the University’s relationships with our nonacademic employees, with our surrounding neighborhoods, and with our business partners appropriately reflect the University’s commitment to diversity as part of its core mission.

University of Florida: President’s Council on Diversity

Bernie Machen, University of Florida President:

I am pleased to announce the establishment of the President’s Council on Diversity, which has been charged with the mission of gathering and analyzing diversity data at the college and departmental levels. The Council on Diversity has been formed to further the University’s commitment to equal opportunity. It is my belief that a great university is a diverse university with world-balance.

The Council on Diversity is also charged with identifying ways to increase the diversity of the faculty, staff and students. Our goal is that the diversity of faculty, staff and students at the University of Florida will closely reflect the population of the state of Florida as a whole. To that end, the Council on Diversity will:

- Review the practices of each college and department within the University to determine whether improvements could be made to increase student, staff, and/or faculty diversity.
- Analyze the efforts of other peer institutions similar to UF to identify any new and promising approaches available to increase student, staff, and/or faculty diversity.
- Propose policies that serve to increase/retain student, staff, and/or faculty diversity.

University of Iowa: Diversity Councils

Several faculty and staff organizations that promote diversity on our campus are supported by the Chief Diversity Office.

- African American Council
- Council on Disability Awareness
- Council on the Status of Women
- Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender Staff & Faculty Association
- Native American Council
- UI Latino Council

University of Michigan Diversity Council
President Mary Sue Coleman established the Diversity Council in 2003 to assess, encourage, and celebrate diversity initiatives. The Council's mission is to offer “expertise and guidance to promote the pursuit and dissemination of essential knowledge and skills that foster effective participation in a diverse, multicultural, and inclusive University community.” Council members are drawn from the ranks of faculty and staff who are engaged in research, teaching, and practices that strengthen diversity skills and champion inclusion and equity. Some members represent Schools or Colleges; others represent units of central administration.

The Council is a principal advisory body to the Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs Lester Monts. The Council’s work includes university-wide diversity summits; encouragement of diversity initiatives through a grants program; and the systematic exchange of information, strategies, and analyses regarding diversity benchmarks, programs, and outcomes. Council action subgroups include outreach, student success and retention, dissemination, and the relationship between globalization and diversity.

University of Pennsylvania: Committee on Diversity and Equity

The Committee on Diversity and Equity aids Penn in fostering and taking full advantage of its diversity as well as in strengthening ties across all boundaries to enrich and enliven the campus community. The Committee shall advise the offices of the president, provost, and the executive vice presidents on ways to develop and maintain a supportive atmosphere on campus for the inclusion and appreciation of diversity among all members of the University community. The Committee will review and provide advice regarding the University’s equal opportunity and affirmative action programs and policies. The areas in which the Committee shall report to the Council include diversity within the educational and work settings, integration of staff and faculty into the larger campus community, and ways to foster a campus environment that is inclusive and supportive of difference. The Committee also will advise the administration on specific diversity issues that may arise on campus. More information on Penn’s commitment to diversity is available on the Diversity at Penn website.

University of Washington: Diversity Council

The University Diversity Council is the primary advisory committee to the President on matters of diversity and equity at all three UW campuses. Dr. Sheila Edwards Lange, Vice President and Vice Provost for Minority Affairs and Diversity, chairs the Council.

The Diversity Council was founded in 2001, in the wake of Washington State Initiative 200 prohibiting "preferential treatment" based on race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin in public employment, education, and contracting. Answering a request by UW student groups, the University of Washington Regents, student leaders, and UW administrators signed a Diversity Compact on October 21, 2000. They pledged to improve diversity on the UW campuses through 19 specific initiatives, which are detailed in the Diversity Compact. Several individuals and groups encouraged the formation of a central administrative body focused on recruiting and creating a welcoming environment for underrepresented students, faculty, and staff. In particular, the Multicultural Organization of Students Actively Involved in Change (MOSAIC) and the Multicultural Alumni Partnership (MAP) played a key role in shaping the Council's mission and scope.
Members of the Diversity Council include members of the University administration, staff and faculty members; undergraduate and graduate students representing student groups and student government; and members of the community with an interest in diversity in higher education. The Council consists of two representatives of each major administrative unit, school and college, as well as representatives of affinity groups. The Council currently has three subcommittees: Staff, GBLTQI, and Disability.

Based on the results of the 2005 University Diversity Appraisal that identifies pressing diversity challenges, the Council addresses issues of diversity in the following areas:

- Mission and Goals
- Diversity Leadership and Governance
- Pipeline/Outreach
- Student Recruitment and Admissions
- Student Development and Retention
- Faculty Recruitment, Development and Retention
- Staff Recruitment, Development and Retention
- Curriculum
- Research
- Climate
- Community Outreach

Council members share diversity best practices, engage in institutional diversity planning, and make recommendations to University administration about pressing diversity issues. The Diversity Council meets as a full body once per quarter, excluding summer quarter. Meetings of the Council are open to the larger campus community and the public.
APPENDIX C

Data Support Analyst- Proposed Job Responsibilities and Campus Data Needs

- Managing data system transitions with an expertise of how other employee data systems might be affected.

- Serving as a liaison with CIT and other University users of HR data such as the Office of Equity, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI), the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, and decanal units to ensure ease of use.

- Reducing/eliminating various ‘shadow systems’ to increase efficiency and data accuracy.

- Providing HR reports and/or useful data ‘views’ for end-users as needed

- Maintaining existing systems and fields

- Auditing and reconciling data inconsistencies across multiple employee information systems.

Campus Data Needs

The Data Support Analyst should receive the assistance and support from central IT, Human Resources and other areas on campus as necessary to examine the feasibility of the following:

- Connecting employee data to recruitment data. Currently, there is no link between the two HR data systems that are responsible for recruitment (UBJobs) and employee information (SIRI/InfoSource/ BARS/SUNY HRMS). Connecting these two systems has the potential to make onboarding new employees vastly easier, including the generation of a new employee record to help eliminate multiple points of entry of the same data. It would also assist in the ability to access aggregate gender and race/ethnicity of the applicant pool when reviewing an employee record. Finally, it would assist in identifying the exact position title by the time a hiring proposal is generated, as a generic job title is often used in the current UBJobs system.

- Streamlining the University’s Race/Ethnicity data fields. While an online employee resurvey tool for race, ethnicity and other categories has been developed to comply with new federal regulations, the resurvey has not been connected with systems such as IPEDS, SIRI and the Research Foundation data systems.
• Creating a standardized process to capture veteran and disability data for all applicants, new hires and current employees in accordance with federal regulations.

• Modifying systems or processes to ensure UB can more clearly identify and track tenured and tenure-track faculty, even when they may be in a non-tenure track title (such as Faculty on family leave – i.e. an Assistant Professor placed in a qualified title) or in a non-traditional title (such as Visiting Associate Professors in Law) or in an unsalaried appointment type (Medicine).

• Modifying or changing current systems to more clearly document faculty changes in appointment electronically, such as promotion, new position, tenure clock stop due to family leave, receipt of tenure, etc. Not only would this be helpful when trying to decode the appointment changes in an individual employee record but standardized choices would enable better analysis of these changes (i.e. how many faculty are taking advantage of family leave policies).

• Developing electronic employee records that include all data regarding the tenure review process, which may be queried and reported in a standard format. New data fields may include anticipated tenure review date, actual tenure review date (beginning of process), tenure review status (i.e. waiting for PRB determination) and tenure review result. Centrally recording all instances of tenure review (including those who fail or leave during the process) will help produce consistent reports.