

University Senate
General Assembly
Meeting Minutes
October 16, 2020

Senators Present: Minerva Ahumada, Francis Alonzo, Suzanne Bost, Laura Brentner, Anthony Deldin, Jenna Drenten, Eilene Edejer, Sarita Heer, Lee Hood, Ashley Howdeshell, Diane Jokinen, Dan Killelea, Kristin Krueger, Patricia Lee, Steven Todd, Susan Uprichard, Maria Wathen, Bill Adams, Anne Divita Kopacz, Tobyn Friar, Kevin Newman, Kathleen Stienfels, Ella Doyle, Teresa Fister, Martin Flores, Charles Hwang, Jacob Palmer, Krislyn Zhorne, Thomas Kelly, Michael Kaufman, Nancy Tuchman, Norberto Grywacz (*ex. officio*), Tavis Jules (*ex. officio*), Kevin Kennedy (*ex. officio*)

Absent: William Duffy, Selam Kahsay

Guests: Tim Love (Executive Director for Equity & Compliance), Laura Buchs (Deputy Title IX Coordinator & Equity Investigator), Robyn Mallett (Assistant Provost for Academic Diversity), Taylor Thomas (SGLC, Student Body Chief Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Officer), Elise Purnsley (Co-President of the Black Cultural Center), LaShaunda Reese (Co-Founder and current President, Black Graduate Student Alliance), Jessica Simpson (Founder, White Coats for Black Lives at SSOM)

Quorum (31/33): Voting members present at start of meeting; quorum is **satisfied**.

Chairperson Susan Uprichard called public meeting to order at 3:00 PM.

I. Review of preliminary agenda and call for motions to amend

All items on the preliminary agenda were added to the agenda.

Chair Uprichard makes a call for any motion to amend the agenda.

Chair Uprichard motions to amend the agenda to add a vote of the University Senate Resolution of Support and Renewed Creativity in Addressing the Financial Impact of CoVID19 Pandemic.

Senator Lee seconds the motion.

Vote: 26 yes, 1 no.

Motion to amend the agenda passes.

Chair Uprichard announces that Senator Lee will help with parliamentary elements of the function of University Senate.



II. Review of minutes from the September 18, 2020 General Assembly, September 23, 2020 Emergency Finance Meeting, and September 29, 2020 Finance Follow-Up Meeting

Motion to approve by Sen. Heer, seconded by Sen. Lee.

Vote: 26 approve, 5 abstain.

Minutes approved.

III. Update from the Office for Equity & Compliance (OEC)

Invited guests: Tim Love (Executive Director for Equity & Compliance) and Laura Buchs (Deputy Title IX Coordinator & Equity Investigator)

Chair Uprichard introduces the issue and gives the floor to Tim Love and Laura Buchs.

i. Update regarding changes to the Comprehensive Policy and Equitable Resolution Procedures for Discrimination, Sexual Misconduct, and Retaliation

Tim Love and Laura Buchs introduce themselves and their office.

Tim Love: I would like to start with a little background on Title IX and the Office of Equity and Compliance. First, Title IX is a federal civil rights law that prohibits discrimination based on sex in any educational program that benefits from federal financial aid. The law has been around since 1972. In 2017 the current administration and Betsy DeVos announced she was ending the “rule by letter” or rule by sub-regulatory guidance and would put forth a revised regulatory framework of how education institutions should be compliant with Title IX.

In January of 2019 Loyola created the Office of Equity and Compliance (OEC) and spent most of 2019 ramping up that office, including making hires and creating processes and procedures. The OEC published the Comprehensive Policy in September of 2019. In May of 2020 the final rules from the Department of Education were released. These rules were substantially different than the predicted rules. Loyola was given a 90-day window to come into compliance with these new regulations. The updated policy was put in place on August 14, 2020.

The significant policy updates for 2020 are primarily dealing with the new Article 3, Title IX Sexual Harassment Grievance Process. Another distinction that needs to be mentioned is the difference between reports and complaints. A report is a formal or informal notice to the university that something has happened, and an individual is seeking resources and support. This could be about discrimination, sexual harassment, or retaliation and the report can be submitted anonymously. The goal of a report is to let the OEC know that someone needs support. A complaint is a



formal accusation or allegation that someone in the university has wronged a person or committed a violation and has taken away someone's rights. That person is asking the university to intervene and to ensure that the situation is investigated and remedied. There are two types of complaints, one that is dealing with Title IX sexual harassment and the other is dealing with any other violations of Title IX other than sexual harassment, including discrimination or retaliation.

The distinction between a report and a complaint are key because a complaint requires certain actions to take place in order for the university to stay compliant. Once a complaint has been filed, both parties, the complainant and the respondent, must be notified that a complaint has been filed. Previously we had more flexibility in this situation and the OEC would reach out to the complainant and explain their rights and the process should they decide to move forward and many times that would result in the complainant saying they were just looking for resources and they did not want to start a formal process. The new rules remove that flexibility and both parties must be informed simultaneously.

There is also a slight modification to the "Responsible Campus Partner" reporting obligation. The Department of Education has lowered the requirements for reporting, but the university has decided to continue the previous reporting obligations as a university policy. This means reporting is still required of all employees when the sexual misconduct involves a current minor, happened while the victim/survivor was/is a student, or happened while the alleged perpetrator was/is a student or employee.

Tim Love now turns the presentation over to Laura Buchs.

Laura Buchs: I want to talk about the new Article 3 Title IX Sexual Harassment Grievance Process. This is brand new to our Comprehensive Policy. This process only applies when allegations meet the definitional and jurisdictional requirements outlined in the Title IX regulations. It is important to note that any time the allegations meet these requirements then the university must follow this grievance process as described by the Department of Education. Both in the definitional and jurisdiction requirements, the Department of Education has narrowed the definition of Title IX sexual harassment. For sexual harassment that falls outside this new narrow definition, the Office of Equity and Compliance can still use the Equitable Resolution Procedures (ERP) to address these types of complaints.

The new Title IX definition of sexual harassment that needs to be highlighted is as it applies to a hostile environment. In order for sexual harassment to potentially reach the level of hostile environment the alleged conduct must be so severe, pervasive, and objectively offensive



that it effectively denies equal access and opportunity in the university's educational program or activity. The significant definitional change here is the requirement that the alleged conduct be both severe and pervasive. This is a higher bar than the previous definition. And when we turn to the jurisdictional requirements to meet the threshold of sexual harassment the conduct must have occurred within the university's educational program or activity and the conduct must have occurred in the United States. So any allegations that we receive of sexual harassment that occurred at the Rome Center would not be addressed under Title IX but would be addressed by Loyola's Equitable Resolution Procedures.

All of these elements of these definitional and jurisdictional requirements must be met in order for a complaint to be addressed by the grievance process. If any of these elements are not met, then the complaint cannot be addressed by Title IX Article 3.

I now want to give an overview of the grievance process. And while I want to discuss this new process, I want to stress that we still think most of our complaints will be dealt with through the university's Equitable Resolution Procedures. There is overlap in some of the procedures for the grievance process and the Equitable Resolution Procedures. The key distinction in the Title IX Grievance Process is the introduction of the live hearing. The grievance process is as follows.

Once a formal complaint has been made, both parties are notified of the complaint. An investigation is conducted by the Office of Equity and Compliance staff resulting in a final investigation report. No determinations or findings are made in that report. This is distinct for the Equitable Resolution Procedures when an investigator can make determinations and findings, in the Title IX Grievance Process the investigator can only present evidence. When the investigation is completed, we move to the hearing stage of the process. Hearings are conducted virtually with audio and visual and the regulations require that both parties be able to hear and see one another. Hearings are facilitated by a trained hearing board or a hearing administrator. Both parties can present evidence and witnesses and engage in cross-examination facilitated by their advisors during the hearing. This is an important piece, while the hearing does include a cross examination the parties themselves do not ask the questions. The questions are asked on their behalf by their advisor. There is no restriction on who a party can elect to be their advisor. When the hearing is over the hearing board or hearing administrator makes a finding of responsible or not responsible on every allegation raised. The hearing board or hearing administrator is also responsible for producing the written determination of the matter. If a respondent is found responsible for any allegation, then it would go to a sanctioning process. Sanctions are determined by the classification of the



respondent. For example, if the responsible party is a student then the hearing board will include a member from the Office of Student Conduct and Conflict Resolution and the hearing board will determine the sanctions. If the party responsible is staff member than Humans Resources would assign the sanctions. Under the grievance process both parties have access to an appeal.

At this time, the Title IX Grievance Process has not been triggered by any complaints we have received yet this year.

Tim Love now takes over the presentation.

Tim Love: Here are the key takeaways. The Office of Equity and Compliance is just one part the university's response/support system for individuals who experience discrimination or sexual misconduct. That the university is committed to meeting or exceeding the requirements for compliance with Title IX and other equity-base laws. Where the university retains discretion for addressing discrimination and sexual misconduct, our mission and values drive our policies and procedures. And finally, that the Office of Equity and Compliance is committed to open communication about these processes and welcomes any opportunity to provide clear, personalized guidance for students, staff, or faculty.

ii. Review of the grievance process and historical outcomes

Tim Love: Chair Uprichard asked that we present on the response to reports. I've pulled the data from the academic year 2019-2020, but we must keep in mind the effect of the pandemic on this data. Between July 1, 2019 and June 30, 2020, the Office of Equity and Compliance has fielded 319 total reports and complaints. Just about half, 150, were about alleged incidents where the perpetrator was not in any way affiliated with Loyola University Chicago. This is to say that a large part of the work of the Office of Equity and Compliance is consultative and to put people in touch with resources and support. The breakdown for the reports and complaints is 88 about discrimination, 31 of which dealing with race/color, 279 dealing with sexual misconduct, and 3 involving retaliation. We also had 55 investigations/resolution facilitated by the Office of Equity and Compliance, and 42 referrals elsewhere such as to Human Resources or the Office of Student Conduct and Conflict Resolution.

I also wanted to present some data points about the responses to these reports and complaints. Sanction/ disciplinary measures have included 5 terminations (employees or vendor employees), 3 student expulsions, 3 student suspensions, 5 educational sanctions such as mandatory training



or restorative service hours, and 14 preventative sanctions such as university probation and no contact directives.

Final takeaways would be that the Office of Equity and Compliance balances the rights/agency of the affected party with the safety and educational interests of the community. The OEC is committed to thorough, impartial investigations, free from bias for/against complainants or respondents. Where there is responsibility, we ensure appropriate outcomes commensurate to the misconduct and where there is not responsibility, other interventions may still be warranted, and we facilitate the referral.

We'd love to take your questions.

Chair Uprichard: Senators, do you have any questions for Tim and Laura?

Sen Wathen: When does an allegation get passed on to the legal system? For example, a case of sexual assault in a dorm?

Laura Buchs: The Office of Equity and Compliance does not refer reports or complaints to law enforcement. It is a complainant's choice whether to report to law enforcement.

Sen. Newman: Thank you again for coming. I am not going to ask about an ongoing investigation or a potential ongoing investigation. Many of us are aware of the allegations in undergraduate admissions and the *Chicago Tribune* article. If there were accusations of racism, employee to employee, in a department and if it was reported to Human Resources, would the Office of Equity and Compliance get involved?

Tim Love: I appreciate the caveat there. So we do have a close partnership with Human Resources. Those working in Human Resources do have reporting obligations as Responsible Campus Partners when it comes to matters of sexual misconduct. But at the moment we do not have the same obligation to report for discrimination, but we do often get reports from Human Resources about discrimination and we also send reports to Human Resources about discrimination if it is outside the OEC scope.

Sen. Newman: For a follow up, one accusation was about notification and timeline. Looking at your presentation about sexual harassment it seemed to imply a general investigative timeline of six months. Would a similar timeline be appropriate for a non-sexual harassment or discriminatory investigation?

Tim Love: It could be, but the timeline is based on the case at hand. These cases range in depth and complexity. When we wrote the updates to the



Comprehensive Policy, which required us to articulate a timeline, that's what we did, and we strive to complete our investigations within six months though we endeavor to complete the investigations much sooner than that. We have legal obligations to both Title IX and Title VI to be both prompt and thorough. It is constantly a balancing act.

Laura Buchs: I am newer to the Loyola, but I can confidently say that the timeframe in which Loyola completes an investigation is shorter than several other institutions. It is something that is stressed to us here that we need to deal with these complaints and investigations as diligently as possible while also being as thorough as possible.

Sen. Flores: Thank you for the presentation and all the work you've been doing. I will not ask you to speak about an ongoing investigation or a potentially ongoing investigation. Per the university communication that outlines what it calls an external investigation regarding the changed nature of a compliant. I am curious as to the process in how you identify the need for an external investigator and what principles you are looking for in a firm? Also how does that external investigation work with a panel of Loyolans?

Tim Love: That decision for an external investigation was made by senior leadership and our office supports that decision. I personally did not have any role in selection of anyone or any firm. I just do not have access to the information to answer your question. I do know that the firm hired has expertise in this area, but I can't speak more to it than that.

Chair Uprichard: Just perhaps a follow up to that, what is reason or rational behind the decision to do something internally or using an external source?

Tim Love: I'm not speaking specifically to this case, but the reasons we might find ourselves in a situation like that would be conflict of interest. We will recuse ourselves from any situation that we cannot act impartially in good faith. President Rooney has indicated that the charged nature of this situation has made it in the best interest of the university of have an external investigation and the process could happen without any suggestion of bias.

Jessica Simpson (guest): Thank you for your time. I am a second-year medical student at Stritch. I was hoping you could share your slides as I am the founder of White Coats for Black Lives and we are very interested in this investigation. Also, I was wondering if there was a timeline for this investigation? This is a pertinent issue as Black students do not feel heard, seen, or supported. This not only as the LUC campus, but also other Loyola campuses.



Chair Uprichard: Jessica, we are not actually discussing this case. I'm sure that is what Tim would have said and he talk about sharing his slides.

Jessica Simpson (guest): I understand, so he cannot talk about the timeline?

Tim Love: No need to apologize as I recognized the importance of the topic and that many are invested in this topic. I cannot give you a timeframe and I know that timelines were discussed when seeking an outside investigation and that promptness was highly valued. Promptness but not at the cost of thoroughness, so a balance is the goal. But that is all I can really say.

Chair Uprichard: Tim and Laura, thank you so much for joining us. I do think it would be helpful if Tim, you could share your slides and we could send them out to the Senators. That would be appreciated.

Tim Love: I think that would be okay. I am always a little nervous to share statistics and those data points as they could be used to identify people, but I can certainly give you all the content about our processes. Let me consider that.

Chair Uprichard: Thank you.

IV. Discussion/Resolution proposing OEC Reporting Responsibilities

Chair Uprichard: This agenda item is somewhat related to the business of the Office of Equity and Compliance and it is nice that they are here to comment on if they wish to stay with us for a little while. This is being brought up by the Senate Diversity Committee and deals with what happens before issues get to the Office of Equity and Compliance and how things to their office. I will give the floor over to Sen. Krueger who is the Chair of the Diversity Committee and she will talk about proposing some reporting responsibilities to get reports efficiently to Tim's office.

Sen. Krueger: Thank you to Tim and Laura for joining us, I really appreciate your time.

I was going through the OEC website and it looks as though there is mandatory reporting in reference to Title IX and sexual misconduct, but there was not mandatory reporting for other violations of Loyola's Nondiscrimination policy. So what the Diversity Committee is bringing to the table is a potential resolution for making anything that is an alleged violation of the nondiscrimination policy mandatory reporting. Perhaps it could even be



included in our Title IX training for faculty and staff. I think a lot of this has to do with faculty and staff not knowing that this reporting exists. So this could be a way in which these sorts of allegations or violations are very effectively routed to the Office of Equity and Compliance, I think would be a very positive impact.

Resolution reads:

Strengthening our Enforcement of the Nondiscrimination Policy

To ensure that all complaints of inequity or hostile work environments are being investigated.

Whereas¹, recent events on campus have made it apparent that some employees at Loyola feel that they work in a hostile and discriminatory environment; and

Whereas², it is critically important that instances of discrimination on campus are effectively and expeditiously reported to the Office of Equity and Compliance (OEC);

Be It Resolved¹, to ensure that Loyola University Chicago provides a safe and equitable environment for all students, staff, faculty, and visitors -- respectful of differences in race, color, religion, sex, age, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, national or ethnic origin, ancestry, disability, marital status, parental status, military/veteran status, or any other characteristic protected by applicable law -- reporting any alleged violations of Loyola's nondiscrimination policy should be mandatory, and there should be a process for ensuring that faculty and staff in leadership positions that might be approached about such issues are sufficiently trained to ensure that all such instances are brought to the attention of the Office for Equity and Compliance.

Chair Uprichard: Are there any suggestions or friendly amendments? Or anything that anyone wishes to bring forward before this goes to a vote?

Sen. Hwang: Just a grammar note, perhaps change the Loyola in the first Whereas to Loyola University Chicago. And at the very end of the Be It Resolved clause, it does say the Office for and should it be the Office of?

Sen. Krueger: Thank you.

Sen. Tuchman: Thank you for bringing this forward. I would like to hear from Tim Love, what he sees the difference would be from where we are now and what this resolution mean and how it might change the work of the office? I'm just curious about the implementation-side of things.



Tim Love: Seeing this on the agenda today was the first I was hearing that something like this was being considered and I'm glad I could be here today to hear the discussion. Our office responds to all of the reports we receive, all of them without exception. Now the response does look different depending on lots of factors. Not all reported behaviors rise to the level of violating our policies, but it is important that behaviors perceived in this manner get reported. I would have to think on this resolution. I would like to put forth some scenarios that might bring up some unintended consequences. This is not to suggest that I am in favor or not in favor, but to illustrate a couple points.

Say that a person confides in a colleague that they feel they have been discriminated against based on their sexual orientation that not a lot of people are aware of. Is there an expectation that that colleague whom this person has come to confide in must make a report even if the person that is not ready to do that? We really strive to reach a balance between the agency of the person who has the experienced the situation and that needs to be honored and honored throughout the process. That person might not want to bring this to the university, and it would be terribly unfortunate if they didn't, but it is their right and might be out of a need for self-preservation. Anything that takes the agency away from the person experiencing the discrimination, I would just urge caution and some very careful consideration of the unintended consequences of that.

I can give an example of a situation where a person felt they had experienced sex-based discrimination in a business unit and confided that to a colleague. That colleague then submitted a report with the best of intentions, but the person who experienced the discrimination was not ready for that report to be made. This led to them having to confront a situation in a way they had not expected to, and it was a hard situation. This is the type of unintended consequence to be aware of. I think it could be different when it comes to a person in a leadership position but again, it's just a consideration.

As for operational impact, I expect we would see more reports which is not necessarily a bad thing, but all reports are not equal.

Chair Uprichard: Thank you, Tim. You are an expert in this and your viewpoint is valuable. I think, Sen. Krueger can correct me if I am wrong, I think if someone was trying to report something and they went to the wrong person, that there would be some sort of mandatory policy that that person would have to give them the correct information or forwarded on to your office. Sen. Krueger tell me if I am incorrect in this and perhaps Tim can give us some guidance here on how to incorporate language. I don't think the intent is to force anybody to do anything.

Sen. Krueger: The intent is not to force anyone, but I would argue that Title IX does the same thing and yet we are mandatory reporters. I don't want to take



anyone's agency but at the same token we do it with sexual misconduct. I don't really see a difference. But here is the scenario I am thinking of. If someone goes to give a complaint to HR and HR does nothing about it. And that is what I think should be mandatory, they should have to report those things to your office. That was the line of thinking that our committee was coming from. I hope the clarifies things a bit.

Tim Love: It does. The intent is not lost on me and I appreciate the spirit of it. I'm hearing the wanting to make sure that no one in this university community who experiences something that is so dehumanizing as discrimination or sexual misconduct, feels that there is nowhere to go in the university to be heard or have their circumstance evaluated by experts against the policy. I appreciate and support wholeheartedly any effort to promote our information and to be included in the Loyola 101 training and have more focus on where to go if you experience discrimination or harassment. I just don't know if a resolution or a policy change that would enforce a hard mandate that would not take away the role of the person who is providing support for a person who might not want to report their experience. I think I would want to make sure that the final language of it does not have any unintended consequences. I also think there are structural barriers to ensuring a cultural sort of expectation to stand up to discrimination and empower people to stand up and speak out about it. I hear that you want to be part of that cultural shift and there are others calling for it too at Loyola. But with just seeing this language for the first time I would urge consideration of the agency and autonomy to the person experiencing the discrimination.

Sen. Kelly: I am wary about the mandatory part for some of the reasons that Tim explained but also as someone who in the past had to argue about the mandatory parts of Title IX reporting to people who did not want to do that. So I would worry about recommending that it be mandatory and not specifying what we think the consequences should be for not following the mandate. I appreciate the sentiment, but I would like to see the Senate take the sentiment and promote the education and training and to raise awareness about the nondiscrimination policy and maybe to support the idea of mandatory faculty and staff training.

Sen Bost: I helped draft this and actually chose the word mandatory in order to make it parallel to Title IX. I am involved in the Women Studies and Gender Studies Program that talk about the issues and problems surrounding mandatory reporting and like how the reporting aspect has been narrowed and defined. I think the issue of racism and discrimination should receive the same consideration and respect. I see the problems and scenarios of both being parallel to Title IX.

Sen. Friar: This maybe unrelated, but when I think of nondiscrimination and the area I oversee, these are all related to Title IV. These types of



nondiscriminatory complaints also tie into the what we have to report to the Illinois Board of Higher Education and the Higher Learning Commission. So there would be so many factors that would go into reporting depending on the type of complaint, be it academic or financial or students with disabilities. Tim would you then be overseeing this change in policy and definitions and what gets reported where or if the student would do it? It can just be a rabbit hole in some ways.

Chair Uprichard: Since we are running short of time and I think this is really important and I do think there is a niche here that needs to be filled in that things get reported when they want to be reported. I'm wondering if the Diversity Committee would be interested in going back and discussing this more with Tim Love and others to make sure we have really tight language, so we get what we want here and not have unintended consequences. Is that something you would be willing to do instead of us voting now?

Sen. Krueger: I think that is a great idea. And Tim I will be in touch with you.

Tim Love: I didn't mean to throw a wrench in anything. I would be happy to help in any way.

Sen. Krueger: I think it is really beneficial to have your input.

Chair Uprichard: Tim, we are very grateful to have you here for this discussion and thank you again.

V. Update on the University Anti-Racism Initiative

(Invited guests: Robyn Mallett (Assistant Provost for Academic Diversity), Taylor Thomas (SGLC, Student Body Chief Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Officer), Elise Purnsley (Co-President of the Black Cultural Center), LaShaunda Reese (Co-Founder and current President, Black Graduate Student Alliance), Jessica Simpson (Founder, White Coats for Black Lives at SSOM))

Chair Uprichard introduces the issue and Robyn Mallett, Chair of the University Anti-Racism Initiative. Robyn is working very closely with several of the student groups on campus and we also have guests from those student groups present today. We thought it was important to include the students so they could participate and/or answer questions after Robyn's presentation.

Before I introduce our student guests, I want to clarify this is not intended to replace the cross shared governance bodies' efforts to try to meet with the students. That meeting will still be planned, this is just a first step to hear the students weigh in on the anti-racism initiative.



The student guests present today are, Taylor Thomas, the SGLC, Student Body Chief Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Officer, Elise Purnsley , the Co-President of the Black Cultural Center, LaShaunda Reese, the Co-Founder and current President, Black Graduate Student Alliance, and Jessica Simpson, the Founder, White Coats for Black Lives at SSOM. And now I will give the floor to Robyn for her presentation.

Robyn Mallett: Thank you and I hope the keep my presentation short so there can be time for discussion.

The Anti-Racism Initiative was started this summer with a group of around 20 faculty, staff and students who were tasked with finding ways to move the university toward the goal of Loyola being a more anti-racist institution.

Our website, <https://www.luc.edu/academicaffairs/antiracisminitiative/>, lists all of the members of the Anti-Racism Initiative group. Over the summer we came up with three main goals to moved forward in the near term. Those goals are, to create a safe, respectful, and inclusive environment for students, staff, and faculty of color; facilitate Black student, staff, and faculty success; and enhance diversity, equity, and inclusion in academic affairs.

I want to describe our process and phases. This is an iterative process. Over the summer we completed Phase 1, which was to create the goals for the Anti-Racism Initiative. This work started with listening and reflection with faculty, staff and students, engaging stakeholders, and inviting feedback. We then synthesized this information by identifying some our existing resources, and reviewing our institutional and policy needs. We then made recommendations and delivered some preliminary plans and also invited additional feedback. We are now working on executing those goals we established.

We are now in Phase 2 of the initiative, which is to form strategy teams for each of those three initial goals that are tasked with specific aims under each strategy. Each of those strategy teams are now in place and are reviewing our current practices and identifying gaps that we could fill to help the university move towards its goals.

In Phase 3, the strategy teams will deliver their “dreams” for how to fill the gaps and move the university forward. Once we receive those dream plans, we will review all the recommendations and allocate resources to advance those goals.

The aim of the Anti-Racist Initiative is to create a culture shift at the university. We have spent the past 150 years creating the culture we now have and we are unable to shift that culture quickly, so this will be a continuous process. The initiative is just the start of that culture shift. And once the plans for the goals are in place and funds have been allocated the initiative will be complete. We



will then continuously monitor progress toward SMART (specific, measurable, attainable, relevant, time based) goals.

I want to give a quick overview of Goal 3, Enhance Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion in Academic Affairs. This will be a huge amount of work, but by Fall 2020 we hope to complete a report of the data on the diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts in each school/college/institute based on information the Deans provided over the summer. We will make a report to the university and hope to make a summary available to the whole of the university.

The second piece of this is a plan to engage every academic unit in a racial justice examen. This will take part to two phases. In Fall 2020, we will be asking people to provide data to us on nine different topics and report the data back by January 19, 2021. The second phase will be a lot of dialogue. People need to engage and talk to one another. All faculty, students, and staff need to engage in this dialogue. After this dialogue we will ask people to write responses to racial justice examen and that will be due by April 30, 2021.

The information from the racial justice examen will be used to create a strategic plan related to racial justice for each academic unit. Each academic unit will create SMART goals unique to their unit.

The topics covered in the racial justice examen will be, service, pedagogy, curriculum, hiring and retention, departmental culture, mentoring, grievance procedures, graduate students, and scholarship.

And that is my very brief overview of where we are and what we hope to accomplish.

Chair Uprichard: Thank you, Robyn. Do people have questions? I would also like to put out there if any of our student guests would have a comment or elaborate on what Robyn has shared.

Sen. Adams: Thank you, Robyn for that presentation. I had a question about how you developed the questions that you will send out relating to the racial justice examen. Also did you get a chance to pilot those questions and how will those answers be recorded?

Robyn Mallett: The questions were developed based on reviewing key components of how to create a culture change and elements of culture present within an academic unit. I drafted those and received feedback from a focus group of faculty members and one graduate student member. I also had a focus group of associate deans and shared the questions with the members of the Anti-Racism Initiative. In terms of pilot testing, no one has completed questions yet. And how it will the data be recorded; people will receive



extensive instructions on how to record answers and will most likely be distributed via Qualtrics.

Sen. Edejer: Thank you Robyn for your presentation. I am curious to know how this fits into the current academic program review process?

Robyn Mallett: At the moment we have not fully integrated it into the full academic program review process because that process is on hold due to the pandemic but moving forward in the future there will be questions and aspects of diversity, equity, and inclusion in the academic review process.

Provost Norberto: I want to also confirm that even though the academic program review process is on hold that they are fully aware that in the future these types questions and aspects will be included.

Chair Uprichard: I am curious how are students, who are very active in this area are interfacing with you Robyn and how they have been integrated into this process?

Robyn Mallett: I'll take the first pass and then the students can jump in too. Over the summer when selecting students for the Anti-Racism Initiative, we were looking for the most vocal and involved students. That is how I came up with this dream team of student members. They have been very candid and insightful in their recommendations. We've had a lot of dialogue with each other and we have also been trying to connect them with members of the university, such as Campus Safety, to help answer their questions and give their point of view.

Jessica Simpson: I'm happy to give a perspective from a student who is on the Maywood campus. It has been a wonderful opportunity to work with Robyn. She is very dedicated. I was also on one of the sub-committees that put together an RFP for an outside contracting group to help us with this process. It's been great to have leadership onboard and to meet with President Rooney and Provost Norberto. I honestly think you cannot do this work without the students being involved and Robyn has done an excellent job of involving us students. It's difficult sometimes because it is hard to hear that some things are wrong, but it is the only way to get to the root of the problem. I appreciate Robyn's willingness to listen and keep an open mind.

LaShaunda Reese: I would like to echo what Jessica has said. Robyn has been very gracious and has extended herself beyond what is called for in the position by attending additional meetings with us and keeping us informed. She is willing to listen to our experiences and check in with us. She is giving us agency and allowing us to have input on the process. Robyn is a very unique individual and the next person to fill her role have to be just as unique.



Jessica Simpson: Robyn has been promoted, which is wonderful for her and we are very happy for her, but we are concerned about losing her. I don't think that everyone is personal or morally on the same page as her and I hope we can find someone to fill her shoes adequately.

Chair Uprichard: So Robyn, you will not be continuing as the Chair of the initiative?

Robyn Mallett: That is right. I am now the Associate Provost for Academic Programs and Planning. So that is more than a full-time job and we just finished interviewing a group of people for my old position. I'll be talking with Provost Norberto soon about those candidates. But I will remain available and will onboard the new hire. Provost Norberto and I will make sure that all the students voices and concerns will be heard in the process.

Sen. Doyle: I wanted to thank everyone for being here. I had a clarifying question. Based on the presentation Robyn, it shows that the phases end when the SMART goals begin. Am I correct?

Robyn Mallett: Yes, that is correct, because it is an initiative. The initiative is just to get something started and then hopefully it will be engrained in our culture after that.

Sen. Doyle: Thank you. So, my clarifying question is after those SMART goals are developed, I know it is early in the process, who would you like to take these goals on and implement and measure and create tangible initiatives?

Robyn Mallett: So, I understand your question to be how do we sustain this change once we make the change we are seeking to make? Correct. First, we need to listen to the specific plans and recommendations that are coming forward from our strategy groups and the information that comes from the racial justice examen process. There is no way to anticipate what new recommendations we are going to have, but hopefully what emerges is a more integrated diversity, equity, and inclusion body that can work collaboratively to influence every single aspect of the university. We are still too early in the process to say for sure though.

Chair Uprichard: We are out of time, but there is time for one more question. You are putting all of those SMART goals together, are you all thinking of ways to assess if we've achieved those goals?

Robyn Mallett: Yes, absolutely. That has to be part of it. I'm hoping we can also have a yearly reflective process where we assess where we are. But yes, we must keep track of how we are doing and if we are reaching those goals.



Chair Uprichard: We are out of time so we will not get to the agenda item I was hoping to add, but we can easily have the vote online. I will solicit some feedback on the finance resolution and then we will have an electronic vote. Finally, is there any pressing business that must be brought forward before we adjourn.

Calls to adjourn.

Sen. Lee motions to adjourn, seconded by Sen. Kelly.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 PM.

Respectfully Submitted AEH 11/3/20

Senate Meeting Schedule for Academic Year 2020-2021

• **University Senate Schedule:**

○ September 18	3:00-5:30pm	Zoom
▪ September 23 (Emergency Ad-Hoc)	9:30-11:30am	Zoom
▪ September 29 (Ad-Hoc Follow Up)	12:00-1:00pm	Zoom
○ October 16	3:00-5:00pm	Zoom
○ November 20	3:00-5:00pm	Zoom
○ January 15	3:00-5:00pm	TBD
○ February 12	3:00-5:00pm	TBD
○ March 19	3:00-5:00pm	TBD
○ April 23	3:00-5:00pm	TBD

• **Executive Committee Schedule:**

○ September 8	3:00-5:00pm	Zoom
○ October 5	3:00-5:00pm	Zoom
○ November 6	3:00-5:00pm	Zoom
○ January 4	3:00-5:00pm	TBD
○ January 29	3:00-5:00pm	TBD
○ March 5	3:00-5:00pm	TBD
○ April 9	3:00-5:00pm	TBD