



**DIVERSITY, EQUITY,
& INCLUSION**
STRATEGIC PLAN
OCTOBER 2016



GERALD R. FORD SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

**GERALD R. FORD SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY
DIVERSITY, EQUITY AND INCLUSION STRATEGIC PLAN**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction and Strategic Planning Process	Page 2
Diversifying Who We Are	
Diversifying Our Student Body	
Undergraduate Students	Page 6
Master’s Students	Page 13
PhD Students	Page 20
Increasing the Diversity of the Faculty	Page 28
Diversifying the Staff	Page 34
Diversifying What and How We Teach	Page 38
Promoting an Equitable and Inclusive Climate	Page 44
Diversifying Our Research and Policy Engagement	Page 49
Implementation of our Five-Year Strategic Plan	Page 54
Summary Documents:	
Summary of Strategic Objectives	Page 56
Table Listing Year One (FY2017) Proposed Actions	Page 58
Table Listing Continued Actions	Page 61
Appendices A-F	Page 64
Bibliography	Page 73
End Notes	Page 75

INTRODUCTION AND STRATEGIC PLANNING PROCESS

From being one of the first universities to admit women in 1870 to our historic defense of race conscious admission policies at the U.S. Supreme Court in 2003, the University of Michigan has had a fierce and longstanding commitment to diversity, equity and inclusion. This commitment rests upon our recognition of the U.S. history of racial, ethnic, and gender discrimination, as well as our understanding that our progress as an institution of higher learning will be enhanced with a vibrant community of people from many backgrounds.

At the Ford School of Public Policy, we have long embraced this commitment. We believe in training the public policy leaders of tomorrow to meet the needs of a diverse country and of an increasingly interconnected world. We also recognize that in order to inform public policymaking, our researchers must think deeply and carefully about how to serve diverse populations in a just and equitable manner. And, we seek to ensure that each member of our community has full opportunity to thrive in our environment, for we believe that diversity is key to individual flourishing, educational excellence, and the advancement of knowledge. Indeed, in 1980 the Ford School was one of four universities which established the Public Policy and International Affairs (PPIA) programs, summer institutes designed to address the underrepresentation of racial and ethnic minorities in public policy leadership. The Ford School continues to run its seven-week summer PPIA program for a diverse population of undergraduate students every year. This has not only helped to diversify the corps of public policy practitioners in the United States but its own master's programs.

But we still have a long way to go. To truly realize our goals, we must further diversify who we are--in terms of students, faculty, and staff--but also ensure that our classrooms and climate truly and demonstrably respect diversity, value equity, and foster inclusion. Therefore, we have welcomed the opportunity to participate in the university-wide five-year strategic planning process on diversity, equity, and inclusion. As we developed this plan over the course of the 2015-2016 academic year, we engaged in extensive data collection and analysis, and community-wide discussions of priorities and goals. We are proud that Ford School community members engaged actively with these issues and the process of creating the strategic plan. We intend to set up the structures that will enable us to assess the goals and effectiveness of the strategies, and to continue to gain repeated input from all stakeholders, including faculty, staff, students and alumni, over the course of the five-year plan.

Diversity, Equity & Inclusion Strategic Plan

The purpose of the Ford School's five-year Diversity, Equity & Inclusion (DE&I) Strategic Plan is to propose specific, achievable, and sustainable short- medium- and long-term goals and actions to enhance diversity, equity and inclusion with specific timetables for execution; to identify resources and points of accountability for achieving the goals; and to identify steps to ensure that the strategic plan is regularly reviewed and updated to reflect both progress towards its goals and newly identified opportunities and challenges.

Diversity: We commit to increasing diversity, which is expressed in myriad forms, including race and ethnicity, gender and gender identity, sexual orientation, socio-economic status, language, culture, national origin, religious commitments, age, (dis)ability status, and political perspective. We recognize the history in the United States of racial, ethnic, and gender discrimination and the intergenerational effects of poverty, and we commit to work assiduously, in accordance with the law, to promote and extend opportunities and outcomes for members of those groups that have been historically marginalized by these profound inequalities.

Equity: We commit to working actively to challenge and respond to bias, harassment, and discrimination. We are committed to a policy of equal opportunity for all persons and do not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, marital status, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, disability, religion, height, weight, or veteran status.

Inclusion: We commit to pursuing deliberate efforts to ensure that our school is a place where differences are welcomed, different perspectives are respectfully heard and where every individual feels a sense of belonging and inclusion. We know that by building a critical mass of diverse groups and creating a vibrant climate of inclusiveness, we can more effectively leverage the resources of diversity to advance our collective capabilities.

Planning Process

The Ford School engaged in a robust data-gathering phase in fall 2015. We did this in conjunction with our communication strategy, in hopes of engaging as many members of the community as possible.

Planning Lead(s): Shobita Parthasarathy, Associate Professor; Susan Guindi, Director of Student & Academic Services

Planning Team: Paul Courant, Professor; Demar Lewis, graduate student; Eric Riley, undergraduate student; Alex Thebaud, Business Manager; Susan Waltz, Professor.

Sources of data and processes for collecting it: in addition to institutional data we already had, the committee created and organized the following data sources:

1. Surveys – The Ford School planning leads and team, in consultation with the Ford School’s dean and chief administrative officer, and the director of research and evaluation from the provost’s office, developed separate surveys for faculty, staff, and students. The surveys were in the field for approximately six weeks, and the Ford School engaged in multiple promotional activities encouraging the community to participate. These included “survey days,” posters throughout the building, and “I Surveyed” buttons. In the end, 81% of the faculty, 48% of the students, and 84% of the staff participated. Appendices A, B, and C contain copies of the surveys. We also took advantage of insights from previous surveys, including the Fordies4Inclusion winter 2015 survey, annual student exit surveys, and the annual staff climate survey.

2. Facilitated conversations – We held five separate facilitated conversations: one for the faculty, one for the staff, one for undergraduate students, and two for graduate students since they are our largest cohort. The Ford School’s planning leads and the dean worked with facilitators external to the school to plan and develop questions for the conversations. The facilitators then ran the conversations themselves. In all, 29 faculty, 38 staff, and 90 (70 graduate, 20 undergraduate) students participated in these conversations. Transcripts from the conversations, as well as participant comments recorded on notecards, were recorded and analyzed by the planning team.
3. Suggestion boxes – For those individuals who preferred to leave anonymous notes, we provided suggestion boxes strategically located throughout the Ford School (five comments were received via this method). They reiterated comments that were received via the survey and conversations.
4. Town Hall – Over 100 members of the community attended the Town Hall in December 2015. At that meeting, we provided the results of our preliminary analysis of the data, and engaged the audience in helping to identify the top goals and strategies for attaining them. Thus, this activity not only generated data, it allowed community members to brainstorm ideas and strategies for action.
5. Communication strategy – The Ford School’s DE&I Committee collaborated with the communications office to create a communication strategy that motivated and encouraged as much community involvement as possible. We had a number of initiatives to publicize the importance of the strategic plan, which in turn emphasized the importance of hearing the varying perspectives of our community members. Among the most successful of these efforts was a series of posters placed throughout the school, floor decals and buttons encouraging participation in the data gathering stage, and a polling station-like setup for individuals to complete the surveys. All of these efforts demonstrated the Ford School’s commitment to crafting a valuable DE&I Strategic Plan.

Data Analysis and Preparation of the Strategic Plan

The Institute for Social Research de-identified the faculty survey data, and then Professor Parthasarathy worked with a doctoral student to analyze all of the quantitative and the qualitative data generated. They identified multiple trends, and presented them (along with the raw data) to the planning committee and dean for their comments. These trends were then presented to the Ford School community during the Town Hall, for their consideration. The raw quantitative data will be cleaned up and de-identified further and then presented to the Ford School community by the end of winter semester 2016.

The writing of the Ford School DE&I strategic plan is the result of collaboration across our community, and involved faculty, staff, and students. First, the DE&I committee drafted the sections of the plan, then reviewed and discussed the sections. The dean reviewed it and shared suggestions, as did members of the Ford School executive committee. Subsections

were also shared for comment with the school's senior staff, faculty program directors, HR manager, and a small group of student leaders. We intend to create a communication strategy to roll out the plan, and as a key step, held an all-school Town Hall on April 18, to discuss and motivate the community to commit to its implementation.

We have taken a comprehensive approach to our strategic planning process because we believe that we must address DE&I across multiple facets of the Ford School's work. The first section focuses on diversifying who we are, focusing separately on undergraduate students, master's students, doctoral students, faculty, and staff. We then focus on the Ford School's activities and environment, with sections on who and what we teach, research and policy engagement, and our climate overall. Each of these sections assesses the current state of affairs, articulates goals for the future, develops strategies and actions to meet those goals, and identifies metrics to help us track our progress. Multiple potential actions for achieving our strategic objectives are listed for each section. We expect that those responsible for implementation will further prioritize actions during the first year. The first year of the strategic plan will then serve as a pilot year. At the end of this year, we will re-evaluate the actions undertaken, revise them as appropriate, and determine a fuller timeline of implementing the full suite of proposed actions for the remainder of the Ford School's strategic plan's timeline. Each action will be undertaken in a manner consistent with the law. The final section discusses our approach to implementing the strategic plan.

DIVERSIFYING OUR STUDENT BODY

A diverse student body is essential for proper training of students in each of our public policy degree programs. Scholars have demonstrated that diverse classrooms help all students develop better moral reasoning and critical thinking skills, and to become better prepared for a diverse and interconnected world (Gurin et al., 2002). They also show that diverse classrooms can improve the teaching skills of instructors (Giangreco, Baumgart, and Doyle 1995). And they assist minority students by helping them increase their aspirations as well as their learning and job outcomes (Milem 2003). Of utmost importance for a policy school, a diverse student body ultimately improves leadership skills and civic engagement (Antonio 2001). It provides future leaders with the tools to engage a wide variety of groups in culturally competent ways (Luo and Jamieson-Drake 2013; Rice 2010; Matthews 2010; Gooden and Myers 2004). Of course, simply creating a more diverse student body is not enough; as we discuss in further detail in the “What and How We Teach,” “Research and Policy Engagement,” and “Climate” sections, we can only maximize the benefits of a diverse student body by adopting more inclusive teaching styles, encouraging interactions among students, and engaging students in our extensive diversity-related research and public engagement. In this section, however, we focus our attention on how to improve both the recruitment and retention of our master’s, undergraduate, and PhD students in order to achieve our DE&I goals.

OUR UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

The Ford School launched its undergraduate degree (BA) program in AY2008; it is a small, highly selective, two-year liberal arts program. University of Michigan students apply as sophomores, and matriculate in the fall of their junior year. The program has grown from a target entering class of 50 juniors, to a target entering class of 75. The program is very popular and its courses receive strong student evaluations. However, as summarized below, the BA student body has lacked diversity since the program’s inception, and concerns about both this lack of diversity and its impact on the overall student climate, as well as the lack of attention to DE&I issues in the classrooms, have grown.

Current Status

While the BA program is somewhat balanced when it comes to gender (in the 2015 entering class, 55% identified as female while 45% identified as male), it is not diverse in terms of race or ethnicity. Under-represented minorities (URMs) made up only 17% of the undergraduate student body in 2015, similar to 2007 when URMs made up 19% of a smaller entering BA class. Of that 17%, 9% of the 2015 entering class identified as Asian. When compared to undergraduate demographics university-wide, we see that the Ford School fares slightly better among URMs but worse among Asians.¹ And if we compare it to the Ross School of Business’s similar (but much larger) undergraduate program, we see again that the Ford School fares better among all URM categories but far worse among Asians.² Of some concern is that while the university overall has increased the racial and ethnic diversity of its undergraduate student body in recent years, the racial and ethnic diversity of the Ford School’s BA program has been stagnant.

When we analyze this data in context, we see that fewer minority students are applying to the Ford School's BA program. In 2007, 25% of the applicants came from URM groups, while in 2015, only 14% of the applicants came from URM groups. This data tells us that we should, at least initially, focus our attention on increasing, in legally permissible ways, the racial and ethnic diversity of our applicant pool. We are pleased that 21% of the 2016 applicant pool are URM (of which 10% are Asians), so we have made some progress in some URM subcategories. Appendix A provides more comprehensive data on the demographics of the undergraduate students applying, admitted, and matriculating in the Ford School from 2007-2015.

The fall 2015 DE&I survey, which had a 44% response rate, suggests that the BA students may be somewhat more diverse across other dimensions. Of those who responded, 30% identified as Christian, 33% identified as Jewish, 17% identified as agnostic, 12% as atheist, and 3% as Muslim. Eighty-eight percent of the BA students who responded to the survey identified as heterosexual. We lack historical data for these dimensions of diversity, and we also did not collect data regarding socioeconomic, undocumented, political perspective, or first-generation college status. It will be important to find ways to collect this data in the future, in order to ensure that we are targeting our DE&I efforts appropriately.

This lack of diversity may be having negative impacts on teaching and learning. Students are exposed to fewer perspectives in the classroom, and instructors have greater challenges in training culturally competent individuals. Indeed, while 78% of BA students indicated feeling a sense of belonging and acceptance at the Ford School, 55% of undergraduate respondents to our fall 2015 DE&I survey indicated being dissatisfied with the "experience and environment regarding diversity at the Ford School." Furthermore, there is some evidence that Ford School BA students are not developing adequate skills to operate in a diverse and multicultural world. Thirty percent of Ford School BA students reported that, more than once a year, they personally experienced insensitive or disparaging remarks (including microaggressions) related to their political views. Similarly, more than once a year 22% experienced insensitive or disparaging remarks related to their gender; more than once a year 18% experienced insensitive or disparaging remarks related to their socioeconomic status; and more than once a year 13% experienced insensitive or disparaging remarks related to their race. The Ford School's exit surveys echo these conclusions. Since 2012, the percentage of undergraduates that agree or strongly agree that the Ford School is a supportive climate regarding gender, race, socioeconomic status, and political orientation has decreased (although the response rate to these surveys is around 50%). Indeed, many of the open-ended responses to questions in the fall 2015 DE&I survey echo these concerns. Undergraduate students were deeply concerned about the lack of diversity in their classes, and felt not only that this hurt their education but that it made it difficult for them to encourage students from diverse backgrounds to apply.

Recruitment and Admissions

The Ford School's student and academic services team has already initiated some programs to diversify its applicant pool. We have asked Ford School faculty involved with the UROP program to identify and recruit promising freshmen and sophomores to the Ford School. We

have also asked our own undergraduates to serve as informal “ambassadors” as they engage with other student organizations across campus (particularly those that serve identity groups). We provide these ambassadors with pertinent information so that they can effectively spread the word about the Ford School BA program. Both staff and the student undergraduate council, which hosts an annual boot camp, offer assistance to prospective students throughout the admission process.

Finally, we have made the race and ethnicity requirement a prerequisite in order to signal the importance of these issues to the study of public policy. However, we are well aware, as we discuss in the “What and How We Teach” section, that the courses that currently fulfill the R&E requirement are quite broad in scope and therefore may not provide students with adequate preparation for grappling with the DE&I dimensions of public policy. We are also aware that an additional prerequisite may make it more difficult for students to apply to the Ford School.

We are also working on multiple fronts to address the concern that our prerequisites—particularly the multiple quantitative courses—may be deterring prospective students from applying to our BA program. The responses we received from the survey and facilitated conversations validate the concern that the prerequisites of Econ 101 and 102 may dissuade a diverse group of students from applying. We are considering eliminating the Econ102 requirement, and the economics department has taken some steps to make the Econ 101 requirement less daunting.³ We are also working with faculty who teach the Comprehensive Studies Program (CSP) section of Econ 101 to encourage those students to consider the Ford School BA program.

In addition, to enhance our program’s match for students with disparate expertise in economics, we will now be offering two sections of our required 300-level economics course at different levels of intensity. This will allow us to satisfy those who want an accelerated economics course, and those who don't. We have created a similar two-section course for our graduate students, and it has worked well. Because our programs are multidisciplinary, we do not believe there is stigma in having one section more econ-heavy than other sections.

Current DE&I-Related Workshops and Programs for Students

The Ford School currently promotes DE&I values among our undergraduate student body in multiple ways. Our mandatory BA orientation includes a DE&I-related workshop. This year, we used the Change It Up bystander intervention workshop, created and conducted by the university’s student life division, in collaboration with the Educational Theater Company. Because the Change It Up workshop is now mandatory for all incoming U-M freshmen, we will use a different DE&I-related workshop in the future. We also realize that we have to expand our DE&I efforts during orientation in order to ensure that the school’s norms and values are made clear to students at the beginning of their studies. As discussed in other sections, both the school and student-led organizations also host multiple community conversations throughout the year that emphasize and enhance understanding of our diversity, equity, and inclusion values. And the Ford School is a proud member of the MLK Spirit Award Program. We typically have numerous students nominated and awarded this prestigious prize.

Strategic Objectives

The goals of this section of the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Strategic Plan are as follows:

- *Increase, in measureable ways, the racial, ethnic, socioeconomic, and political diversity of students in our undergraduate program, with particular interest in recruiting students from underrepresented racial and ethnic backgrounds.*
- *Equip undergraduate students with the ability to traverse issues of diversity, equity, inclusion, identity, and social justice as they relate to analyzing, making, and implementing policy.*

Proposed Actions

Below, we list a number of potential actions for achieving our strategic objectives, subject to funding availability and in a manner consistent with the law. We have provided some guidance in terms of priorities, but we expect that those responsible for implementation will further prioritize actions during the first year, which will serve as a pilot year. At the end of this year, those implementing the plan will re-evaluate the actions undertaken, revise them as appropriate, and determine a fuller timeline for implementing the full suite of proposed actions.

Recruitment and Admissions

We will review, monitor and refine the processes and strategies used to recruit a more diverse BA applicant pool. Specifically, we will develop a robust BA recruitment plan by early fall to be reviewed by the BA Program Committee and presented in September to the Executive Committee, in order to engage students and faculty. We will gather data during the recruitment cycle that will enable us to determine which activities are most effective, and refine the recruitment plan for the following year. We will prepare a report about what worked well and what needs to be revisited, in time for the annual faculty retreat. Activities are likely to include:

1. Collaborations and partnerships
 - a. Collaborating with the Office of Undergraduate Admissions (OUA), and the Office of New Student Programs to expand the list of prospects for our undergraduate program to include recently matriculated students who are first generation college students and/or attended high school in underserved communities. The Ford School's student and academic services staff (SAS) will take the lead role on this.
 - b. Working with UM's Comprehensive Studies Program (i.e., Bridge) to identify and recruit promising students, with particular focus on CSP courses that are prerequisites or required courses for the Ford School, i.e., Econ 101 and 102, Stats 250. The Ford School's SAS will take the lead role on this.

- c. Exploring the feasibility and desirability of a collaborative recruitment event with other departments that receive large numbers of undergraduate student applications, including the Organizational Studies Program (OSP) and Ross business school. The Ford School's SAS will take the lead role on this.
- d. Learning more about the successes and failures of efforts by similar U- M units to recruit a diverse student body, particularly those done by OSP and Ross. This will likely provide the Ford School with additional strategies.
- e. Creating a program to make annual recruitment visits to on-campus schools, organizations, and sites from which we are likely to recruit the students we seek. This may include presentations (perhaps from our faculty) about what public policy is, as well as information sessions about our educational programs and admissions processes. Possible partnering institutions include the Comprehensive Studies Program, LS&A departments, identity-focused student organizations, the Office of Academic Multicultural Initiatives, fraternities and sororities serving minority or historically disenfranchised populations, and organizations concerned with civic and social justice issues. The Ford School's SAS will take the lead role on this.
- f. Formalizing our student "ambassadors" program, to encourage them to initiate recruitment events among diverse communities.
- g. Sending our student ambassadors, or staff, to the major and minor expos that LS&A hosts.
- h. Adding questions to the Ford School BA application form that ask how applicants heard about the program, and where and how they receive information about educational programs, to both track the success of our collaborations and partnerships and to determine which partnerships to pursue in the future.

2. Communications and Outreach

- a. Developing a suite of recruitment materials, including on the Ford School website and its social media, likely to capture the attention of diverse students, highlighting not only underrepresented students and alumni whose work pertains to DE&I, but also the Ford School's efforts to increase attention to diversity, equity and inclusion. The Ross business school [site](#) may be a helpful model. The Ford Schools' SAS, in cooperation with the BA faculty director and the Ford School communications and outreach department, will spearhead this effort.
- b. Creating an outreach strategy to communicate the Ford School's commitment to DE&I and engagement with these issues, countering the

image some students claim the Ford School has of being “white and wealthy.” The Ford School’s SAS, in consultation with the communications and outreach department, would take the lead role on this.

- c. Improving and expanding the boot camp program in order to work with interested freshmen and sophomores, which we hope will include students from underrepresented groups and first-generation students, throughout the application process, and ensure that they are assigned mentors once they matriculate. The Ford School’s SAS will take the lead role on this.
- d. Providing professional development opportunities to the admissions committee to guard against unconscious bias on the part of reviewers and the inadvertent privileging of measures that do not predict student academic success.

Curricular Changes

As discussed more fully in the section on “What and How We Teach,” we must ensure that our curriculum enhances our efforts to increase the diversity of our student body and that we equip our students with the skills and abilities to engage with issues of DE&I. The BA Program Committee will conduct a comprehensive review of the BA program, including prerequisites for admission and course requirements, in order to determine whether they are limiting the diversity of our applicant pool or impacting our students’ ability to traverse issues of DE&I. The BA Program Committee will then make recommendations to the Ford School Executive Committee about how to address this. The curricular review should:

1. Classify one or more public policy electives as courses that can satisfy U-M students’ race and ethnicity requirement.
2. Consider how to require that BA students receive substantial education related to DE&I (approximately 1.5 credits worth). This could be through an additional required course, or integrating DE&I more into existing required courses (discussed in more detail in the “What and How We Teach” section).
3. Pay particular attention to the prerequisite economics courses and explore whether the Ford School should offer its own versions of these courses, offer shorter or bridge versions of these courses, and whether they should be prerequisites at all.
4. Ensure attention to diversity, equity, and inclusion in PUBPOL 201; and advertise this fact widely to the broader undergraduate community, since PubPol 201 serves as an introduction to public policy. Similarly, consider offering more 201 sections and/or other introductory courses that target freshmen in the winter term.

Equip undergraduate students with the ability to traverse issues of DE&I

1. Enhance our DE&I orientation session for BAs and expand it to include a more robust programming spread throughout the academic year.
2. Develop an alumni mentoring program for all students, which we hope will include URM students, to connect with Ford School alumni.
3. Identify faculty and staff, as individuals or a committee, who can act as a resource for students who experience discrimination, micro aggressions, or insensitive remarks.
4. Create a small-grants fund to encourage undergraduate students and student organizations to plan community conversations and/or simulations that address issues of DE&I. We will do the same for graduate students.

Metrics for Evaluation

In order for these strategies to be successful, the following metrics for evaluation must be instituted and consistently used:

1. Continue to track and monitor whether, and to what extent, we are able to diversify our undergraduate applicant pool in measurable ways, as well as the matriculated student body.
 - a. Begin to track diversity across other dimensions (e.g., socioeconomic status, first generation students, sexual orientation), perhaps through annual or biannual climate surveys.
2. Incorporate into the BA graduate exit survey, which has over a 90% response rate, questions pertaining to DE&I, including in the classroom, co-curricular opportunities, and overall climate. Report findings to the dean and other leadership. Document students' experiences and perspectives over time.
3. Track the success of the student ambassadors program and other collaborations and partnerships through questions on the application form or other methods.
4. Track the number of and attendance rate at DE&I-related events convened by Ford School-affiliated undergraduate student organizations.

OUR MASTER'S STUDENTS

Current Status

At present, the Ford School has a fairly diverse master's student body. Over the last two years, 50% of our entering students have identified as female, while 48% have identified as male. Thirty-two percent come from underrepresented minority groups (including 5% Asian). Looking more closely at the racial and ethnic demographics of our data, we see that we have very few Native American or Hawaiian applicants or matriculated students. Approximately 16% identify as neither US citizens nor US permanent residents.

If we view these numbers in historical perspective, we see that the master's student body has become somewhat more diverse in recent years. In 2007, 20% of our master's students came from underrepresented minority groups (including 4% identifying as Asian), while in 2008 23% of our master's students identified as URM (including 7% identifying as Asian). Over those same years, 16% of our master's students did not identify as either US citizens or US permanent residents. Appendix B provides more comprehensive data on the demographics of the master's students applying and admitted to, and matriculated in, the Ford School from 2007-2015.

If we compare some of this data with students at other professional schools, we see that we are somewhat more diverse. Ross business school is 60% white, 19% Asian, and 19% other URM, and 27% female. The School of Public Health is 65% white, 15% Asian, and 14% other URM, and 72% female.

We lack historical data across other dimensions of diversity, but our fall 2015 DE&I survey began to paint an initial picture and also suggested areas for further exploration. Thirty-five percent of survey respondents identified as Christian, 2% as Jewish, 2% as Hindu, and 2% as Muslim.⁴ Fifteen percent identified as gay, lesbian, bisexual, or other.⁵ We did not ask students whether they came from low-income backgrounds or were first-generation students, but responses to the open-ended survey questions suggest that we should ask these questions in future surveys. These are important diversity dimensions that have a major impact on whether students can attend and thrive at the Ford School and likely warrant dedicated resources.

Ninety-one percent of master's students who enrolled in the 2011-2012 academic year had graduated by August 2015. We do not have demographic information on the students who did not complete their degree, but during the period of the strategic plan we would like to collect more information on these students so that we can explore whether we improve in this area.

Recruitment and Admissions

We have diversified our graduate student body in large part by leveraging several strategic partnerships. Below is a cross-section of these activities:

- Public Policy and International Affairs (PPIA)—As noted in the introduction, the Ford School is one of only four schools that host a junior summer institute that exposes college students after their junior year to the study of public policy. While all students are eligible for it, many minority and students of low socio-economic status participate in the program. Eighteen students enroll in the program each year. Once the program is complete, we follow up with PPIA graduates and encourage them to apply to the Ford School's master's programs. These efforts have yielded some success: in fall 2014 we had three PPIA alumni in our entering class, and six in 2015.
- Targeted recruiting with the Congressional Black Caucus Fellows and Congressional Hispanic Caucus interns and fellows.
- Targeted recruiting with the Thomas R. Pickering Foreign Affairs Fellowship Program, Peace Corps, AmeriCorps, and Teach for America.
- Participation in Diversity Alliance graduate school recruiting fairs
- Matching applicants who have expressed an interest to representatives from Students of Color in Public Policy (SCPP), a Ford School student organization, to assist the former with their applications and answer their questions about the Ford School.
- We provide information about access for prospective students who are undocumented in the FAQs in the admissions section of the Ford School's website.
- New Rackham Diversity Allies Project—Working with Rackham, we recently initiated a program to publicize the Ford School's master's program among the state's outstanding universities (particularly those with significant URM student populations). We began with a networking event in November 2015 with senior faculty and administrators from a handful of the universities, in an effort to build and strengthen our connections with them. We now have an ongoing communication strategy in place with these schools, and will host a group of their undergraduate students for a workshop on public policy in fall 2016.

Financial Aid and Scholarships

As part of its recruiting strategy, the Ford School offers numerous financial aid packages. The most generous is the Rackham Merit Award (RMA), a joint program with the Rackham Graduate School. Other fellowships include the Gerald R. Ford Fellowship, offered to a Michigan resident, and the Bohnett Fellowship, which includes a tuition award plus an internship with the City of Detroit mayor's office. However, we are well aware that one of the major challenges we face is that some of our peer institutions (e.g., Princeton's Woodrow Wilson School for Public and International Affairs) are able to offer their students full tuition scholarships for their master's studies. In addition, unlike other public universities like U-C Berkeley and UCLA, undocumented students must pay out-of-state tuition. As a result, we have trouble recruiting students who cannot fund their tuition and other education costs.

Student Support and Retention

The Ford School currently provides three broad levels of support to encourage the academic and professional success of its students: Student & Academic Services, including programs that partner with faculty; Graduate Career Services (GCS); and student organizations.

The Office of Student & Academic Services (SAS) provides academic advising, counseling sessions, peer tutoring, and referral to other university resources. To help retain students, SAS matches incoming students with faculty mentors. SAS staff also checks in with faculty during the middle of each academic term to get early warnings about students who may not be keeping up in the classroom. And, in the 2015-16 academic year, SAS launched a student guide program in which first year master's students can consult with "student guides" to help them navigate life as a student at the Ford School, including curriculum requirements, registration processes, first-generation/transition issues, international student affairs/transition issues, student organizations, employment opportunities, and U-M campus resources.

As we discuss in further detail in the "Climate" section, SAS and other staff members collaborate on numerous DE&I-related programs throughout the year, beginning with orientation. Because it is mandatory, and because it sets an important tone for our values, we have incorporated a multi-hour DE&I-related workshop into our orientations. This year, we used the Change It Up bystander intervention workshop, created and conducted by the University's student life division, in collaboration with the Educational Theater Company. We have also organized or supported student-led, DE&I-related, community conversations. These conversations model appropriate ways to discuss difficult and sometimes controversial issues, ways that instill respect and help make for a more inclusive environment.

The Office of Graduate Career Services (GCS) provides professional development, career counseling, interview preparation, job/internship support, skill-focused trainings and workshops, employer information sessions, formal networking opportunities, networking with Michigan and Ford School alumni, and other related programs. There are two student MPP/MPA peer advisors.

There are numerous student organizations that graduate students can join, including several that are relevant to conversations of diversity, equity, and inclusion, at the Ford School and elsewhere. These organizations offer students the opportunity to explore common interests, to socialize, and to support each other academically and professionally.

Strategic Objectives

The goals of this section of the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Strategic Plan are as follows:

- *To maintain, and if possible increase, in measurable ways, the racial, ethnic, socioeconomic, political, and gender diversity of students in our graduate programs, with particular interest in recruiting students from underrepresented racial and ethnic backgrounds.*

- *To enhance the Ford School's support services to meet the needs of domestic and international students from diverse backgrounds and circumstances.*
- *To equip graduate students with the ability to traverse issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion, as it relates to analyzing, making, and implementing policy.*

Proposed Actions

Below, we list a number of potential actions for achieving our strategic objectives, subject to funding availability and in a manner consistent with the law. We have provided some guidance in terms of priorities, but we expect that those responsible for implementation will further prioritize actions during the first year, which will serve as a pilot year. At the end of this year, those implementing the plan will re-evaluate the actions undertaken, revise them as appropriate, and determine a fuller timeline for implementing the full suite of proposed actions.

Recruitment and Admissions

We will review, monitor and refine processes and strategies used to recruit more diverse student applicant pools through multiple collaborations and partnerships, pipeline programs, communications and outreach strategies, and revised admissions. Specifically, we will develop a robust Masters recruitment plan by early fall to be reviewed by the Masters Program Committee and presented in September to the Executive Committee, in order to engage students and faculty. We will gather data during the recruitment cycle that will enable us to determine which activities are most effective, and to refine the recruitment plan for the following year. We will prepare a report about what worked well and what needs to be revisited, in time for the annual faculty retreat. Activities are likely to include:

1. Pipeline programs
 - a. Continue to support and expand our efforts to create pipelines into our graduate programs, including PPIA and our Rackham Diversity Allies Program. SAS will spearhead these efforts.
 - b. Create avenues to maintain communication with PPIA alumni.
 - c. Explore opportunities to match Ford School PPIA alumni with post-graduate work opportunities with Ford School alumni, and subsequent admission to MPP program.
 - d. Continue with the Rackham Diversity Allies Program to create a comprehensive communication strategy, including in-person visits, with faculty and alumni at other universities in the State of Michigan to inform them about the Ford School and encourage them to recommend their students for graduate study at the Ford School.
2. Collaborations and Partnerships
 - a. Create a communication strategy for minority serving institutions (i.e., historically black colleges and universities, Hispanic-serving institutions, and tribal colleges) to try and increase the number of applications from these

institutions, coordinating faculty, students, staff, alumni, and university resources for the purpose of actively recruiting students from these partnership schools. SAS will spearhead this effort.

- b. Create a communication strategy for fraternities and sororities on U- M's campus that predominately serve URM's and/or are affiliated with the National Pan-Hellenic Council, Multicultural Greek Council, Intrafraternity Conference, and the Panhellenic Councils. SAS will spearhead this effort.
- c. Create a communication strategy for the Ronald E. McNair Scholars Post-Baccalaureate Achievement Program, the Mellon Mays Undergraduate Fellowship Program, or other similar entities that prepare underrepresented students for studies in the academy and social sciences. SAS will spearhead this effort.

3. Communications and outreach

- a. Develop a suite of recruitment materials likely to capture the attention of diverse students, highlighting not only underrepresented students and alumni whose work pertains to DE&I, but also the Ford School's efforts to increase attention to diversity, equity and inclusion. As part of these efforts, the Ford School's website and other recruitment materials should make its policies and support for undocumented students clearer, beyond the FAQ section. The Ford Schools' SAS, in cooperation with its communications and outreach department, will spearhead this effort.
- b. Continue the SCPP collaboration that matches current students with applicants to assist the latter with their applications and answer their questions about the Ford School.
- c. Contact faculty (both from U-M and other institutions) who have written recommendations for particularly promising students from diverse backgrounds, encouraging them to recommend the Ford School to their future students. Provide them with recruitment materials, and also encourage them to contact the Ford School directly for more information.

4. Admissions Process

- a. Encourage applicants to reflect on their DE&I interests and commitments through essay questions, in order to establish the Ford School's DE&I commitment early on. This could include asking students to describe their commitment to and/or experience working in diverse settings or with diverse populations, inclination or predisposition to engage critical perspectives around issues of educational practice, and/or demonstrated resilience or persistence in the face of obstacles.
- b. Provide professional development opportunities to the admissions committee to guard against unconscious bias on part of reviewers and the inadvertent privileging of measures that do not predict student academic success.

Financial Aid and Scholarships

The Ford School will develop and leverage scholarships and funding streams to facilitate, in legally permissible ways, the recruitment, admission, and retention of students who have backgrounds, experiences, and inclinations consistent with Ford School's commitment to DE&I. To this end, proposed activities may include:

1. Developing scholarship programs to fund graduate students who have demonstrated a commitment to working on issues of DE&I.
2. Working with the university registrar's office to advocate for ways to ensure that the classification of residency status does not work against students, particularly diverse students and those of low SES backgrounds.
3. Advocating for continued or increased numbers of RMA fellowships and other fellowships awarded to students from various underrepresented backgrounds.
4. Working to continue to increase funding support for internships and explore partnerships with non-profits that work in DE&I-related fields.
5. Work with the Office for the Vice Provost for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion to promote inclusive residency guidelines for graduate and non-traditional undergraduate undocumented and DACAmented students.

Student Support and Retention

In addition to existing programs and the proposed actions outlined elsewhere in the plan, the Ford School will extend its capacity to support, retain, and graduate a diverse student body, and to equip our students with the ability to traverse issues of DE&I. Proposed activities may include:

1. Promote more consistently and widely the existing small-grants program that funds legally permissible student-initiated DE&I efforts, such as community conversations, presentations, and videos.
2. Develop an alumni-mentoring program for all students, including in particular URM students, to connect with Ford School alumni.
3. Dedicate resources (both staff time and financial) to support the emotional and practical needs of first-generation students, students coming from low SES backgrounds, and undocumented and DACAmented students. At present, we rely on Rackham support that provides hardship funding for all Rackham students, not just those from these particular groups, but we should explore Ford School-specific funding and personnel for these needs as well as possible staff support.

4. Enhance our DE&I orientation session for graduate students and expand it to include a more robust set of programming spread throughout the academic year.
5. Identify faculty and staff, as individuals or a committee, who can act as a resource for students who experience discrimination, micro aggressions, or insensitive remarks.
6. Encourage Graduate Career Services to establish more internship collaborations and identify more job opportunities for students interested in DE&I and social, environmental, and health justice.

Metrics

In order for these strategies to be successful the following metrics for evaluation must be instituted and consistently used:

1. Continue to track and monitor whether, and to what extent, we are able to diversify our undergraduate applicant pool in measurable ways, as well as the matriculated student body.
 - a. Begin to track diversity across other dimensions (e.g., socioeconomic status, first generation students, sexual orientation)
2. Track the number of internship partnerships available that focus on DE&I.
3. Incorporate questions into the exit survey pertaining to DE&I, including in the classroom, co-curricular opportunities, and overall climate. Conduct annual analysis and report findings to the dean and other leadership. Document students' experiences and perspectives over time.
4. Track the number of DE&I-related events convened by Ford School-affiliated undergraduate student organizations, and if possible, the number of attendees.

OUR PHD STUDENTS

The Ford School's PhD program in public policy and social sciences, while considered a single joint doctoral program within the Ford School, is actually three different collaborations with the Departments of Economics, Political Science and Sociology. Each of these programs has separate requirements and procedures for admissions, advancement to candidacy, and dissertation development, as is characteristic of other U-M joint degree programs involving several units/departments. In what follows, we focus on how the Ford School can improve the recruitment and retention of a diverse PhD student body, mindful of the fact that in practice we may need to think about some of this work collaboratively.

Current Status

Appendix C provides more comprehensive data on the demographics of the Ford School PhD student body from 2007-2015. Looking at the students currently enrolled, 65% are women and 18% are international students. Among the domestic students, 21% are historically URM students. Since 2011, the percentage of women, international, and underrepresented minority students has stayed the same. Overall, the program has been successful in recruiting a strong, diverse student body. Nonetheless, there remains work to do, as some of our dual programs are more diverse than others. The political science and sociology programs have more gender and racial/ethnic diversity (39% and 37%, respectively), while the economics program has less diversity, as it is most represented by whites (70%) and Asian Americans (20%). Although the numbers are small, when our student body is compared to those who apply and are admitted, we see that our applicant pool is more diverse than those who are admitted and those who matriculate. In future years, we should look more closely at these numbers—especially for our economics joint program—to explore both opportunities to expand our applicant pool and to admit students who have applied.

As noted in a recent Rackham Program Review, the Ford School's Ph.D. program has many strengths, including committed program leadership and staff who have taken numerous steps to support students' transition, rigorous scholarly grounding, and progress through the program. We are proud of the success of our doctoral program, but nonetheless, there are issues we would like to improve. One such issue that is not as relevant for our master's program is diversity, equity and inclusion with respect to disciplines. We have heard from joint sociology and, to a lesser extent, joint political science PhD students that they feel their discipline is not as valued as economics is at the Ford School. This is related to DE&I because sociology and political science PhD candidates (and faculty) tend to be more diverse, and because it impacts feelings of inclusion of our doctoral students. In the past, we heard from students that the introductory PhD course (PP810), which is intended to expose students to multiple fields, can seem dismissive of sociology. However, to address this, the faculty member currently teaching PP810 has reinvented it and is working hard to integrate all three disciplines – sociology, political science, and economics. Students have provided very positive feedback in reaction to these changes.

Doctoral students have also expressed a lack of community between them and other students at the Ford School, and also concern that the administration has not prioritized community-based integration among all the Ford School programs. Rather, they worry, the school has focused on building community primarily among master's students and also among the BA students. They recommend that PhDs who specifically wanted to focus on policy rather than academia would benefit from interacting with MPPs, and conversely, MPPs with interests in pursuing PhDs would also benefit from opportunities to get to know students across programs.

Similar to the master's program, when talking about diversity, it is important to account for indicators beyond gender and racial identity. While the Ford School has been making diligent efforts to increase the number of enrolled first-generation, veteran, low-SES background, undocumented and DACAmented students—among other diverse populations—these students remain underrepresented in the overall population.

Historically, the Ford School has not tracked the sexual orientation of its students, though this is also an identity that is represented within the school's community. Additionally, it may be useful to explicitly track and delineate the ethnic and cultural identities of students from racial groups, as they are not interchangeable.

Before we turn to listing goals and strategies, we outline below the current status regarding recruiting & admissions, and student support and retention for graduate and doctoral students in the Ford School of Public Policy.

Recruiting & Admissions (See Appendix C)

In order to address the insufficient diversity of the Ford School, it is necessary to consult historical recruiting and admissions outcomes. Most of the applicants to the Ford School's PhD program are from the U.S., states outside of Michigan, and identify as female. Appendix C lays out the demographics of applicants, admitted students, and matriculated students. As noted above, while we have enjoyed some success in recruiting URM students – through a variety of recruiting strategies – we believe there is additional work we can do, laid out more fully in the strategies/actions section below.

Financial Aid & Fellowships

All doctoral students admitted to the joint program receive a full five-year funding package, which includes tuition and fees, stipend and benefits. Traditionally, the first and fifth year are fellowship, the second and third years are through a graduate student instructor (GSI) position in their other department, and their fourth year is either a graduate student research assistant (GSRA) position or another GSI. In addition, the Ford School partners with Rackham to offer its most generous funding package, the Rackham Merit Fellowship (“RMF”), as well as the National Science Foundation (NSF). The Ford School will also nominate students for various other prestigious fellowships across campus, such as the Barbour Scholarship, pre-doctoral fellowship, Mary Malcomson Raphael Fellowship, and the ProQuest Dissertation Award.

Student Support & Retention

There are currently several broad levels of support that the Ford School provides to our doctoral students: Student & Academic Services; Rackham Graduate School; faculty advisors; Graduate Career Services (GCS); and student organizations.

The Office of Student & Academic Services (SAS) provides academic advising, tutoring, a PhD mentoring program, and other related services relevant to student achievement and support. Over the last few years, at the request of students, the PhD program has implemented a mentoring program for first and second year students, regular events to check-in with students, and reinstated “Dinner with the Director” to bring all students across programs together.

In addition, and working with the PhD Program Director, SAS invites PhD students to participate in the fall graduate student orientation, as well as the other programs (including DE&I-related community conversations) that it and other Ford School organizations, holds throughout the year. However, PhD students are not required to attend any of these events. As we discuss in the “Proposed Actions” section, we suggest that establishing a stand-alone orientation or workshop related to DE&I would not only help integrate new PhD students into the Ford School but also clearly establish our values.

Rackham Graduate School, in particular the Office of Graduate Student Success, provides our PhD students with additional support. It works in partnership with Ford School faculty and staff to provide programs that facilitate academic success and enhance the quality of student life for all graduate students. So too do faculty advisors. Upon being accepted into the joint program, students are assigned a faculty mentor in both public policy and the other department, based on their expressed interests.

For PhD students not planning on entering the academic job market, the Office of Graduate Career Services (GCS) provides professional development, career counseling, interview preparation, job/internship support, skill-focused trainings and workshops, employer information sessions, formal networking opportunities, networking with Michigan and Ford School alumni, and other related programs. For those who wish to pursue the academic job market, they are assisted by their faculty advisors and other faculty members.

There are numerous student organizations within the Ford School and the other joint departments that PhD students can join, including several that are relevant to conversations of diversity, equity, and inclusion. These organizations offer students the opportunity to explore common interests, to socialize, and to support each other academically and professionally. However, we have found that most of our PhD students tend to join identity-focused organizations—including Political Scientists of Color, Sociologists of Color, and Students of Color of Rackham (SCOR)—outside of the school.

Strategic Objectives

Our goals for the recruitment, matriculation, and retention of doctoral students are:

- *To increase, in measurable ways, the racial, ethnic, socioeconomic, political, and gender diversity of students in our graduate programs, with particular interest in recruiting students from underrepresented racial and ethnic backgrounds.*
- *To enhance the Ford School's support services to meet the needs of domestic and international students from diverse backgrounds and circumstances.*
- *To equip graduate students with the ability to traverse issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion, as it relates to analyzing, making, and implementing policy.*

Proposed Actions

Below, we list a number of potential actions for achieving our strategic objectives, subject to funding availability and in a manner consistent with the law. We have provided some guidance in terms of priorities, but we expect that those responsible for implementation will further prioritize actions during the first year, which will serve as a pilot year. At the end of this year, those implementing the plan will re-evaluate the actions undertaken, revise them as appropriate, and determine a fuller timeline for implementing the full suite of proposed actions.

Recruiting and admissions

We will review, monitor and refine the processes and strategies used to recruit a more diverse applicant pool. In addition to the strategies laid out above in the section of this plan on our master's students, we will pursue some or all of the following strategies, done in a manner consistent with the law:

1. PhD recruitment materials and initiatives should explicitly spotlight the intellectual diversity of the school. It should also highlight the resources available at Ford, and across campus, for all students, including demographically diverse ones. The PhD program director and SAS should spearhead this effort.
2. Develop an active recruitment plan for increasing underrepresented minority students in the program, drawing on successes and lessons learned so far, as well as addressing unique challenges and opportunities related to recruitment of URM students to the different joint programs. Continue to attend Rackham's recruitment workshops, work with the Ford School's faculty ally and the Faculty Allies Program. SAS should spearhead this effort.
3. Solicit information annually from our PhD students about programs they participated in to prepare for doctoral programs, and create a communication strategy with those programs, in addition to other national organizations such as the Ronald E. McNair Scholars Post-Baccalaureate Achievement Program and the Mellon Mays Undergraduate Fellowship Program.

4. Work with the joint departments to develop admissions procedures and provide professional development opportunities for admissions committees, to guard against unconscious bias on part of reviewers and the inadvertent privileging of measures that do not predict student academic and teaching success. The PhD program director should spearhead this effort.

Financial Aid and Scholarships

The Ford School will develop and leverage scholarships and funding streams to facilitate, in legally permissible ways, the recruitment, admission, and retention of students who have backgrounds, experiences, and inclinations consistent with Ford School's commitment to promote diversity and to advance equity and inclusion. To this end, the Ford School will advocate for continued or increased numbers of RMF fellowships awarded to students from various underrepresented backgrounds and other funding opportunities to assist in alleviating the potentially prohibitive financial burdens of graduate education, and will offer comparable funding to that of competitor schools.

Student Support and Retention

In addition to the mechanisms outlined elsewhere in the plan, the Ford School will extend its capacity to support, retain, and graduate a diverse student body through the implementation of some or all of the following complementary strategies:

1. Continue to give students a better understanding of other joint disciplinary departments, particularly through the restructuring of curriculum in the introductory public policy course (PP810). This year (2015-16) was a pilot year for a new structure of PP810 and feedback has so far been positive. We will continue to review the course regularly and adjust the format accordingly. The PhD Program Director should spearhead this effort.
 - a. In addition to the changes noted above, PP810 should expose the incoming PhD cohort to the full breadth of fields, disciplines, and methods represented at the Ford School, in order to demonstrate the variety of ways that academic work can inform public policy.
2. Clarify curricular requirements to ensure that all students are required to have some competence related to the field of sociology. At present, students are required to take courses related to both economics and political institutions, but there is no program-wide sociology requirement. The PhD program director should spearhead this effort.
3. Require all incoming PhD students to participate in a workshop or orientation related to DE&I, either in a stand-alone fashion or alongside the master's students (either would help build the cohort and sense of belonging to the Ford School).

4. Invite PhD students to participate in the DE&I-related seminars and lunches proposed to increase DE&I competency among the faculty. The PhD program director should spearhead this effort.
5. Work with public policy faculty and staff, as well as joint departments, to better understand students' climate experiences and to inform actions to improve it.
6. Expand the already existing mentor program to support students in transitioning to their graduate or doctoral program and succeeding at the Ford School.
7. Highlight more the opportunities available to students through Rackham's Graduate Student Success programs centered around professional development (mock interviews, job searches, career exploration, and funding), faculty mentoring through the MORE (Mentoring Other Results in Excellence) program and initiatives particularly targeted towards RMF students for networking opportunities, summer programs, and other general support services.
8. Provide more opportunities for PhD students to interact with other students in the Ford School, perhaps with seed grant funding. PhDs who want to work on policy issues in the workplace, rather than pursue jobs in academia, would benefit from interacting with master's students, and conversely, master's and BA students who may want to pursue a PhD could benefit greatly from interacting with the PhD students. SAS should spearhead this effort.

Metrics

In order for these strategies to be successful the following metrics for evaluation must be institutionalized and integrated with existing reporting/evaluation rhythms:

1. Track and monitor whether, and to what extent, we are able to diversify our doctoral program applicant pool in measurable ways, as well as the matriculated student body. Metrics should include number of applicants and acceptances per recruiting strategies noted above.
2. Work with the PhD Advisory Committee to evaluate the processes and strategies used for each admission cycle to recruit a more diverse applicant pool – among those strategies listed above – and adjust recruitment strategies accordingly.
3. For the mentoring programs, compile data on numbers of graduate students that participate, and create a method to analyze the success of the various mentoring programs (e.g., number of participating prospective students that matriculate in the Ford School, academic success of participating students, etc).
4. Track and monitor, through bi-annual and exit surveys, PhD student satisfaction and particularly their feelings of inclusion within the Ford School.

INCREASING THE DIVERSITY OF THE FACULTY

As a public policy school, we need to have a demographically diverse faculty both to properly serve our students and to more meaningfully analyze and engage in policymaking in a diverse world. Researchers show that faculty of color and female faculty are more likely to enhance institutional efforts in the areas of mission, research, teaching, and service, and also use more student-centered learning techniques that benefit learning (Milem 2003). They are also more likely to assign course readings written by minority populations and use examples that represent diversity (Mayhew and Grunwald 2001; Hurtado 2001). Finally, students from racial and ethnic minorities tend to feel more comfortable and perform better when their professors also come from minority populations (Chesler 1993). Studies also show that researchers who come from different demographic backgrounds tend to ask different kinds of questions and offer different perspectives on research problems (Fox Keller 1984). And, of particular importance for a public policy school, the vibrancy, innovativeness and relevance of research to the public depends in part on the variety of perspectives involved in the research effort (Yellen 2014; Page 2008).

Indeed, a substantial majority of students, staff, and faculty at the Ford School agree that diversifying our faculty demographically is essential to advancing the Ford School's commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion. Participants at our December Town Hall identified diversifying our faculty as our highest priority. In our fall 2015 DE&I faculty survey, 87% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that hiring of more faculty of color should be a top priority of this university. And there was also general agreement among faculty that a racially and ethnically diverse campus environment prepares students for leadership in a multicultural society, an essential element of the Ford School's mission. In the 2015 DE&I student surveys, 84% of graduate students and 75% of undergraduates agreed or strongly agreed that hiring of more faculty of color should be a top priority of this university. And in their open-ended responses to the survey, graduate students expressed frustration that the vast majority of core courses were taught by white males (and that only one person of color teaches a core course).

Current state and recent history

At present, our faculty is quite homogeneous with regard to race, ethnicity, disability, sexual orientation, and political orientation. Moreover (see table XX, attached), at least along race/ethnicity and gender dimensions, there has been little change over the last decade and more. For example, the faculty is currently 83% white. Since 2004 it has been as high as 85% and as low as 75%, and almost always within a few percentage points of 80%. The preceding figures are based on head count of all faculty appointments, including both non-tenure track and zero fraction (courtesy) appointments. If we just look at tenure track head count, the basic story is similar to that for the faculty as a whole. The tenured and tenure track faculty is currently 79% white, down slightly from the early 2000s. It may be possible to use dry appointments to help diversity the faculty, but at least to date the fraction of such faculty who are white is higher than for the faculty as a whole, or than the tenured and tenure-track faculty.

It is worth noting that the numbers are similar, but on the high side, when compared to our sister departments and other professional schools across campus. In November 2015, 69% of the sociology faculty, 80% of the political science faculty, and 74% of the economics faculty, all in U-M's College of Literature, Science, and the Arts, reported as white. At the same time, 63% of the faculty reported as white in the College of Pharmacy compared to 84% white at the Law School, 73% in the School of Public Health, and 75% in the Ross business school. Of course, these numbers should not satisfy us. In order to truly demonstrate our DE&I commitment and to comprehensively tackle policy problems in the 21st century, we must diversify our faculty further.

Although the picture is better for female faculty, there is still room for improvement.⁶ The current fraction of female faculty is 39%, the same as in 2001 but sharply up from 30 percent only two years ago. Most years in-between have been near 40% female. Focusing only on tenured and tenure-track faculty, we see a somewhat uneven increase in the fraction of female members over the last decade. The current figure of 41% is near the top of the range since 2001, and the absolute number of female tenured and tenure-track faculty is at an all-time high of 14 (four more than the all-time low over the last fifteen years) out of a total of 34. We are a small enough school that the hiring or departure of only a few women (or men) can move the fraction. (The same comment applies to race and ethnicity as discussed earlier.) Basically, changes in fraction of the faculty who are male (or female) look to be without trend and consistent with the sort of variation that comes with small population sizes. Appendices D and E provide more comprehensive data on the demographics of our faculty, from 2001-2015.

We lack historical data on most other diversity dimensions, but our 2015 DE&I faculty survey provides a current snapshot. Ninety-three percent of survey respondents identified as heterosexual. Ninety-eight percent said that they do not have a disability that substantially limited a major life activity. And while we have a fair amount of religious diversity, we are notably lacking any Muslim faculty, which could limit our research, teaching, and policy engagement on an important subset of geopolitics.

In recent years, we have made some efforts to diversify the faculty. Focusing first on governing faculty, all search committee chairs have been required to attend the ADVANCE STRIDE workshop since AY2008 (or before), and committee members have been strongly encouraged to attend as well. In AY2015, ALL search committee members were required to attend. However, this requirement was followed only inconsistently.

Knowing that a person-specific – or ‘target of opportunity’ – hiring strategy that considers an individual’s contribution to intellectual diversity has increased faculty diversity, including with respect to race, ethnicity, and sex, in other units on campus, we have also tried, on a limited basis, to make such hires to diversify our faculty. We have also partnered with the provost’s office on a ‘pipeline postdoc program.’ While successful in the sense that we recruited and mentored a strong candidate, who received a tenure-track offer from us, she ultimately accepted a tenure track offer elsewhere on campus.

Overall, we have launched searches for tenured or tenure-track faculty each year during AY2008 to AY2015. These have resulted in 102 job visits to campus – and we have

information about race and ethnicity for 100 of these. Overall, 77% were white while 23% were Asian, Black or Hispanic. Similarly, 23% of our offers were to members of underrepresented groups (seven Black, four Latino and two Asian). However, 94% of those we successfully recruited were white. While there is clearly more that we can do to identify strong, diverse candidates, a key challenge will be recruiting (and retaining) members of underrepresented groups who receive offers. We realize that this is a tough mountain to climb, especially because diverse candidates are more likely to be attracted to work environments that are already diverse (Thomas and Wise 1999; McKay and Avery 2005). Furthermore, there are multiple issues at play, including salary, institutional prestige, and the desire to be at a policy school rather than a disciplinary department. But we are committed to climbing it.

We also recognize that, as an institution with a PhD program and with opportunities for post-doctoral positions, the Ford School can help to increase the pipeline of strong candidates for tenure-track faculty positions. As discussed in the chapter on research and policy engagement, the National Poverty Center played a very active role in this effort for many years – a testament to the impact of the leadership of a few committed faculty. Revisiting the Ford School's engagement in building a diverse pipeline should be a priority – and overlaps as well with our strategic objectives for our joint PhD program.

Most searches for lecturer positions are considerably less structured. These are typically local searches, and the focus is coverage of teaching gaps, as well as enriching our curriculum with courses taught by professionals who have firsthand practical experience in the types of policy positions to which many of our students aspire. These searches are typically constrained by the lack of diversity in relevant local pools. (A recent exception was our recent national search for a lecturer to teach statistics, but we ultimately recruited a white candidate.). In seeking policy leaders for our Towsley Policymaker-in-Residence (TPMR) program, which brings distinguished practitioners to the Ford School for up to two years to teach and engage in the community, we pay considerable attention to recruiting individuals who can bring diverse perspectives to our community. This has resulted in some diversity in terms of ethnicity as well. Our TPMR in AY2015 was an alumna of color, one of our three TPMRs in AY2016 is a person of color, and we have three invitations outstanding to policy leaders of color, for future TPMR positions. We now extend many more invitations, and recognize that fewer than half of them may ultimately be accepted. We are most successful recruiting individuals within the Ford School network.

Diversifying our professors of practice, lecturers and Towsley Policymakers-in-Residence (who visit for up to two years) would also contribute to achieving our goals. While the priority is increasing the diversity of our governing (tenured and tenure-track) faculty, we recognize the important role that faculty on other tracks play in our community – especially for our students, who are often not aware of which faculty are on which track.⁷ Because hiring processes and retention differ by faculty type, we will have to develop a variety of strategies in order to achieve overall success.

Strategic Objectives

Given the current status, diversifying our faculty is of the highest priority. We aim to:

- *Develop recruitment and hiring processes to attract and retain a demographically, intellectually, and politically diverse faculty.*
- *Create and provide routine workshops, at least annually, for all faculty to help them recruit diverse faculty and guard against unintentional biases.*

Proposed Actions

Below, we list a number of potential actions for achieving our strategic objectives, subject to funding availability and in a manner consistent with the law. We expect that those responsible for implementation will further prioritize actions during the first year, which will serve as a pilot year. In year two of the strategic plan those implementing the plan will re-evaluate the actions undertaken, revise them as appropriate, and determine a fuller timeline for implementing the full suite of proposed actions.

The following strategies and actions are most relevant to recruiting and retaining a diverse “ladder” (both tenure-track and tenured) faculty:

At the Ford School, as at the University generally, faculty are hired by faculty, implying that material changes in the diversity will derive from the way in which our faculty colleagues engage in searches and recruitment. Therefore, strategies to diversify our faculty must focus there. At the level of the school and the central administration searches can be structured in ways (consistent with law) that increase the likelihood that successful candidates will be diverse, and that those we recruit will accept our offers.

Particularly useful are policies and practices that permit person-specific recruitment when attractive opportunities appear. Additionally, however, there are a variety of steps that can be taken by the faculty as a whole, as well as by search committees. Given the documented support of the great majority of the faculty for increasing its diversity, we would expect that the requisite effort would be forthcoming.

1. We will make deliberate efforts to develop and institute faculty search principles and protocols that guard against unintentional biases and that proactively and consistently assess candidates’ abilities to contribute to our diversity, equity, and inclusion agenda.
 - a. As also discussed in the “What and How We Teach” section, we recommend that two faculty meetings per year, including time at the faculty retreat, be spent on DE&I. In addition to workshops and discussions related to equitable and inclusive teaching, a portion of this time should be focused on recruiting and retaining a diverse faculty. This would include, for example, discussions about implicit bias in hiring and strategies to overcome it and will likely involve bringing in outside advisors from time to time. The dean will coordinate these efforts.

2. When we articulate our faculty hiring strategies each year, we will also assess each option according to its potential for diversifying our faculty. This likely means that we will have to continue to recruit beyond our traditional disciplines, in fields that tend to be more diverse (but are also engaged in policy research). But it also means that we might hire more in disciplinary and topic areas in which we already have strength. The dean will coordinate this effort.
3. We will review, monitor, and refine recruitment principles, policies, and practices, aiming to maximize the diversity of applicant pools, with particular attention to increasing the representation of underrepresented minorities within those pools.
4. In order to establish hiring protocols that will guard against implicit bias and maximize recruitment of a diverse faculty, we will establish a faculty committee in Year 1 of DE&I Plan Implementation. This committee will discuss and develop, in consultation with the full faculty, a set of recruiting strategies and procedures ready for use in recruiting during the next academic year (Year 2 of the DE&I Plan). The protocols should be developed with an eye towards transparency, continuous monitoring, evaluation and improvement. Both the School of Education's faculty hiring protocol and the Office of the Provost's Handbook for Faculty Searches and Hiring provide a good place to start for these efforts.
5. As they develop these protocols, this faculty committee should also conduct post-mortems on previous failures to diversify our faculty. These post-mortems would likely require systematic discussion with both current faculty and previous job candidates on where we went wrong, and how we might do better. This will also likely involve discussion about whether we need to make the Ford School faculty culture more welcoming to a diverse array of candidates (and how we might do so).
6. The personnel charged with implementing the DE&I Strategic Plan will be responsible for monitoring that search protocols are followed.
7. All members of search committees will be required to participate in the ADVANCE Program's STRIDE workshop during the year in which they serve on the committee, or in the year immediately preceding. This is already required, but the personnel implementing the DE&I plan will now verify with ADVANCE that search committee members have attended the workshop. Members will not be able to continue participating in the search committee if they do not attend the workshop. The dean's office will monitor this.
8. In general, opportunistic hiring tends to occur within our social networks and therefore can be harmful for diversifying our faculty (Belle, Smith-Doerr, and O'Brien 2014; Peters and Ceci 1982; Clauzet, Arbesman, and Larremore 2015). However, we recommend that the Ford School leverage, in compliance with university policy and federal guidelines, "person-specific" hires as a vehicle for proactively recruiting faculty members whose background, scholarly expertise, professional practice, and personal commitments are likely to advance the diversity

mission and goals of the Ford School and provide a diversity of perspectives and curricular offerings. Before we can do this effectively, however, we need to understand why previous efforts have failed, as detailed above. In order to support such person-specific efforts, the Ford School will:

- a. Identify and prioritize areas of potential hiring that will maximize faculty diversity.
 - b. Develop structured forums and mechanisms (e.g., speaker series, visiting faculty positions) aimed at assessing the promise and cultivating the interest of prospective person-specific hires.
9. We will also make specific efforts to diversify our faculty with individuals whose professional background and experience are rooted in other parts of the world, either through tenured or tenure-track appointments, or through our visiting faculty programs. The dean's office will coordinate this.
10. We will establish a stand-alone, ongoing postdoctoral fellowship program to encourage the creation of a diverse faculty community at FSPP. The program could be modeled on the CRECH program in the School of Public Health and the NCID-sponsored program. This program would recruit, on an annual basis, postdoctoral fellows who want to spend two (or three) years at the Ford School. Over the course of two years, postdoctoral fellows would pursue their own research, receive mentorship from FSPP faculty, and do limited teaching. Postdoctoral fellows would be chosen on the basis of the quality of their research program at the intersection of DE&I and public policy, as well as their capacity to diversify the experiences and perspectives of the Ford School through their areas of study, professional background, life experiences, and commitment to diversity. This program would be housed entirely in the Ford School, and coordinated through the dean's office, and all Ford School faculty would be strongly encouraged to participate as mentors.

This approach has two advantages over the "pipeline postdoc" approach we've tried previously. First, by recruiting candidates systematically on an annual basis, we would attract a wider pool of candidates. Second, we would also clearly establish the Ford School as committed both to DE&I and to a diverse faculty.

This consistent commitment and transparent approach could not only help us identify promising fellows who will be productive and engaged members of our faculty, but it also signal our DE&I commitment to other faculty candidates. As noted above, candidates from diverse backgrounds and experiences are attracted to workplaces that have already signaled clear commitments to DE&I.

11. Recruiting and retaining a diverse faculty will require active engagement from all of our faculty during the recruitment process as well as when new faculty are on the tenure-track. This means that faculty will have to attend job talks and meet with candidates, and in doing so be informed about both the Ford School and U-M's DE&I-related initiatives. In terms of mentoring, senior faculty should actively

engage with junior faculty (from informal meetings to more formal discussions of their work), in order to help them feel at home within the Ford School community as well as intellectually supported.

12. We will revisit our mentoring policies and procedures for junior faculty, so as to ensure that we have created an environment that is strongly conducive to their success. Historically, the Ford School has followed a relatively informal approach to mentoring and a more structured approach may be more effective for a more diverse faculty.

The following strategies and actions are most relevant to recruiting and retaining a diverse cadre of lecturers, courtesy appointments, and visiting faculty:

1. Continue to use our visiting faculty and Towsley Policymaker-in-Residence programs as a means of diversifying our faculty in terms of their areas of study, professional background, life experiences, and commitment to diversity.
2. Continue to leverage our various speaker series, including our Tuesday faculty lunches, to bring individuals with a diverse range of perspectives and experiences to the Ford School. As we discuss in our “Diversifying our PhD Students” section, we should also include our PhD students in these events. This will help us identify strong, diverse candidates for visiting positions and develop relationships that will make us more successful in recruitment. It will also help us demonstrate our DE&I commitment to faculty candidates as well as to our graduate students.
3. We must leverage more fully the diversity of faculty across campus who have policy interests. This includes reconsidering our portfolio of dry appointments, and as we do so we should consider reaching out beyond our traditional disciplines to fields that are more diverse, including public health, psychology, urban planning, and area studies.
4. As the Center for Public Policy in Diverse Societies develops (and finds a director), it should establish a list of affiliate faculty across campus. Faculty will receive some benefit from becoming an affiliate (such as eligibility for seed grants, for example), but in return, they should play an active role in the Ford School community. Again, this list of affiliate faculty should be broad in disciplinary/field orientation.

Metrics

1. Tracking the diversity of:
 - a. our faculty applicant pool;
 - b. candidates who are short-listed for a faculty position;
 - c. candidates who receive Ford School faculty offers; and
 - d. candidates who accept Ford School faculty offers.
2. Tracking how widely Ford School faculty positions are advertised.

3. Tracking the demographics of new Ford School-specific postdoctoral fellowship program.
4. Tracking faculty demographics across multiple dimensions of diversity, including religion and sexual orientation.

DIVERSIFYING THE STAFF

The Ford School's staff helps make it one of the top policy schools in the nation. It plays critical roles in shaping the student experience as well as supporting faculty, and is the face of the school with students, faculty, university colleagues, donors, guests, and the general public. Its work includes student recruitment and retention, career development and placement, organizing events and global engagement activities, supporting faculty research, and providing an efficient administrative infrastructure to support all this work. In sum, DE&I is particularly important for the staff both because of the importance of a collegial work environment for improved service delivery (Claver et al. 1999) and because the staff is the backbone of the Ford School.

Current State

The Ford School employs approximately 45 staff members, and in recent years has worked hard to diversify this group. In 2008, 3% identified as a person of color, in 2010 the number had grown to 8%, and in November 2015 20% of our staff had identified as a person of color. We are proud of this progress, although we realize that there is still room for continued progress. In 2014, the state of Michigan was 20% URM, and Washtenaw County is about 25% URM. In addition, we would like to diversify our staff further in terms of other demographics, including sexual orientation, national background, gender, veteran status, and persons with disabilities. In particular, we seek to diversify the gender of our staff, as only 25% of our staff currently identifies as male.

Appendix F provides more comprehensive data on the demographics of our staff, from 2001-2015.

In order to accomplish this increased staff diversity, the Ford School made its hiring processes more inclusive. Starting in 2008, it began to use teams of staff (rather than just one or two administrators) to conduct interviews. It also adopted a tiered hiring process, including a first-stage phone interview that helped to minimize hiring bias. It now also advertises much more widely, taking advantage of university list serves—including those specifically targeted to diverse populations—as well as expanded social networks. This has helped the Ford School not only diversify in terms of race and ethnicity, it has also produced more employees with non-traditional backgrounds.

We are also trying to foster an equitable and inclusive climate among the staff through targeted programming. Since 2007, the Ford School's professional development committee has hosted workshops on a roughly monthly basis. These include soft and hard skills training, and over the past year or so, there has been a sharp increase in workshops related to DE&I, including the most recent, "Everything You Ever Wanted to Know About Inclusive Language (But Were Afraid to Ask)." In order to promote staff inclusion and enhance faculty-staff relationships, we have also instituted seminars in which faculty talk to staff (and engage in Q&A) related to their research. In order to improve the staff climate, we dedicate funds, provide tuition reimbursement, and use the annual Performance Evaluation Management System (PEMS) process to help employees achieve their professional development goals.

Finally, in 2014, Ford School administrators began to track staff satisfaction with climate through an annual survey. This helps senior leadership assess how staff feel about the Ford School, and make changes accordingly.

Overall, staff responses to the fall 2015 survey suggest that these efforts have been welcomed and successful. Eighty-five percent of staff who responded to the survey feel accepted and have a sense of belonging at the Ford School, and 71% support awareness/sensitivity workshops and programs across multiple DE&I-related topics.

Open-ended survey responses welcomed the school's DE&I-related efforts, and cited the need for more diversity across multiple dimensions. Some staff suggested that the interview and hiring process should be transformed further to include explicit questions about the candidates' understanding of and commitment to DE&I. Staff also expressed concern about the lack of political diversity within the school as a whole, noting that right-leaning and conservative individuals feel that they cannot speak their minds safely.

There were mixed opinions on how DE&I should be incorporated into the staff evaluation and annual review process. Slightly less than half of staff surveyed agreed or strongly agreed that evaluating them on their demonstrated commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion would improve FSPP's climate, while slightly more than half agreed or strongly agreed that evaluating supervisors on this commitment would improve FSPP's climate. Finally, a number of staff expressed concern about their treatment by both students and faculty. They expressed particular concern that some faculty and students don't respect them, including not knowing their names (even when they have been at the school for years).

Strategic Objectives

We aim to build upon the efforts outlined above. As we do so, we have the following specific goals:

- *To hire, develop, and retain a diverse staff that values working in a diverse environment. In this effort, we aim to continue to increase the diversity of our staff across multiple dimensions in order to ensure diversity of thought and experience in our workforce.*
- *To foster and enhance an equitable and inclusive staff climate, where all staff feel valued and respected by their peers, faculty and students.*
- *To continue to improve on the Ford School's history of strong staff/faculty interactions and address the challenges that school growth has had on these relationships.*

Proposed Actions

Below, we list a number of potential actions for achieving our strategic objectives, subject to funding availability and in a manner consistent with the law. We have provided some guidance in terms of priorities, but we expect that those responsible for implementation will further prioritize actions during the first year, which will serve as a pilot year.

At the end of this year, those implementing the plan will re-evaluate the actions undertaken, revise them as appropriate, and determine a fuller timeline for implementing the full suite of proposed actions.

1. Continue and enhance attention to DE&I in the hiring process, through a multi-tiered selection approach, wide advertising, and team-based interviewing.
2. Explicitly consider DE&I through the hiring process by asking candidates, at the first stage, about both their understandings of and attention to DE&I. Those candidates who have demonstrated commitment to DE&I should be given serious consideration.
3. Include an area on the annual evaluation form to document the diversity, equity and inclusion activities engaged in by staff. This could include work-related activities, discussions, professional development opportunities or any other activity that a staff member engaged in to promote and/or better understand diversity, equity and inclusion. Staff who have contributed to enhancing DE&I awareness within the Ford School could be rewarded through salary adjustments.
4. Require supervisors and administrators, at least once a year, to participate in workshops on recruitment and retention of a diverse staff (including on implicit bias in the workplace) and also how to implement best practices for training staff and supervisors with respect to DE&I.
5. Continue to conduct an annual staff climate survey and share the results with all staff in an attempt to continue to identify areas for growth and improvement within our community, but add DE&I-specific questions.
 - a. Include DE&I-related questions on the staff climate survey, perhaps repeating some of the questions from the fall 2015 DE&I survey in order to provide benchmarking.
 - b. Include opportunities for staff to offer comments in the annual climate surveys about their supervisor's commitment specifically to DE&I.
6. Include questions related to DE&I, focused both on the school's climate as well as supervisor demonstrated commitment to the principles of DE&I in exit interviews with all departing staff.
7. Require that at least two professional development workshops per year focus on DE&I. These could take the form of discussion-based sessions relying on the Ford School's internal experts, or lectures and workshops facilitated by outside groups including the Office of Student Conflict Resolution and the Program on Inter- Group Relations. Topics are likely to include implicit bias in the workplace, recognizing and minimizing micro aggressions, and modeling inclusive language.
8. Require that the staff onboarding process include explicit attention to DE&I. This would include an overview of university and Ford School specific policies,

procedures and expectations that provide a clear understanding of its importance to the Ford School and our work environment. It could also include attention to issues of implicit bias in the workplace, the use of inclusive language, and recognizing and addressing micro aggressions.

9. Enhance staff-faculty relationships by increasing the number of opportunities for them to learn from one another. This includes:
 - a. Continuing to sponsor the faculty information sessions.
 - b. Asking staff to speak at faculty meetings. Each department should speak at a faculty meeting once per year, giving them an opportunity to introduce themselves to explain what their department does.
10. Enhance staff-student relationships. Those departments that deal directly with students, as well as staff in leadership roles across the school, should introduce themselves and their work at student orientation (with each staff member introducing themselves).
11. Actively work to identify and nominate Ford School staff for university level awards that recognize their contribution in this area.
12. Make MLK Day a university holiday for all members of the community, faculty, students, *and* staff (currently, only faculty and students have the day off), and all members of the community should be encouraged to take advantage of MLK programming.

Metrics

1. Document annually the demographics of the staff, across multiple dimensions of diversity.
2. Use the staff climate survey to document satisfaction with DE&I.
3. Use annual reporting (PEMS form) to document individual staff efforts towards DE&I.
4. Maintain records of the annual number of staff professional development sessions focused on DE&I, as well as number of faculty and staff information sessions.
 - a. Document attendance at these professional development sessions and other DE&I-related workshops and lectures.

DIVERSIFYING WHAT AND HOW WE TEACH

Given the Ford School's overall goal to train future leaders "to advance and improve our world," our commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion must be particularly clear in our classrooms. A large body of research shows that equitable and inclusive classrooms improve learning outcomes for all students. Studies also show that courses that expose students to diverse perspectives improve their critical thinking and moral reasoning skills (Millem 2003; Gurin, et al., 2002). Minority students, in particular, benefit from curricula that resonate with their experiences as minorities (White, 2004; Chesler, 1993). And, of particular interest to a policy school, attention to diverse perspectives and equity concerns in the classrooms helps to improve civic engagement by producing culturally competent citizens who can interact with different types of individuals and better serve their communities (Gurin, et. al., 2002; Luo and Jamieson-Drake, 2013; Rice 2010; Mathews 2005; Gooden and Myers 2004).

We recognize that both graduate student instructors (GSIs) and students have important roles to play in ensuring inclusive classrooms, but Ford School faculty must take on the primary responsibility for ensuring diversity, equity, and inclusion. In the strategic objectives and proposed actions that we outline here, we focus on faculty and GSI responsibilities. In the section on the Ford School climate, as well as in the sections regarding the diversity of our student body, we discuss how the Ford School can both convey its DE&I-related expectations of its students and train them to contribute to inclusive teaching in some detail.

At present, the Ford School's attention to diversity, equity, and inclusion in the classroom is uneven. According to the DE&I survey conducted in fall 2015, graduate students generally agreed that the Ford School paid inadequate attention to issues of disability, race and ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, and religion, while undergraduate students generally had more positive responses.⁸ Overall, the faculty responses to this battery of questions was much more positive, ranging from 53% agreeing or strongly agreeing that the Ford School adequately addressed disability and ableism in our courses to 73% agreeing or strongly agreeing that the Ford School adequately addressed sex/gender or sexism in our courses.⁹ Sixty-five percent of graduate students reported that their professors accomplished an inclusive classroom all or most of the time, while 85% of undergraduates reported the same. According to our qualitative data, many students felt that courses were insufficiently diverse both in terms of attention to issues of social equity and in terms of representation from diverse perspectives. A number of students also felt that contributions from female students, students of color, and non-US students were undervalued both by faculty and by fellow male students.

Over the last two years, the Ford School has already taken some steps to promote diversity, equity, and inclusion in the classroom. Two faculty retreats and multiple faculty meetings have been devoted to these topics, where we have shared our challenges and learned about best practices. In these activities, we have received external guidance from U-M's Center for Research on Learning and Teaching as well as the School of Education. In addition, to complement our existing course offerings, one member of our faculty now offers a well-received half-semester course (offered twice per year) entitled, "Dialogue Across Faultlines: Race, Identity, and SES" to both graduate and undergraduate students. We also offer multiple electives at both the graduate and undergraduate levels related to DE&I. Enrollments in these

courses, however, vary. Some, like Social Welfare Policy, are highly subscribed, while others, including Identity & Bias, have had low enrollments despite receiving strong student evaluations.

Our graduate programs do not require that students take a course with content related to diversity, equity and inclusion in order to complete their degrees. And while some of the core courses do include some related content on a very limited basis, this varies enormously by instructor. Our undergraduates are required to meet the LS&A race and ethnicity requirement by taking one course as a prerequisite for admissions. However, no Ford School courses currently 'count' for the R&E requirement, and students report uneven quality for those courses deemed to satisfy the R&E requirement. As for Ford School required courses, there are no explicit expectations that required core courses for either BAs or graduate students contain material related to DE&I. While some core courses may devote time to these topics, this attention depends on the interests of the faculty who are teaching. And, of course, our elective offerings at both the graduate and undergraduate level change from year to year. As a result, we cannot assume that our students receive any, let alone consistent, DE&I training before they graduate.

The above discussion makes clear that we have our work cut out for us. However, we are pleased that, moving forward, there is significant agreement that the Ford School's curriculum should reflect priorities of diversity, equity, and inclusion. There was broad agreement among all Ford School constituencies for incorporating writings and research from diverse populations into courses (98% of faculty strongly agreed or agreed, 87% of undergraduate students strongly agreed or agreed, and 97% of graduate students strongly agreed or agreed). In addition, 88% of undergraduates, 86% of graduate students, and 65% of faculty agreed or strongly agreed that all Ford School classes should include some attention to diversity, equity, and inclusion. And Ford School faculty were very supportive of awareness and sensitivity workshops that would better equip them to serve students in these areas.

Strategic Objectives

Given this context, the Ford School's goals vis-à-vis diversity, equity, and inclusion are the following:

- *To ensure that all FSPP classrooms are diverse, equitable, and inclusive;*
- *To ensure that all FSPP students are equipped to work and live in a diverse, multicultural world;*
- *To increase attention to issues of diversity and social equity in Ford School classrooms; and*
- *To provide all faculty with the tools to create and foster a diverse, equitable, and inclusive classroom.*

Proposed Actions

Below, we list a number of potential actions for achieving our strategic objectives, subject to funding availability and in a manner consistent with the law. We have provided some guidance in terms of priorities, but we expect that those responsible for implementation will further prioritize actions during the first year, which will serve as a pilot year. At the end of this year, those implementing the plan will re-evaluate the actions undertaken, revise them as appropriate, and determine a fuller timeline for implementing the full suite of proposed actions.

1. Faculty training opportunities
 - a. Increase and make systematic mechanisms for increasing instructors' awareness and enactment of specific teaching strategies and routines that facilitate diversity, equity, and inclusion in the classroom. This will be the responsibility of the dean. This includes both regular workshops for all faculty as well as opportunities for individual coaching for faculty. At least two faculty meetings per year, and a portion of the faculty retreat, should be devoted to these topics. Possible topics for these workshops include dealing with micro aggressions, using inclusive language, rules for an inclusive classroom, implicit bias in the classroom, and facilitating learning among diverse populations.
 - b. Require that all new Ford School faculty (regardless of rank or tenure track) receive training on inclusive teaching, similar to what is currently required for LS&A faculty through its Teaching Academy. The dean and associate dean for academic affairs will spearhead this effort. They can either negotiate with LS&A to allow Ford School faculty to participate in LS&A's Teaching Academy, or work with CRLT and other instructional units to develop a separate inclusive teaching academy. These workshops likely would take place over multiple days in the faculty member's first year. The vice provost for diversity, equity, and inclusion is already increasing university resources related to inclusive teaching, with the expectation that all new faculty undergo this kind of training, so this initiative could piggyback on those plans.
 - c. In addition to the question currently asked about the instructor's sensitivity to diversity in the classroom, end-of-term course evaluations should also include questions related to the inclusiveness of the instructor's approach to teaching and the degree to which course content (including readings and examples discussed in class) reflect diverse perspectives and experiences. The faculty and staff tasked with implementing the DE&I strategic plan, in consultation with the associate dean for academic affairs, will coordinate this.
 - d. Offer real and significant incentives, including financial grants and course releases, to encourage faculty to immerse themselves in DE&I as it relates to their teaching. The result of such immersion would lead to a teaching transformation, such as development of a new DE&I-related course, or a dramatic change in an instructor's teaching approach to be more equitable and inclusive. Instructors receiving these funds would be expected to share the nature and outcomes of their efforts with the broader Ford School community to grow our collective capacity.
 - e. Create a mechanism to publicly recognize faculty members who have

demonstrated a clear and significant commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion in the classroom. In Year 1 of the strategic plan, the faculty and staff tasked with implementing the plan will determine the basis for this recognition, as well as the reward, and also roll out the program. One option might be to create a “Diversity Honor Roll” similar to the current “Teaching Honor Roll,” which publicly recognizes excellence in and commitment to teaching in ways that maximize diversity, equity, and inclusion in formal instruction; and/or leading efforts aimed at realizing the school’s pedagogical and curricular commitment to diversity and equity. The roll would be developed by setting a threshold score for the DE&I questions on student evaluation raised above. Like the “Teaching Honor Roll,” the list of those on the “Diversity Honor Roll” will be circulated to all of the faculty after the close of each semester. Some have raised important concerns, however, about whether such a quantitative, student evaluation-based indicator would in fact be best and bring us closer toward our goals.

- f. As noted in the section on diversifying our faculty, we will include questions about diversity and equity in the teaching and learning process in all applications and interviews associated with hiring new instructors.
- g. Support instructors’ travel to and/or enrollment in professional development workshops aimed at developing their pedagogical expertise in cultivating inclusive classrooms.

2. Course offerings

- a. Require that all Ford School undergraduates and graduate students receive at least 1.5 credits worth of training related to diversity, equity, and inclusion before they graduate. The faculty and staff tasked with implementing the DE&I Strategic Plan, in consultation with the bachelor’s and master’s program committees, the dean, and the associate dean for academic affairs will determine how to incorporate this content into the undergraduate and graduate core curricula, but there are at least a couple of ways to accomplish this, including:
 - i. Changing the content of an existing core course so that half of the content is DE&I-related (for both undergraduates and graduate students).
 - ii. Changing the content of multiple core courses to include DE&I-related content, so that in total, all undergraduates and graduate students receive a 1.5 credits worth of instruction related to DE&I.
 - iii. Creating a new, required, 1.5 credit DE&I-related course (perhaps modeled on the “Faultlines” course) that are required of all graduate and undergraduate students. Those tasked with plan implementation will decide whether different courses should be offered for graduate and undergraduate students, and whether multiple courses should be offered at each level.
- b. Assess the portfolio of the Ford School’s courses as it relates to DE&I, through a review of syllabi and discussions with instructors. This will be done by the faculty and staff tasked with implementing the DE&I strategic plan.
 - i. As part of this review, the faculty and staff tasked with implementation will work with instructors to increase the representation of diverse perspectives and experiences in their course readings, materials, and examples.

- c. Increase elective course offerings related to diversity and social equity. As part of the assessment proposed in 2a above, we should also endeavor to understand why some of the previous elective courses have suffered from low enrollments, while others have been very well subscribed. The faculty and staff tasked with implementing the DE&I strategic plan, in consultation with the associate dean for academic affairs, will monitor progress in this area.
- 3. Student training opportunities outside the classroom
 - a. Establish mechanisms to increase students' capacities to contribute to the cultivation of inclusive classrooms. At minimum, the Ford School will:
 - i. Expand new student orientation to include multiple mandatory sessions over the course of a student's first semester, in order to emphasize the importance of DE&I to the Ford School, and to public policy training. As part of this, there should be multiple required sessions on facilitating constructive dialogue on difficult topics; micro aggressions; participating in brave spaces; understanding the importance of diversity, equity, and inclusiveness in public policymaking; and other related topics. Student and Academic Services staff (SAS), in consultation with the personnel implementing the DE&I strategic plan, would organize these orientation workshops.
 - ii. Require continuing students to participate in at least one other workshop per semester related to DE&I. The focus of the workshops would be similar to those organized for new students, and would also be organized by SAS.
- 4. Other Programs to Advance DE&I in the classroom
 - a. Encourage discussions across Ford School constituencies on DE&I in the classroom, with the intention of advancing the value of inclusive teaching while bringing the community together. As part of this, the Ford School community would work together to develop both norms and understanding about how to address DE&I and establish brave spaces inside and outside the classroom. Those implementing the plan will decide how best to bring the community together to establish and discuss these shared norms, whether through reading groups, informal discussions, workshops, or lectures.
 - b. Continue to create opportunities for faculty to share with one another their strategies for teaching students how to respect and empathize with diverse racial, ethnic, socioeconomic, gender, national, religious, and political perspectives in the classroom.
 - c. Develop resources, including a support network, and protocols for intervention, to help faculty who experience uncivil, disruptive, and hostile behavior in the classroom. The associate dean for academic affairs would work with SAS to develop these resources.

Metrics

1. DE&I-related questions on course evaluations—including those given early and in the middle of the term.
2. Responses in annual BA and master's student exit surveys.
3. Assess faculty's demonstrated commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion in the classroom through their annual reports (and placement on the Diversity Honor Roll).
4. Student satisfaction with the FSPP curriculum vis-à-vis DE&I should be assessed through surveys administered either annually or every other year. These surveys would be similar in scope (although much shorter) than the fall 2015 DE&I survey.
5. Assess attention to diversity, equity, and inclusion in FSPP courses through a systematic analysis of syllabi and through discussions with individual instructors on a biannual basis.

PROMOTING AN EQUITABLE AND INCLUSIVE CLIMATE

Diversifying who we are—our students, faculty, and staff—and diversifying what and how we teach are essential to cultivating an equitable and inclusive environment at the Ford School. But these measures are not enough, as the Ford School's community and values also take shape outside of our classrooms and through less formal interactions with one another. We must establish our commitment to DE&I outside the classroom, by demonstrating openness to multiple perspectives and backgrounds. Furthermore, our community must demonstrate a willingness to engage difference in complex, unfamiliar, and often uncomfortable ways and be transformed by the experience. Indeed, scholars teach us that DE&I initiatives will fail unless they are truly inclusive and transform organizational culture (Pless and Maak 2004; Barak 2013). This cultural transformation is crucial to establishing the climate we value, and it is imperative to the development of successful policy professionals.

We must, therefore, develop and incorporate norms across the Ford School that support the development of attitudes, interactions, and orientations that bridge and engage difference in respectful, mindful, and productive ways. The cultivation of these norms must be done with explicit attention to the existing status hierarchies (e.g., between staff and faculty, between faculty and students, between tenured and untenured faculty, between faculty of different disciplines, and between supervisors and those who report to them) that render some members of our community more vulnerable than others in the work required to bridge and engage difference. We aim to make the school, including but not limited to our classrooms, into a “brave space” (Arao and Clemens 2013) in which we can respect, empathize with, and support one another, and work together to make a better world.

Current Status

In terms of both the current Ford School climate and its environment vis-à-vis diversity, staff and faculty expressed a more positive view than students in our Fall 2015 DE&I survey. Eighty-five percent of both faculty and staff expressed feeling acceptance and belonging at the Ford School, while 78% of undergrads and 79% of graduate students indicated feeling a sense of belonging and acceptance. Meanwhile, 70% of faculty and 77% of staff expressed satisfaction with their experiences and the environment regarding diversity at the Ford School while only 35% of undergrads and 50% of grad students indicated being satisfied with the experience and environment regarding diversity at the Ford School.

This data is underscored by responses to more detailed questions throughout the survey. Both undergraduate and graduate students report that they have personally experienced either insensitive or disparaging remarks, or discrimination or harassment, on the basis of their identity. For example, 23% of female graduate students reported that they had experienced an insensitive or disparaging remark on the basis of their gender identity at the Ford School at least once a term, including off-handed comments about the differing abilities of men and women. Twenty percent of them reported that they had experienced discrimination or harassment at the Ford School on the basis of their gender identity at least once a term, including being ignored by their male professors or peers. Similarly, 22% of female undergraduate students reported that they had experienced an insensitive or disparaging

remark on the basis of their gender identity at the Ford School at least once a term, 15% of them reported that they had experienced discrimination or harassment on the basis of their gender identity at the Ford School at least once a term. Their reports of individual incidents are similar to those reported by female graduate students. Although we don't have detailed information, and need to probe further regarding these issues, these incidents appear to be generated by both faculty and their peers.¹⁰ We see similar data related to socio-economic background and race/ethnicity.¹¹

Survey responses also suggest insufficient tolerance for political diversity. 75% of students (both graduate and undergraduate) reported that at least once a term, they heard a fellow Ford School student make an insensitive or discriminatory remark about people with particular political affiliations and views. 42% of students (both graduate and undergraduate) reported that they heard similar comments from a Ford School faculty member at least once a term. Both quantitative and qualitative data from the faculty and staff surveys reveal similar concerns about our community's tolerance of political diversity. Overall, while the Ford School already engages in many activities to address the climate, which we outline below, but our survey responses reveal that we must do more.

At present, our new student orientation programs—which are currently mandatory for bachelors and master's students—are the primary way to establish the Ford School's values vis-à-vis DE&I. We currently provide a multi-hour workshop that addresses these issues. This year, we used the Change It Up bystander intervention workshop, created and conducted by the university's student life division, in collaboration with the Educational Theater Company. As one participant noted, shortly after the workshops, "I think it was helpful to get the topic of diversity and inclusion on people's minds at the beginning of the term." However, we believe we need to expand our orientation activities.

In addition to the orientation workshop, we host special events for new international graduate students prior to orientation, including a "welcome" for them to the Ford community and a module on American government that helps them in advance of their courses. While the module is specifically designed for international students, all new students are eligible to participate.

As noted in the "What and How We Teach" and "Diversifying Our Staff" sections, we have also begun to provide cultural competence workshops for faculty and staff. Over the past two years, the faculty have devoted time at their annual retreat and their faculty meetings (one to two per year) to addressing DE&I in the classroom. Similarly, the 2015 annual staff retreat included a two-hour workshop entitled "Being Cultural Beings," an experiential simulation that helps build multicultural understanding.

There has also been a sharp increase in voluntary, community-wide dialogues related to DE&I. Many are organized by students, others are spearheaded by faculty and/or staff, and still others are collaborations among multiple members of the Ford School community. Past conversations were scheduled in response to the situation in Ferguson and to the Muslim students who were killed in North Carolina. Fordies4Inclusion, a student group, held "office hours" in fall 2015 to help their peers deal with multiple traumas students were dealing with at the time, including those related to Paris, incidents at the University of Missouri, and

refugees fleeing Syria. In addition, in winter 2015 a group of students created a powerful video called “Walking the Line of Blackness” that they screened for the Ford School community, and combined it with a community dialogue. The school’s diversity center has sponsored or co-sponsored many of these activities. We have been pleased that these events have generated interest across our community, and generated both small and large group conversations across constituencies. However, we are aware that these events tend to attract the same people, so we must find ways to consistently engage all of our community in these efforts.

We also try to encourage DE&I in other, smaller, ways: we also host numerous cultural celebrations throughout the year, to learn about and celebrate the diversity of our community, including Lunar New Year and Diwali celebrations; we use name tents at the beginning of the year so that faculty and students learn the names of all members of the class; and we have extensive statements on diversity on our website and in our handbook. As noted in other sections, we have multiple mentoring programs, and these offer support and motivation to students, as do the student organizations. Finally, the dean appointed three faculty members to serve on the Faculty-Student Alliance in winter 2015 to provide an informal means by which students can discuss issues pertaining to identity and inclusion, to report an incidence of intolerance, or to otherwise express concerns about climate issues.

Strategic Objectives

- *Promote shared values, norms and practices that foster mutual respect, and that help faculty, staff and students engage in difficult yet productive conversations.*
- *Foster more widespread participation across members of the Ford School community to engage with and celebrate our diversity.*
- *Improve the cultural competencies of all members of the Ford School community.*

Proposed Actions

Below, we list a number of potential actions for achieving our strategic objectives, subject to funding availability and in a manner consistent with the law. We have provided some guidance in terms of priorities, but we expect that those responsible for implementation will further prioritize actions during the first year, which will serve as a pilot year. At the end of this year, those implementing the plan will re-evaluate the actions undertaken, revise them as appropriate, and determine a fuller timeline for implementing the full suite of proposed actions.

1. As we discuss in further detail in our “Diversifying Our Students” and “What and How We Teach” sections, we will expand our mandatory DE&I-related programming during student orientation events (and add mandatory DE&I programming for PhD students).
2. In Year 1 of the strategic plan, those tasked with implementation, along with the dean, will review our current and past survey efforts and develop a plan for systematically

surveying all Ford School constituencies moving forward. So as not to over-survey our community, we should try to piggy-back on existing efforts, including the annual staff climate survey and student exit surveys, and university-wide climate surveys (particularly those that have high response rates). We should also try to develop benchmarks from past survey efforts, including the Fordies4Inclusion winter 2015 survey and the FSPP DE&I fall 2015 survey. These systematic surveys should then be conducted annually or every other year, and allow us to gauge not just the Ford School climate overall, but specifically its progress vis-à-vis DE&I (and specifically the strategic objectives outlined in this plan). Surveys may be supplemented with other means by which we can track community members' perceptions of the Ford School climate.

3. At the beginning of each school year, we will communicate and discuss community standards regarding respectful and professional means of engaging in discussions of diversity and difference across Ford School constituencies. In Year 1 of the strategic plan, the dean and those tasked with plan Implementation will work with the Ford School community to determine which communication methods might work best. Options include an all-school meeting at the beginning of the school year, a statement from the dean, and smaller cross-constituency meetings peppered throughout the years, among other things.
4. Those charged with DE&I plan implementation should at least maintain the healthy level of DE&I-related programming that we have established over the last couple of years, to ensure that all members of our community are offered systematic training regarding mutual respect, constructive dialogue across difference, brave spaces for difficult conversations, and collaborative work and agendas surrounding diversity and equity. In developing this programming, those charged with implementing the plan should also consider how to get new members of our community engaged, so that participation is not restricted to the "usual suspects." This might require different kinds of community-derived programming. Additional activities might include:
 - a. Enhanced cultural competence workshops in student orientation, new faculty orientation, and as part of staff on-boarding activities.
 - b. Systematic workshops throughout the year for students on cultural competency in the workplace, and how to navigate sensitive conversations with colleagues and supervisors
 - c. Systematic workshops for individual cohorts (faculty, staff and students) that include, but are not limited to, topics of:
 - i. political sensitivity and tolerance for other political views;
 - ii. socioeconomic status, race/ethnicity, gender and sexuality, sexual orientation, disability;
 - iii. implicit bias;
 - iv. privilege
 - d. In doing this work, they may find it helpful to work with other U-M organizations, including Intergroup Relations and CRLT. We should also support continued community dialogues and/or Policy Talks focused on DE&I, coordinated among the multiple constituencies of the Ford School and among multiple administrative offices.

5. As we discuss elsewhere in the plan, we should continue to have a small-grants fund for students interested in initiating DE&I-related programming, and publicize the availability of these funds widely. We should consider making such funds available to faculty and staff who seek to organize similar events that bring together the Ford School's constituencies, and also consider prioritizing events that bring new voices into the conversation.
6. Develop clearer and more formal mechanisms to help individuals document, understand and/or seek counsel for inequitable, exclusionary, or biased interactions or practices that were reported to them or that they personally witnessed or experienced. This should include assessing and refining as needed our current structures and practices, such as the Faculty-Student Alliance, mentors, and peer advisors. Those tasked with implementing the DE&I strategic plan will spearhead this effort.
7. Develop the means by which individuals can document those day-to-day and institutionalized experiences that provide evidence of our progress towards establishing a more equitable and inclusive environment.

Metrics

1. Maintain data on the number of, and attendance at, DE&I-related meetings, workshops, policy talks and conversations; report on this via all-school meetings and in annual report to the faculty
 - a. Consider tracking the success of these new events in bringing new voices into the conversation.
2. If a campus-wide climate survey is created and administered, the Ford School will participate in it. Otherwise, we will leverage existing student, faculty, and staff surveys to include more questions regarding DE&I. In doing so, we should build on the data developed through the fall 2015 DE&I survey. Disseminate results and comparisons to previous years.

DIVERSIFYING OUR RESEARCH AND POLICY ENGAGEMENT

The Ford School's research and public engagement initiatives are an important part of our DE&I commitment. As public policy researchers, faculty at the Ford School occupy a unique place within the social sciences. They identify important social and policy problems using rigorous methods and develop and analyze solutions for matters of broad public concern. In doing this work, they can bring to light important social, health, and environmental justice concerns, peel apart the implications of public policies for different populations (including different countries), and identify inequities that demand novel policy solutions. Indeed, many of the Ford School's faculty work on these problems, and they translate their findings to both the general public and policymakers in a variety of ways. They also often work on these problems in a multi-disciplinary fashion, and train demographically diverse students as they conduct this research. As Yellen has suggested (2014), diversity contributes to better problem solving, and public policy scholars who come from diverse backgrounds and perspectives increase the array of knowledge that informs policy options. Moreover, to the extent that public policy research reaches practitioners as well as academics in several fields, public policy research has the possibility of disseminating this diverse, policy-relevant, knowledge. Indeed, the Ford School as a whole sponsors a variety of symposia, public conversations, and consulting projects designed to engage and serve the public.

As we discuss below, the Ford School's research and public engagement already reflect a commitment to DE&I, but we believe that active attention to diversity, equity, and inclusion can enhance further the Ford School's overall portfolio of research and policy engagement. In articulating our strategic objectives and proposed actions in this important work, we recognize fully that individual faculty members will play different roles with some much more actively engaged than others. There is no expectation that every faculty member will devote significant amounts of time to these topics in their scholarship, however all are expected to be open to and respectful of diverse perspectives.

Current Status

The fall 2015 survey suggests a strong faculty commitment to research questions related to DE&I, particularly with regard to issues of socioeconomic position, ethnicity, nationality, and gender. Among faculty respondents, 55% reported that DE&I concerns are either central to their research or often related to it. About 20 faculty identified specific research projects related to DE&I concerns. This includes studies of the effects of poverty and inequality on educational performance, the effects of immigration policy on outcomes for immigrants with different skillsets and from different world regions, and the ways in which people with limited resources engage in processes of innovation.

Several sponsored research projects explore the differential impact of education policies. The Ford School currently engages six graduate research assistants on DE&I-related projects. And the school recently received a \$1.2 million grant to fund health equity research, which will engage a multi-disciplinary group of faculty and research assistants to reduce racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic disparities in health.

The Ford School's research centers have also long engaged with DE&I on a systematic basis. This includes the National Poverty Center (NPC), which has been nationally recognized on DE&I-related issues. Begun in 1989 with university funding and supported by numerous public and foundation grants, the Center acted as a magnet, bringing together poverty scholars from public policy, economics, sociology, social work, political science, and psychology, in order to train a new cohort of researchers who would be both methodologically and substantively sophisticated. The aim was to integrate theoretical models from the different disciplines to generate new lines of inquiry and, ultimately, disseminate research findings and inform policy targeted to improve conditions for the most vulnerable in American society.

At the same time, the Center's leadership sought to increase the number of minority scholars engaged in research on poverty and the disadvantaged (using lawful means to do so), as they have been historically under-represented among the national poverty research community. By bringing to campus nationally recognized scholars and by remaining in close contact with former fellows once they left the program, faculty sought to build and expand a network of scholars who would continue to engage, collaborate, and push research on poverty forward. About 50 pre-doctoral students and 50 postdoctoral fellows were supported by the Center over the past 25 years and they, in turn, have become a strong and diverse cohort of policy research professionals concerned about issues that at their core revolve around equity and inclusion. Finally, the NPC regularly hosted research seminars and public events that stimulated intellectual discussions and helped inform the broader community about issues of equity and inclusion. Through such research and outreach it served as a platform for public engagement on related policy issues.

Retirement or departure of key faculty, as well as the loss of several external funding sources, have significantly reduced the National Poverty Center's activities. But this example demonstrates what a small group of dedicated faculty can accomplish, the Ford School's historical leadership on DE&I research and public engagement, and how we can leverage our research centers to help accomplish DE&I objectives.

With regard to public engagement, the Ford School is doing a good job bringing diverse policy leaders to campus through its Policy Talks @ the Ford School series. These speakers typically spend some time engaging with students and faculty. The school's practical engagement curriculum has also paid some attention to diversity issues – in particular, recent IPEs (Integrated Policy Exercise) have brought diverse local policy leaders to Weill Hall to interact with students as part of this required policy simulation. In addition, many of the clients for the Applied Policy Seminar projects --including Asian-Pacific Islanders Association Vote, Washtenaw County Office of Community Corrections, and the Detroit mayor's office-- enhance student training related to DE&I. More could be done to explicitly engage DE&I through the other components of our practical engagement offerings, including our international study-travel courses. Furthermore, the Ford School's other research centers, including the EPI, CLOSUP, and IPC could bring in more speakers and foster public and policy engagement on DE&I-related issues. Such speakers are likely to bring additional attention to issues of social and environmental justice, which, according to our 2015 survey, are of particular interest to our students.

Overall, we believe that the Ford School can and should reclaim its leadership in research and public engagement related to DE&I. To accomplish this, we suggest legally permissible small grants that will encourage Ford School faculty—across perspectives and intellectual backgrounds— to engage in DE&I-related research to the extent that they want to do so, or to engage in social, environmental, and health justice efforts at the community level. Indeed, at present, nearly half of the faculty reported that their public engagement activities frequently intersected with DE&I concerns. This work spans a wide range of issues, from political ideology and beliefs about environmental issues to alternative community corrections programs and international initiatives on transitional justice. We also provide funding to encourage faculty to bring in guest speakers with diverse perspectives (or speakers focused on DE&I-related issues) for their classes.

The school’s new associate dean for research and policy engagement can play a pivotal catalytic role in amplifying, leveraging, and coordinating this work to maximize its potential. The Center for Public Policy in Diverse Societies, which has historically funded small grants related to diversity and co-hosts DE&I-related events, can play a coordinating role. And, the Ford School’s communications and outreach office can enhance the Ford School’s website and social media to clearly signal our commitment to DE&I in our research and policy engagement. Ross business school provides an excellent example in this regard.

Strategic Objectives

In light of the centrality of research and public engagement to our mission, the Ford School will work to ensure that:

- *DE&I values and themes are prominently reflected in the school’s research portfolio.*
- *DE&I values and themes are prominently reflected in public and policy engagement efforts by faculty.*
- *The Ford School’s commitment to DE&I values is projected to constituencies beyond the immediate Ford School community in an effort to promote support for DE&I values in public policy discourse across the US and in the world.*
- *Faculty research and policy engagement related to DE&I is more fully connected to our educational programs, enabling students to participate and to benefit from this part of the school’s mission.*

Proposed Actions

Below, we list a number of potential actions for achieving our strategic objectives, subject to funding availability and in a manner consistent with the law. We have provided some guidance in terms of priorities, but we expect that those responsible for implementation will further prioritize actions during the first year, which will serve as a pilot year. At the end of this year, those implementing the plan will re-evaluate the actions undertaken, revise them as appropriate, and determine a fuller timeline for implementing the full suite of proposed actions.

1. Revitalize faculty leadership and funding specifically focused on DE&I research and public/policy engagement.
 - a. The associate dean for research and policy engagement, with help from the Center for Public Policy in Diverse Societies, will play a central role in leveraging and amplifying existing research and encouraging new research.
 - b. The associate dean will oversee a proportion of the overall internal budget for funding faculty research and public engagement, which will be dedicated to projects and activities related to DE&I.
 - i. Offer annual research assistantships for faculty projects related to DE&I, to be coordinated by the associate dean for research and policy engagement.
 - c. A DE&I guest speakers fund will be created, to encourage faculty to bring in speakers with diverse perspectives (or speakers with DE&I expertise) to speak to their classes. The fund would defray travel and accommodation costs for these speakers. This could be coordinated either by the associate dean for research and policy engagement or the associate dean for academic affairs.
2. As a means of both tracking and encouraging DE&I-related activities among faculty, it will be included as a rubric in annual faculty reports. As part of this, faculty will be asked to report on explicit and implicit DE&I aspects of their research and policy engagement work. This explicit accounting will reiterate the Ford School's DE&I priorities. The dean will coordinate this.
3. Showcase DE&I-related activities in communications intended for external audiences. Ford School communications staff will review possibilities for showcasing faculty research and engagement related to DE&I on the Ford School website and internal publications (*State and Hill*, etc.).
4. Require all policy centers to include DE&I-related topics in their array of events. During the five-year strategic planning period, all policy centers should set a target (in percentage or absolute number) for events explicitly related to DE&I. The faculty and staff tasked with implementing the DE&I strategic plan will monitor these efforts.
5. Continue to bring in diverse outside speakers who come through our Policy Talks and Citi Foundation lecture series. It is important that our high profile speaker series continues to showcase distinguished policy leaders who are diverse across many dimensions and/or are focused on social, environmental, or health justice concerns. The Communications and Outreach Office would coordinate this.
6. Begin a regular "Diversity and Public Policy" seminar and discussion series, in which academic experts from around the country and the world speak to our faculty—perhaps once or twice a semester during our regular Tuesday lunches—on DE&I-related issues. This would serve to not only educate our faculty and

graduate students, but also re-establish the Ford School as a central node for research on diversity and public policy. A revitalized NPC or diversity center could run this series, in consultation with the Dean.

Metrics

To assess progress on the actions/strategies above, we will use the following metrics:

1. Annual faculty report – dean and executive committee to track faculty reporting of DE&I-related research and public engagement.
2. Research centers will maintain data on DE&I-related programs (including number of DE&I-related events and research grants, among other DE&I activities).
3. Track DE&I-related guest speakers in classes.
4. Communications and Outreach Office to maintain data on DE&I-related material on website and in publications.

IMPLEMENTATION OF OUR FIVE-YEAR STRATEGIC PLAN

The Ford School has put forth an ambitious, yet attainable, DE&I plan. We have identified strategic objectives and proposed actions across multiple dimensions, including the diversity of the Ford School students, staff and faculty, what and how we teach, our research and public engagement, and our climate overall. Making progress on these objectives will require participation from across the Ford School community, although as we have articulated throughout this document, individuals and offices will play different roles. We will also need financial, logistical, and other support from the president, vice provost for diversity, equity, and inclusion, and other units across campus. Given the high priorities of many of our recommendations, it may also require reallocation of resources within the school.

We recommend a combination of faculty, staff, and student leadership to implement this plan, including initiating, maintaining, and coordinating actions and tracking progress. A faculty lead should be identified and given the resources (which may include course relief) to lead the effort. In Year 1, this effort will involve implementing the highest priority actions and then prioritizing the other actions for the remaining years of the plan. Indeed, we view Year 1 as the pilot year of the plan. S/he will coordinate with the Ford School's executive and other committees and offices responsible with implementing parts of the plan, as well as with the new DE&I staff expert whose duties are detailed below.

Likely to be most involved are the executive committee, the bachelors and master's program committees, the associate deans for academic affairs and research and policy engagement, the student and academic services office, the communications and outreach office, and the human resources director. The faculty lead will also further develop, and begin to deploy, metrics for evaluation, building upon the suggestions offered in the text of this plan. In the remaining years of the plan, the faculty point person's responsibilities may shift slightly, as s/he uses the evaluation tools to decide which actions to maintain, change, develop, and reprioritize.

To work alongside this faculty point person, we recommend that the Ford School employ a DE&I staff expert (program manager). This staff member would coordinate DE&I activities and plan implementation and serve as liaison with school offices and committees. Duties may include the following: assist the Ford School community in accessing and developing DE&I-related resources (including assessing and setting up workshops and courses), administer DE&I-related grant and fellowship programs, and tracking and evaluating Ford School DE&I activities. In Year 1 of the Plan, s/he will also have to work with the faculty point person and other offices across the school to develop strategies for engaging Ford School constituencies more fully, including those who were not involved in the development of this plan, such as our alumni and perhaps also the employers of our students. The DE&I program manager may also work with the Ford School's communications and outreach office to enhance both the school website and social media vis-à-vis DE&I.

Finally, we recommend that two students (one graduate and one undergraduate) be hired, on a rotating and part-time basis, to assist with leadership and coordination of the Ford

School's DE&I activities. While expectations and duties would need to be fleshed out, these students would serve as liaisons between the student body and the Ford School's DE&I efforts and provide their insights and expertise to the faculty and staff members implementing the plan. They will ensure that student interests are represented, and will also gain valuable expertise in DE&I-related matters. These will be paid positions with a formal application process, similar to the "peer advisor" positions the Ford School has at the undergraduate level. These students will report to the DE&I program manager. In addition to the leadership outlined above, we intend to engage Ford School faculty, staff and students in implementing our strategic plan and assessing our progress.

In what follows, we provide a summary of our strategic objectives, as well as two tables. The first lays out our new plans for Fiscal Year 2017, with specific attention to the proposed actions, metrics for evaluating them, the strategic objectives the actions will help us achieve, and the individuals accountable for implementation (including action leads). The second table lays out the actions we plan to continue in Fiscal Year 2017, with attention to the strategic objectives they achieve, metrics, and individuals accountable. We will provide information about resources needed by the provost's April 15 deadline. We hope that these provide easy-to-follow summaries of the Ford School's plans to achieve its diverse, equitable, and inclusive future.

SUMMARY OF STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES

Overview of the Five-Year Strategic Objectives

Introduction

1. Diversify who we are--in terms of students, faculty, and staff--and ensure that our classrooms and climate truly and demonstrably respect diversity, value equity, and foster inclusion.

Who We Are – Students

1. Maintain, and if possible increase, in measurable ways, the diversity of students in our graduate programs, with particular interest in recruiting students from underrepresented backgrounds.
2. Increase, in measurable ways, the diversity of students in our undergraduate program, with particular interest in recruiting students from underrepresented backgrounds.
3. Equip students with the ability to traverse issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion, as it relates to analyzing, making, and implementing policy.
4. Enhance the Ford School's support services to meet the needs of domestic and international students from diverse backgrounds and circumstances.

Who We Are – Faculty

5. Develop recruitment, hiring and development processes to attract and retain a faculty that is diverse across multiple dimensions.
6. Develop cultural sensitivities of all faculty to enhance their ability to guard against unintentional biases and help them recruit diverse faculty.

Who We Are – Staff

7. Recruit, develop, and retain a diverse staff that values working in a diverse environment. In this effort, we aim to continue to increase the diversity of our staff across multiple dimensions in order to ensure diversity of thought and experience in our workforce.
8. Foster and enhance an equitable and inclusive staff climate, where all staff feel valued and respected by their peers, faculty and students.
9. Continue to improve on the Ford School's history of strong staff/faculty interactions and address the challenges that school growth has had on these relationships.

What and How We Teach

10. Ensure that all FSPP classes are diverse, equitable, and inclusive;
11. Ensure that all FSPP students are equipped to work and live in a diverse, multicultural world;
12. Increase attention to issues of diversity and social equity in Ford School classrooms; and

13. Provide all faculty and GSIs with the tools to create and foster a diverse, equitable, and inclusive classroom.

Research and Policy Engagement

14. Enhance the extent to which DE&I values and themes are prominently reflected in the School's research portfolio;
15. Enhance the extent to which DE&I values and themes are prominently reflected in public and policy engagement efforts by faculty and staff;
16. Ensure that the Ford School's commitment to DE&I values is projected to constituencies beyond the immediate Ford community in effort to promote support for DE&I values in public policy discourse across the US and in the world.
17. More fully connect faculty research and policy engagement related to DE&I to our educational programs, enabling students to participate in and benefit from this part of the school's mission.

Climate

18. Promote shared values, norms and practices that foster mutual respect, and that help faculty, staff and students engage in difficult yet productive conversations.
19. Foster more widespread participation across members of the Ford School community to engage with and celebrate our diversity.
20. Improve the cultural competencies of all members of the Ford School community.

ACTION PLANNING TABLES WITH DETAILS AND ACCOUNTABILITIES

PLANNED ACTIONS FOR FY2017

ACRONYMS USED BELOW:

ADAA: Associate Dean for Academic Affairs

C&O: Communications & Outreach

ADRPE: Associate Dean for Research & Policy Engagement

GCS&AR: Graduate Career Services & Alumni Relations

DEI-FL: DE&I Faculty Lead

SAS: Student & Academic Services

DEI-SE: DE&I Staff Expert

EC: Executive Committee

A. Recruitment, Retention and Development

Key Constituency	Strategic Objective	Measures of Success	Details Actions Planned (measurable, specific)	Action Leads & Those accountable
Students -- BA, Master's, and PhD students	Increase in measurable ways the diversity of students in our degree programs, with particular interest in recruiting students from underrepresented backgrounds.		Review, monitor & refine processes & strategies used to recruit more diverse student applicant pools through multiple collaborations and partnerships, pipeline programs, communications and outreach strategies, and revised admissions processes.	
		Increased diversity in our BA applicant pools	Develop robust BA recruitment plan by early fall to be reviewed by BA Program Committee and presented in September to the Executive Cmte. Wrap-up report will be available for discussion at the faculty retreat in May, including what worked and what needs to be revisited.	SAS; BA Program Director & Committee; ADAA; DEI-SE
		Maintained or increased diversity in our Master's and PhD applicant pools	Develop robust Masters and PhD recruitment plans by early fall to be reviewed by relevant Program Committee and presented in September to the EC. Wrap-up report will be available for discussion at the faculty retreat in May, including what worked and what needs to be revisited.	SAS; ADAA, PhD Program Director, Graduate program Committees; DEI-SE
Faculty	Recruit and retain a faculty that is diverse across multiple dimensions	Increased diversity in our applicant pools, interview pool and hiring yield	Review, monitor & refine processes & strategies used to recruit more diverse applicant pools for faculty searches	DEI-FL; EC; Faculty search committees
			Develop and vet a protocol for faculty searches. This will be discussed by the EC and then by the governing faculty.	
			Provide bias workshops/training for governing faculty and continue requiring all search committee members to complete the ADVANCE program's STRIDE workshop.	
		Develop post-doc program in FY 17, for launch in FY 18 or 19.		
		Improved climate for junior faculty	Develop and implement robust mentoring plan for junior faculty; Initial plan to be implemented for Fall 2016.	ADRPE, EC, Senior Faculty
Staff	Recruit and retain a diverse staff	Increased diversity in our applicant pools, interview pools and yield	Continue and enhance attention to DE&I in the hiring process, and require those making hiring decisions to participate in bias & DEI training.	HR

B. Education and Scholarship

Key Constituency	Strategic Objective	Measures of Success	Details Actions Planned (measurable, specific)	Action Leads & Those accountable
Faculty	To provide faculty with the tools to create and foster a diverse, equitable, and inclusive classroom	Attendance at DE&I workshop(s), positive faculty feedback about workshop and skill building, course evaluations	Work with UM resources to develop DE&I Workshop(s), and more generally, expand opportunities for DE&I skill-building Require new faculty to participate in DE&I Workshop(s) Strongly encourage continuing faculty to participate in DE&I Workshop(s)	Dean; DEI-FL; ADAA
		Course evaluations and student feedback	Fund to support 'teaching transformation' and innovative strategies for addressing DE&I in the classroom	DEI-FL, ADAA
		Increase in faculty self-identifying their comfort with fostering DE&I classroom	Explore opportunities to create inclusive teaching faculty support groups.	
		Attendance of all new GSIs at DE&I training workshops; positive GSI feedback about training	Expand and enhance DE&I training for new Graduate Student Instructors	ADAA; HR; SAS
Students - BA, Masters, and PhD	To ensure that Ford School classes are diverse, equitable, and inclusive, and that we increase attention to issues of diversity and social equity in classrooms		Review curriculum and incorporate DE&I content into it more fully.	Faculty directors; Program Committees
		Course evaluations and student survey responses regarding their ability to traverse DE&I issues	CORE REQUIREMENTS: Ensure increased DE&I content in at least one BA required course and at least two master's required courses; ELECTIVES: Expand offerings of DE&I materials in electives and/or publicize more fully existing content & offerings.	
		Course evaluations	Add DE&I questions to course evaluations; include discussion of student responses in EC's annual faculty reviews.	
Students - BA, Masters, and PhD	Faculty research and policy engagement related to DE&I is more fully connected to our educational programs, enabling students to participate and to benefit from this part of the school's mission.	Quantity and variety of guest speakers funded	Develop DE&I guest speakers fund to encourage faculty to bring in diverse speakers to their classes, and to leverage our alumni network.	ADRPE; GCS&AR
Faculty	Enhance the extent to which DE&I values and themes are prominently reflected in the school's research portfolio and in the faculty's public and policy engagement efforts	Faculty annual reviews	Add questions to the annual faculty review about addressing issues of DE&I in faculty members' research and public engagement	Dean, EC

C. Promoting an Equitable and Inclusive Community

Key Constituency	Strategic Objective	Measures of Success	Details Actions Planned (measurable, specific)	Action Leads & Those accountable
Faculty, staff and students	Foster more widespread participation to engage with and celebrate diversity	Climate survey(s)	Determine appropriate way to track climate for each constituency, leveraging existing surveys as appropriate	DEI-FL, DEI-SE; HR and SAS
Students - BA, Masters, and PhD	Promote shared values, norms and practices that foster mutual respect, and that help students engage in difficult yet productive conversations	Number of programs and attendance at each; assessments	Increase mandatory DE&I-related programming, including at orientation programs; programming will also include pathways to address conflict	SAS; DEI-SE
Faculty, staff and students	Promote shared values, norms and practices that foster mutual respect, and that help students engage in difficult yet productive conversations	Content and means of communication	Determine how best to communicate and discuss community standards regarding respectful and professional means of engaging in issues of DE&I	DEI-FL, DEI-SE, and C&O
		Number of programs and attendance at each	Expand opportunities for informal engagement among constituents, including (a) increased 'take a faculty to lunch program; (b) expand informal research and policy engagement sessions; (c) at least one/semester community conversation	DEI-FL; DEI-SE
Staff	Foster more widespread participation to engage with and celebrate diversity	Number of programs and attendance at each	Include DE&I materials in at least two staff development workshops annually	HR, staff professional development committee
		Nominations and awards, if any	Encourage nominations for U-M DE&I related awards	HR, staff recognition committee
Students - BA, Masters, and PhD	Enhance the Ford School's support services to meet the needs of students from diverse backgrounds	Climate survey	Identify faculty and staff who can act as a resource for students who experience discrimination or insensitive remarks	DEI-FL, DEI-SE

D. Service

Key Constituency	Strategic Objective	Measures of Success	Details Actions Planned (measurable, specific)	Group/persons accountable
Ford School, U-M and Broader Community	Commitment to DE&I values is projected broadly in effort to promote support for DE&I values in public policy discourse across the US and in the world.	Creation of publicity regarding Ford School DE&I efforts	More fully publicize (on web site and in other materials) DE&I related activity at the Ford School -- including public events, scholarship and public engagement	C&O

CONTINUED ACTIONS

As we describe throughout the Plan, the Ford School currently engages in multiple efforts to promote diversity, equity, and inclusion. We plan to continue these efforts in fiscal year 2017, while also reviewing and developing new means of evaluating them as appropriate. After Year 1 of the Plan, we will review the success of these continuing actions along with the new ones we have proposed in this plan, and prioritize our efforts accordingly. Below please find a summary of these continuing actions and the strategic objectives they address.

<u>Strategic Objective</u>	<u>Continued Action</u>	<u>Current Metric</u>
<i>Increase, in measureable ways, the diversity of students in our undergraduate program, with particular interest in recruiting students from underrepresented backgrounds.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leverage connections with the Black Student Union and other student organizations focused on diverse populations, through an “ambassador” program • Strengthen connection with the Comprehensive Studies Program • Review and revise the curriculum 	Demographics of our undergraduate student body
<i>Maintain, and if possible increase, in measurable ways, the diversity of students in our graduate programs, with particular interest in recruiting students from underrepresented backgrounds</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offer PPIA – a 7 wk Summer Pipeline Program for 18 students, one of 4 such programs nationally • Create communication strategies and targeted recruiting with individuals, organizations, and offices both inside and outside the University of Michigan • Strategic partnerships to offer numerous financial aid 	Demographics of our Masters student body
<i>Equip students with the ability to traverse issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion, as it relates to analyzing, making, and implementing policy.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Including a DE&I related workshop during our mandatory orientation programs • Revised PubPol 810 course for incoming PhD students that integrates scholarship from multiple disciplines 	Course evaluations and exit surveys

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Created Course on '<i>Facilitating Dialogue Across Fault-Lines</i>' -- 1.5 credits, now offered twice/yr. 	
<i>Enhance the Ford School's support services to meet the needs of domestic and international students from diverse backgrounds and circumstances</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student guide program to help 1st year Masters students acclimate Module on American government in advance of first-year coursework 	Exit surveys
<i>Develop recruitment, hiring and development processes to attract and retain a faculty that is diverse across multiple dimensions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Using our visiting faculty and Towsley Policymaker-in-Residence programs as a means of diversifying the perspectives of our faculty Leverage our various speaker series, including our Tuesday faculty lunches, to bring diverse individuals to the Ford School Requiring search committee chairs to attend the ADVANCE STRIDE workshop 	Demographics of our faculty
<i>Recruit, develop, and retain a diverse staff that values working in a diverse environment. In this effort, we aim to continue to increase the diversity of our staff across multiple dimensions in order to ensure diversity of thought and experience in our workforce</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An inclusive hiring process that involves teams of staff conducting interviews, a tiered hiring process, and widespread advertisements of jobs. 	Demographics of our staff
<i>To foster and enhance an equitable and inclusive staff climate, where all staff feel valued and respected by their peers, faculty and students.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regular DE&I-related workshops for staff Staff climate survey 	Staff climate survey

<i>To continue to improve on the Ford School's history of strong staff/faculty interactions and address the challenges that school growth has had on these relationships</i>	Faculty information sessions, which give staff the opportunity to learn more about faculty research	Staff climate survey
<i>To provide all faculty and GSIs with the tools to create and foster a diverse, equitable, and inclusive classroom</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular DE&I-related workshops for faculty, focused on enhancing their teaching skills • Mandatory orientation for GSIs which includes DE&I-related training 	Student course evaluations
<i>Foster more widespread participation across members of the Ford School community to engage with and celebrate our diversity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community dialogues and/or Policy Talks focused on DE&I, coordinated among the multiple constituencies of the Ford School and among multiple administrative offices 	Number of and attendance at events
<i>Improve the cultural competencies of all members of the Ford School community</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community-wide celebrations of holidays such as Lunar New Year and Diwali 	Number of and attendance at events
<i>Promote shared values, norms and practices that foster mutual respect, and that help faculty, staff and students engage in difficult yet productive conversations</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legally permissible small-grants fund for students interested in initiating DE&I-related programming, and publicize the availability of these funds widely 	Number of and attendance at events; diversity of FSPP community members applying for funds; total funding awarded
<i>The Ford School's commitment to DE&I values is projected to constituencies beyond the immediate Ford School community in an effort to promote support for DE&I values in public policy discourse across the US and in the world</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bring in diverse outside speakers who come through our Policy Talks and Citi Foundation lecture series. • Including a Statement of Diversity in our student handbooks as well as on the Ford School website 	Number of and attendance at events

APPENDIX A: Demographics of Our BA Students

Table A1: BA Applicants

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Gender									
Female	53	60	74	66	59	75	58	67	101
Male	47	53	54	66	59	62	74	78	94
Domestic Ethnicity									
2 or More	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	4	6	0	3
Asian	11	9	8	10	12	6	9	13	15
Black	5	5	9	2	3	5	6	6	2
Hawaiian	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hispanic	8	4	4	3	3	4	5	6	7
Native American	1	0	2	0	1	0	0	2	1
White	65	82	88	106	96	110	87	108	147
Not Indicated	10	12	17	10	2	5	19	8	12
Citizenship									
Non Resident	0	1	0	1	0	3	0	2	8
U.S. Citizen	99	108	123	130	117	133	130	139	181
Perm. Resident	1	4	5	1	1	1	2	4	6
Total	100	113	128	132	118	137	132	145	195

Table A2: BA Admitted Students

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Gender									
Female	27	32	33	33	34	40	38	36	43
Male	35	30	30	33	32	29	34	36	36
Domestic Ethnicity									
2 or More	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	1	5	0	2
Asian	6	4	5	9	6	2	4	6	7
Black	5	4	3	2	1	3	4	4	1
Hawaiian	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hispanic	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	2	3
Native American	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2	0
White	45	44	42	50	53	57	44	55	56
Not Indicated	4	7	10	3	1	2	13	3	6
Citizenship									
Non Resident	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	4
U.S. Citizen	62	57	61	65	66	68	70	72	73
Perm. Resident	0	4	2	1	0	0	2	0	2
Total	62	62	63	66	66	69	72	72	79

Table A3: BA Matriculated Students

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Gender									
Female	25	30	31	30	31	36	33	32	41
Male	32	27	28	28	30	25	31	34	34
Domestic Ethnicity									
2 or More	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	1	4	0	2
Asian	5	3	5	8	6	2	3	6	7
Black	4	4	3	1	1	2	3	4	1
Hawaiian	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hispanic	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	2	3
Native American	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0
White	42	40	39	44	48	50	43	52	52
Not Indicated	4	7	9	3	1	2	9	1	6
Citizenship									
Non Resident	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	4
U.S. Citizen	57	52	57	57	61	60	62	66	69
Perm. Resident	0	4	2	1	0	0	2	0	2
Total	57	57	59	58	61	61	64	66	75

APPENDIX B: Demographics of Our Masters Students

Table B1: Masters Applicants

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Gender									
Female	289	333	335	422	416	345	323	419	375
Male	231	225	307	357	331	438	425	357	293
Domestic Ethnicity									
2 or More	NA	NA	NA	NA	22	15	19	14	19
Asian	53	42	59	60	48	40	38	39	39
Black	37	21	31	39	26	26	15	30	25
Hawaiian	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Hispanic	23	21	24	52	31	32	19	32	28
Native American	2	1	4	4	1	2	1	2	0
White	244	282	313	339	310	297	258	275	234
Not Indicated	47	46	48	26	28	28	29	27	20
Citizenship									
Non Resident	114	145	163	259	281	343	368	357	303
U.S. Citizen	391	404	469	509	457	431	376	404	359
Perm. Resident	15	9	10	11	9	9	4	15	6
Total	520	558	642	779	747	783	748	776	668

Table B2: Masters Admitted Students

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Gender									
Female	170	187	169	180	179	186	227	182	222
Male	145	141	166	186	159	181	199	204	200
Domestic Ethnicity									
2 or More	NA	NA	NA	NA	14	13	15	10	15
Asian	32	24	36	29	31	25	29	23	32
Black	25	11	16	17	9	10	12	18	17
Hawaiian	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Hispanic	17	11	10	20	19	16	15	21	20
Native American	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	0
White	145	181	165	184	136	180	172	171	180
Not Indicated	27	21	25	14	16	10	24	17	18
Citizenship									
Non Resident	68	79	81	101	112	111	157	125	140
U.S. Citizen	235	242	249	257	222	253	267	251	277
Perm. Resident	12	7	5	8	4	3	2	10	5
Total	315	328	335	366	338	367	426	386	422

Table B3: Masters Matriculated Students

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Gender									
Female	51	51	46	46	67	46	59	47	53
Male	43	56	56	55	43	55	49	54	46
Domestic Ethnicity									
2 or More	NA	NA	NA	NA	5	4	5	8	3
Asian	4	7	11	8	14	10	6	5	5
Black	10	6	8	5	3	3	7	11	9
Hawaiian	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hispanic	6	3	5	5	7	4	8	8	7
Native American	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0
White	51	66	48	57	51	53	42	42	54
Not Indicated	8	7	5	3	3	4	11	4	5
Citizenship									
Non Resident	15	17	24	22	26	23	28	22	16
U.S. Citizen	77	87	77	78	83	76	80	75	82
Perm. Resident	2	3	1	1	1	2	0	4	1
Total	94	107	102	101	110	101	108	101	99

APPENDIX C: Demographics of Our PhD Students

Table C1: PhD Applicants

	2012	2013	2014	2015
Gender				
Female	85	108	113	110
Male	88	101	108	98
Domestic Ethnicity				
2 or More	3	5	5	6
Asian	5	8	8	11
Black	11	9	12	8
Hawaiian	0	0	0	0
Hispanic	4	13	11	8
Native American	0	0	0	0
White	47	65	62	61
Not Indicated	11	6	4	7
Citizenship				
Non Resident	92	103	119	107
U.S. Citizen	80	102	99	94
Perm. Resident	1	4	3	7
Total	173	209	221	208

Table C2: PhD Admitted Students

	2012	2013	2014	2015
Gender				
Female	10	4	8	11
Male	7	8	5	5
Domestic Ethnicity				
2 or More	0	0	1	0
Asian	3	2	0	0
Black	1	0	2	0
Hawaiian	0	0	0	0
Hispanic	0	2	0	2
Native American	0	0	0	0
White	6	6	7	12
Not Indicated	2	0	1	1
Citizenship				
Non Resident	5	2	2	1
U.S. Citizen	11	10	10	15
Perm. Resident	1	0	1	0
Total	17	12	13	16

Table C3: PhD Matriculated Students

	2012	2013	2014	2015
Gender				
Female	5	2	5	4
Male	2	3	2	1
Domestic Ethnicity				
2 or More	0	0	1	0
Asian	1	2	0	0
Black	1	0	1	0
Hawaiian	0	0	0	0
Hispanic	0	1	0	1
Native American	0	0	0	0
White	2	1	4	3
Not Indicated	0	0	0	0
Citizenship				
Non Resident	3	1	1	1
U.S. Citizen	3	4	5	4
Perm. Resident	1	0	1	0
Total	7	5	7	5

APPENDIX D: Ethnicity of Our Faculty

	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Tenure and Tenure Track	30	33	35	37	36	35	30	28	29	29	29	30	35	28	34
Black	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Asian	1	2	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	3
Hispanic	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2
2 or More										1	1	1	1	1	1
White	27	28	29	31	29	29	23	22	23	23	23	24	29	22	27
Supplementary (Visiting & Adjunct)	2	3	6	7	4	6	6	3	8	4	5	5	6	4	3
Black					1		1								
Asian			1	1		1	3	2	1	1	2	1	3	3	1
Hispanic											1	1			
White	2	3	5	6	3	5	2	1	7	3	2	3	3	1	2
Lecturer	4	4	4	6											
White	4	4	4	6											
LEO Lecturer I & II					1		1		3	3	3	3	2	2	3
Asian							1								
White					1				3	3	3	3	2	2	3
LEO Lecturer III & IV					3	3	4	4	5	5	7	7	8	6	6
Black							1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1
2 or More										1	1	1	1		
White					3	3	3	3	3	3	5	5	6	5	5
LEO Intermittent Lecturer					2	2	3	6	2	3	2	3	2	5	4
Black								1						1	1
Hispanic								1							
White					2	2	3	4	2	3	2	3	2	4	3
Dry Appointments							8	8	10	12	14	12	13	15	18
Black									1						1
Asian											1	1	1	1	
2 or More										1	1	1	1	1	1
White							8	8	9	11	12	10	11	13	16
Clinical Instructional						1									
White						1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Grand Total	36	40	45	50	46	47	53	50	58	57	61	61	67	61	69

APPENDIX E: Gender of Our Faculty

	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Tenure and Tenure Track	30	33	35	37	36	35	30	28	29	29	29	30	35	28	34
Female	11	11	10	10	11	12	11	11	10	10	10	11	13	12	14
Male	19	22	25	27	25	23	19	17	19	19	19	19	22	16	20
Supplementary (Visiting & Adjunct)	2	3	6	7	4	6	6	3	8	4	5	5	6	4	3
Female	1	3	2	2	1	1	2	2	3	1	1	1	1	2	1
Male	1		4	5	3	5	4	1	5	3	4	4	5	2	2
Lecturer	4	4	4	6											
Female	2	2	1	2											
Male	2	2	3	4											
LEO Lecturer I & II					1		1		3	3	3	3	2	2	3
Female					1				1						1
Male							1		2	3	3	3	2	2	2
LEO Lecturer III & IV					3	3	4	4	5	5	7	7	8	6	6
Female					2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	2
Male					1	1	2	2	3	3	4	4	5	3	4
LEO Intermittent Lecturer					2	2	3	6	2	3	2	3	2	5	4
Female								1				1	1	3	2
Male					2	2	3	5	2	3	2	2	1	2	2
Dry Appointments							8	8	10	12	14	12	13	15	18
Female							2	2	2	3	3	2	2	3	7
Male							6	6	8	9	11	10	11	12	11
Clinical Instructional						1									
Male						1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Grand Total	36	40	45	50	46	47	53	50	58	57	61	61	67	61	69

APPENDIX F: Gender and Ethnicity of Our Staff

	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Ethnicity															
Black	1	4	5	3	5	5	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	3
Asian		1			2						1	2	3	3	2
Hispanic	1			1		1	1		1	2	2		1	1	1
2 or More												1	1	1	2
White	18	19	24	30	28	28	30	34	33	34	35	35	38	36	32
Not Indicated									1	1	1	4	2	1	
Gender															
Female	17	19	24	28	29	28	26	27	27	29	29	30	35	35	30
Male	3	5	5	6	6	6	8	8	9	9	11	13	11	10	10
Grand Total	20	24	29	34	35	34	34	35	36	38	40	43	46	45	40

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Antonio, Anthony Lising (2001). "The role of interracial interaction in the development of leadership skills and cultural knowledge and understanding." *Research in Higher Education* 42.5: 593-617.

Arao, Brian and Kristi Clemens (2013). "From Safe Spaces to Brave Spaces: A New Way to Frame Dialogue Around Diversity and Social Justice." *The Art of Effective Facilitation*. Stylus Publishing.

Barak, Michelle (2013). *Managing Diversity: Toward a Globally Inclusive Workplace*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Belle, Deborah, Smith-Doerr, Laurel, & O'Brien, Lauren M. O'Brien (2014). "Gendered networks: Professional connections of science and engineering faculty". In V. Demos, C.W. Berheide, & M. Texler Segal (Eds.), *Gender Transformations in the Academy* (2014). UK: Emerald Group. pp. 153-175.

Chesler, Mark. 1993. "Perceptions of Faculty Behavior by students of color", *CRLT Occasional Papers No. 7.*, CRLT, University of Michigan.

Clauset, Aaron, Arbesman, Samuel, & Larremore, Daniel B. (2015). Systematic inequality and hierarchy in faculty hiring networks. *Science Advances*. 12 February.

Claver, et. Al (1999). "From Bureaucratic culture to citizen-oriented culture," *International Journal of Public Sector Management* 12.5: 455-464.

Giangreco, Michael F., Diane M.J. Baumgart, and Mary Beth Doyle (1995). "How Inclusion Can Facilitate Teaching and Learning." *Intervention in School and Clinic*. 30.5: 273-278.

Gooden, Susan T., and Samuel L. Myers (2004). "Social Equity Analysis and Management: What MPA and MPP Students Need to Know". *Journal of Public Affairs Education* 10.2: 172-175.

Gurin, Patricia, et al (2002). "Diversity and higher education: Theory and impact on educational outcomes." *Harvard Educational Review* 72.3: 330-367.

Luo, Jiali, and David Jamieson-Drake (2013). "Examining the educational benefits of interacting with international students." *Journal of International Students* 3.2: 85-101.

Mathews, Audrey L (2005). "Diversity management and cultural competency." In Mitchell F. editor, *Diversity and Public Administration*. New York: M.E. Sharpe. Chapter 12.

McKay, Patrick F. and Avery, Derek R. (2005). "Warning! Diversity Recruitment Could Backfire!" *Journal of Management Inquiry*. 14.4: 330-336.

Milem, Jeffrey F (2003). "The educational benefits of diversity: Evidence from multiple sectors." In *Compelling interest: Examining the evidence on racial dynamics in higher education*. Edited by Mitchell Chang, Daria Witt, James Jones, and Kenji Hakuta. Report of the AERA Panel on Racial Dynamics in Colleges and Universities. 126-169.

Peters, D. P. & Ceci, S. J. (1982). "Peer-Review Practices of Psychological Journals: The Fate of Published Articles, Submitted Again." *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*. 5: 187- 255.

Pless, Nicola and Thomas Maak (2004). "Building and Inclusive Diversity Culture: Principles, Processes, and Practice." *Journal of Business Ethics*. 45.2: 129-147.

Rice, Mitchell F. (2005). "Cultural Competency, Public Administration" in Rice, Mitchell F., ed. *Diversity and public administration*. New York: ME Sharpe.

Thomas, Kecia M. and Wise, P. Gail. (1999). "Organizational Attractiveness and Individual Differences: Are Diverse Applicants Attracted by Different Factors?" *Journal of Business and Psychology*. 13.3: 375-390.

White, Susan (2004). "Multicultural MPA curriculum: are we preparing culturally competent public administrators?" *Journal of Public Affairs Education*. 10.2: 111-123.

Yellen, Janet L. "Welcoming Remarks", National Summit on Diversity in the Economics Profession, Washington, D.C, October 30, 2014.
(<http://www.federalreserve.gov/newsevents/speech/yellen20141030a.htm>)

¹ In 2013, the Ford School had 19% URMs compared to 10.4% for the university as a whole, and 5% Asians compared to 15% for the university as a whole. In 2015, the Ford School had 17% URMs compared to 12% for the university as a whole, and 5% Asians compared to 12% for the university as a whole.

² In 2015, the entering BBA class was 5% URM and 25% Asian.

³ Starting last winter term, the Comprehensive Studies Program began to offer a section of Econ 101 that is designed to be less intimidating. This section is much smaller (40 instead of 400) and taught by a faculty member. In addition, starting next semester, the economics department will raise the median grade for its larger Econ 101 sections, and one of the sections is being taught with less math and more emphasis on intuition.

⁴ Forty percent identified as agnostic, 18% as atheist, and 17% as other.

⁵ Eighty-five percent of survey respondents identified as heterosexual.

⁶ Comparison to our sister departments and professional schools: in November 2015, 62% of the sociology faculty, 40% of the political science faculty, and 19% of the economics faculty, all in U-M's College of Literature, Science, and the Arts, reported as female. At the same time, 44% of the faculty reported as female in the School of Pharmacy compared to 34% female at the Law School, 44% in the School of Public Health, and 30% in the Ross Business School

⁷ Our 'regular faculty' include those faculty for whom the Ford School is their primary employer, and who are actively engaged in teaching as well as service. Regular faculty are comprised of governing faculty (for whom scholarly research is a key expectation) as well as professors of practice and Lecturer III and IV.

⁸ Thirty-one percent of graduate students and 47% of undergraduates agreed or strongly agreed that Ford School courses adequately address disability or ableism, 57% of graduate students and 85% of undergraduates agreed or strongly agreed that Ford School courses adequately address race or racism, 35% of graduate students and 60% of undergraduates agreed or strongly agreed that Ford School courses adequately address religious beliefs or harassment, 52% of graduate students and 77% of undergraduates agreed or strongly agreed that Ford School courses adequately address sex/gender or sexism, 43% of graduate students and 63% of undergraduates agreed or strongly agreed that Ford School courses adequately address sexual orientation or homophobia.

⁹ Sixty-eight percent of faculty agreed or strongly agreed that the Ford School adequately addressed race or racism in our courses, 68% of faculty agreed or strongly agreed that the Ford School adequately addressed religious beliefs or harassment in our courses, and 68% of faculty agreed or strongly agreed that the Ford School adequately addressed sexual orientation or homophobia in our courses.

¹⁰ Sixty-seven percent of all disparaging or insensitive remarks experienced by graduate students came from other graduate students (22% from faculty); 66% of all disparaging or insensitive remarks experienced by undergraduate students came from other undergraduate students (12% from faculty). Sixty-two percent of the discrimination and harassment experienced by graduate students came from other graduate students (19% from faculty); 50% of the discrimination and harassment experienced by undergraduate students came from other undergraduate students (12% from faculty).

¹¹ In terms of socioeconomic status: 26% of graduate students reported personally experiencing an insensitive or disparaging remark more than once a term related to their socioeconomic status, while 22% of graduate students reported experiencing discrimination or harassment on the basis of their socioeconomic status. Eighteen percent of undergraduate students reported personally experiencing an insensitive or disparaging remark more than once a term related to their socioeconomic status, while 10% of undergraduate students reported experiencing discrimination or harassment on the basis of their socioeconomic status. In terms of race/ethnicity: 36% of graduate students reported personally experiencing an insensitive or disparaging remark more than once a term related to their race or ethnicity, while 33% of graduate student reported experiencing discrimination or harassment on the basis of their race or ethnicity. Twenty-three percent of undergraduate students reported personally experiencing an insensitive or disparaging remark more than once a term related to their race or ethnicity, while 18% of undergraduate students reported experiencing discrimination or harassment on the basis of their race or ethnicity.



“...the global economy requires unprecedented grasp of diverse viewpoints and cultural traditions.”

GERALD R. FORD

38th President of the United States

AB '35 and HLLD '74, University of Michigan

Gerald R. Ford School of Public Policy
Joan and Sanford Weill Hall
735 S. State Street
Ann Arbor, MI 48109
734-764-3490
fordschool.umich.edu

© 2016 Regents of the University of Michigan

University of Michigan Regents

Michael J. Behm, Grand Blanc
Mark J. Bernstein, Ann Arbor
Laurence B. Deitch, Bloomfield Hills
Shauna Ryder Diggs, Grosse Pointe
Denise Ilitch, Bingham Farms
Andrea Fischer Newman, Ann Arbor
Andrew C. Richner, Grosse Pointe Park
Katherine E. White, Ann Arbor
Mark S. Schlissel, *ex officio*