

MEMORANDUM

To: Leisl Folks, Senior Vice President and University Provost
Robert C. Robbins, President

Cc: Andrea Romero, Vice Provost, Faculty Affairs

From: Rebecca Tsosie, Regents Professor of Law and (former) Vice Provost,
Inclusive Excellence in Academic Affairs

Re: Assessment of Diversity and Inclusion at UA

Date: August 19, 2019

Introduction:

This memorandum provides an assessment of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI) at the University of Arizona and was prepared at the request of Jeff Goldberg, the Interim Provost, when I served as Vice Provost for Inclusive Excellence in Academic Affairs.¹ I served in that role from October 2018 to June 2019 and was asked to “define the core values of diversity and inclusion and align these values with the intellectual mission of the University” and serve as a consultant for the diversity and inclusion components of the Strategic Plan. I provided a written assessment on the draft Strategic Plan to Jeff Goldberg and President Robbins prior to the Regents’ meeting in November 2018.²

My appointment letter asked me to develop a plan for diversity and inclusion through a process of campus engagement with UA faculty, staff, students, and shared governance entities.³ Although this strategy seemed appropriate in late

¹ On October 2, 2018, I accepted an administrative appointment as Vice Provost for Inclusive Excellence in Academic Affairs to extend through June 30, 2019. The appointment formalized President Robbins’ earlier request to me and to Javier Duran and Helena Rodrigues, as co-Chairs of the Diversity Coordinating Council, to develop a one-year plan for diversity and inclusion at the UA, following the departure of Dr. Jesus Trevino as Vice Provost for Diversity and Inclusion in spring 2018. We authored a joint memorandum to President Robbins and Interim Provost Jeff Goldberg on April 27, 2018 with several recommendations. After several months of internal discussion, this appointment was authorized.

² Memorandum dated October 21, 2018 from Rebecca Tsosie to Jeff Goldberg and Brew McKenna regarding UA Strategic Plan.

³ The duties are listed in the letter as follows: (1) “work closely with the Diversity Coordinating Council to map our Institutional capacity, complete an assessment, identify best practices for institutional inclusion, generate a set of metrics for evaluation, and develop and implement accountability structures; (2) assist with the evaluation of the needs and best location in the organization for

October, it was no longer appropriate by January 2019 when President Robbins announced the creation of a new Office of Equity and Inclusion under the leadership of Vice President Ron Wilson. Assistant Vice Provost Teresa Graham-Brett, who directs ODIEX and the newly created Office of Inclusion and Multicultural Engagement (IME), moved under Ron Wilson's oversight, and he was assigned as the Pillar 3 Leader for the Strategic Plan, overseeing the diversity and inclusion initiatives.

Because the institutional leadership of diversity, equity, and inclusion shifted to the President's Cabinet and my appointment had not been announced to the campus community, Jeff Goldberg instructed me to return to the more modest advisory role that I've had at UA since 2016 and write a memo outlining best practices for diversity and inclusion within institutions of higher learning, and comment on our existing capacity by identifying areas of excellence, as well as potential challenges. This memorandum responds to that charge.⁴

Part I of the memo summarizes the contemporary research on the optimal organization and structure for diversity and inclusion at a modern Research University. Part II of the memo discusses the structure at UA, comparing what exists now with the national norm and trends. The final section of the memo concludes with specific recommendations relevant to the University of Arizona, which might be useful to President Robbins and Provost Leisl Folks, as well as other campus leaders.

The University of Arizona is well-poised to develop an effective institutional structure for DEI. There are at least three senior staff members tasked with aspects of the DEI portfolio: Ron Wilson, Vice President of Equity and Inclusion, Celina Ramirez, Chief Compliance Officer, and Teresa Graham-Brett, Assistant Vice Provost for Inclusion and Multicultural Engagement. All three have the experience necessary to provide exceptional leadership on diversity, equity and inclusion. The challenge will be to create an institutional structure for this work that extends across the University and enables effective leadership and communication with campus constituents and community members.

ODIEX. At this point it will be located in Campus Life under the direction of Teresa Graham-Brett; (3, 4, 5) work with... shared governance [entities] student organizations...faculty...and staff to ensure that their "voice and needs" are included in any strategy and plans you build," (6) serve on SPBC; (7) serve on SPFI selection Committee; (8) serve as the Inclusion Consultant for the UA strategic plan process...to ensure that initiatives in the entire plan consider the issues of inclusion and multicultural engagement." [and other duties "as needed" according to specific directives of the Provost and President].

⁴ This memorandum is based upon my research into the best practices for diversity and inclusion within contemporary institutions of higher learning, my participation in various meetings for the past three years, and conversations with campus leaders.

I. The Structure for Diversity and Inclusion at Institutions of Higher Learning:

Across the nation, corporations and educational institutions have recognized the need for centralized leadership on diversity, equity and inclusion, as well as the need for an organizational structure that can effectuate the optimal goals and outcomes that the entity defines as applicable to its own mission.⁵ Educational institutions differ from corporations because they tend to retain their primary organizational structures (for example, academic units and leadership roles as Dean, Provost, Chancellor) and because their mission has historically been tied to transmission of academic knowledge, disciplinary training, and other forms of instruction, such as clinical education.

Despite these differences, universities across the country are adopting corporate models of governance, often because these are more cost-effective. Universities are increasingly asked to generate revenue, making themselves accountable to consumer preferences, and they are also restructuring their organizational systems to eliminate inefficient and outdated structures. For example, a University may centralize its information technology (IT) services or marketing services, rather than leaving those within the administration of discrete Colleges or Departments. With this in mind, it is advisable for universities to examine their existing structures for diversity and inclusion to identify inefficiencies that might exist, and promote an organizational structure that can facilitate campus needs.

A. The Importance of Terminology:

At a basic level, university administrators should ask whether campus constituents understand what is meant by the terms “*diversity*” and “*inclusion*,” and whether they can differentiate the concept of “*inclusive excellence*.” Some universities decline to use the term “*diversity*” because it has become a politicized term, often associated with “*identity politics*” and the historic grievances of particular groups. Some universities seek to expand the term to include “*intellectual*” diversity, even though this should be the norm at a liberal arts University, and there is also a national movement to highlight “*ideological diversity*” so that conservative groups will feel “*included*,” given their perception that Universities have become “*too liberal*.”

Some universities substitute the term “*inclusion*” as a more “*neutral*” proxy designed to indicate the nature of a campus community where “*all belong*.” The project of “*inclusive excellence*,” however, is linked to the idea that diversity can become the cornerstone of an Institution’s mission to achieve academic excellence. In this case, the term “*diversity*” should be closely tailored to the University’s academic mission. The University of Arizona ODIE website adopts the latter approach, discussing inclusive excellence as a set of “*high quality, high impact strategies to advance diversity and inclusion at the University of Arizona*” as “*the*

⁵ See Damon A. Williams and Katrina C. Wade-Golden, *The Chief Diversity Officer: Strategy, Structure, and Change Management* (2016).

leading research University in the Southwest.” However, the website doesn’t define “diversity” or “inclusion.”

Damon Williams, a leading scholar on diversity and inclusion in higher education, encourages campus leaders to understand the differences among four key terms that are often conflated and used interchangeably, but in fact carry a distinctive meaning: *equity, diversity, multiculturalism, and inclusion*.⁶

According to Williams, “**Diversity** refers to all of the ways in which people differ” in their **primary** identities (associated with factors such as race, age, gender, sexual orientation, ethnicity, ability status), as well as their **secondary** characteristics (including education, income, religion, work experience, family status, language skills).⁷ Primary identities are generally fixed, while secondary characteristics might and generally do shift.

“**Equity**” refers to “the process of creating **equivalent outcomes** for members of historically underrepresented and oppressed individuals and groups. Equity is about ending systematic discrimination against people based on their identity or background.”⁸

“**Inclusion**” is an **intentional process** designed to ensure that “traditionally marginalized groups and individuals” participate in the dominant society’s structures as “full and valued members of the community.” To adopt “inclusive practices” means that all constituents are involved in shaping and redefining the institutional culture” to reflect a shared sense of identity and belonging.⁹

“**Multiculturalism**” is an attitude that “acknowledges and promotes the acceptance and understanding of different cultures living together within a community. To the extent that a University represents a shared “social environment,” multiculturalism would encourage the peaceful coexistence of diverse races, ethnicities, and religions.

Building upon this foundation, an Institutional commitment to **diversity** means that the campus community, including faculty, staff and students, will reflect the social/cultural/economic diversity of the nation and region.

An institutional commitment to “**equity**” means that the University will act intentionally to identify instances of bias and discrimination and adopt appropriate practices and policies so that the Institution can address conditions that might allow discriminatory behavior to continue.

⁶ Damon A. Williams, *Strategic Diversity Leadership: Activating Change and Transformation in Higher Education*, at 89 (2013).

⁷ Williams, *Strategic Diversity Leadership*, at 90.

⁸ Id.

⁹ Id.

It is difficult to have a commitment to equity without acknowledging diversity. The institution should examine representational diversity, for example, to ensure that historically marginalized and disadvantaged groups now enjoy equal access to the educational opportunities of the University. This may be required under federal law if the University is a federal contractor or uses federal funds to operate its programs. This is true even if the relevant state Constitution prohibits consideration of race, ethnicity and gender in University admissions or employment.

A commitment to honor **multiculturalism** in and of itself will not ensure equity or inclusion. Nor will representational diversity ensure inclusion or equity. Rather, the Institution must make a commitment to specific goals and adopt institutional structures and policies to ensure that those goals are met. Accountability is a key feature of an effective diversity and inclusion strategy.

B. Inclusive Excellence and the Diversity Mission of Universities:

The term “**inclusive excellence**” reflects an understanding that the University must adopt specific diversity goals that are in alignment with its mission in order to operationalize inclusion.

While institutions vary in how they organize the portfolio of diversity and inclusion, a recent study of universities and colleges throughout the nation identifies a shared consensus that **four goals** are **essential** to the success of the diversity mission¹⁰:

- (1) Achieve access and equity for historically underrepresented groups, including students, staff, administrators and faculty
- (2) Create a multicultural and inclusive environment for the entire campus community
- (3) Enhance domestic and international research and scholarship around diversity issues
- (4) Prepare all students to engage a diverse and international global society

Each of these goals can be fostered in numerous ways, but a successful outcome requires cohesion and collective action by the campus community. Therefore, the trend among national peer institutions is to design institutional structures for diversity and inclusion that contain **three main features**:

- (1) Centralized leadership;
- (2) An **effective** implementation structure for each of the functions necessary to achieve the goals; and
- (3) alignment of diversity and inclusion with the mission of the Institution (rather than narrowing the role of the Diversity Office to compliance with equity structures that address harassment or discrimination).

¹⁰ Williams, The Chief Diversity Officer, at 5.

An effective implementation structure requires more than a symbolic office or administrative position. If the Diversity Office exists only for symbolic purposes and has no ability to effectuate change, then it will not be effective in achieving the goals of the campus community. Effective structures require **metrics for accountability**, benchmarks, and continuous and regular assessments of institutional data on representational diversity (student, staff, faculty, administrators), as well as campus climate.

I will summarize each component and identify applicable caveats, where relevant.

(1) Centralized Leadership:

While the functions of diversity and inclusion extend throughout the campus community, it is very difficult to develop an effective organizational structure without centralized leadership. Most major universities today have a central Office of Diversity and Inclusion with staff or faculty leadership. To be effective, the Office requires sufficient resources and staff to drive the various initiatives, and the Office must also have structures in place that facilitate engagement with University faculty, staff and students. Community engagement structures are also very important, particularly with respect to underserved communities.

A centralized leadership structure is increasingly necessary because of the greater student diversity at universities and the prevalence of contested political issues surrounding “affirmative action,” immigration, campus speech, and gender/sexual orientation issues. The Diversity Office should be able to engage immediately if a bias incident occurs and must know the relevant procedures to ensure that the University is effective in dealing with these incidents.

It is best to think of centralized leadership of diversity and inclusion as a “role” rather than as a title, but intentional design of the role is critically important. In the corporate world, the Chief Diversity Officer serves alongside the CEO and CFO on the senior leadership team, so the CDO title makes sense. Some Universities use the CDO title, but the role is increasingly attached to the traditional offices within the academic leadership structure, for example, as a Vice President, Vice Provost or Vice Chancellor for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion. This is a better practice because the official will generally have access to the University leadership structure (for example, Provost’s Council or President’s Cabinet or both), whereas a staff CDO will generally lack this access.¹¹

¹¹ I experienced this personally at UA. In my role as “Special Advisor,” I was not invited to any meetings of the President’s cabinet or Provost’s councils. As “Vice Provost,” I sat on the Provost’s Council, Dean’s Council, and was appointed to SPBAC. I learned more about the UA in 6 months, than I had in the prior 2 ½ years, and much of the knowledge was directly relevant to diversity and inclusion at UA. The senior leader must have access.

The following practices are **not** advised because they detract from the effectiveness of the leadership role:

- 1) Some institutions develop the CDO by “**elevating**” the existing role of a minority staff or faculty member, who might transition from a general title (e.g. Associate Dean of Students) to a “leadership” role as Chief Diversity Officer.¹² This approach is generally not successful because the University is using a “diverse person” to fulfill a set of functions that can only be achieved through institutional restructuring. For example, it is impossible for a staff CDO to “require” University faculties “diversify” the faculty if this is not tied to a directive from the President or Provost and tied to an incentive or accountability structure. A further caveat is that if the CDO role is perceived as the only mechanism for a minority staff or faculty member to enter the administrative structure of the University, this can foster destructive competition among campus constituents for the one coveted spot. It may also incentivize the CDO to avoid “ruffling feathers” and maintain the status quo. Sometimes the status quo must be changed to effectuate inclusion. The CDO role is challenging and it is unwise to create this level of vulnerability in the Office.
- 2) Some institutions **politicize** the role, so that it is a direct report to the Provost or President and the role is only good so long as that particular leader is in power. When the senior leadership structure changes and the CDO role is attached to a particular leader, rather than a set of institutional functions (like a CFO), the role can be destabilized or dismantled.¹³ Although it can be politically convenient to “shift” responsibility from one office to the other, the better practice is to create the role to report to both the President and Provost. The institutional role of the CDO should be integrated into the basic structure of the University, much like the role of the CFO.
- 3) Some institutions hire a CDO to serve a “**symbolic**” role and be the “face” of diversity, but they keep a decentralized structure for the various functions, which creates a competitive environment in which several people are tasked with “diversity and inclusion” and the leadership responsibilities that would typically be tied to the CDO role are contested among various offices and initiatives. This is chaotic and inefficient. It is also unfair to the CDO because that person will be seen as incompetent if things go awry, and possibly become the scapegoat for bad decisions made by other persons who had the actual authority. For these reasons, a decentralized approach is not effective in promoting leadership of diversity and inclusion.

I could not find any contemporary literature that recommended a decentralized approach to the portfolio of diversity and inclusion. The distributed authority

¹² See Williams and Wade-Golden, *The Chief Diversity Officer*, at 2.

¹³ See Williams and Wade-Golden, *supra* note ___ at 191 for case studies of this.

model is generally the de facto result of gaps in leadership, and this approach often results in complaints being directed to the University President, who has the overt leadership role on all aspects of University governance.

(2) Implementation: Institutional Processes to Effectuate Diversity, Equity and Inclusion

The diversity and inclusion portfolio at a University contains several dimensions. The National Association of Diversity Officers in Higher Education (NADOHE) has identified several **key functions** for the CDO role/Office¹⁴, which I will summarize as falling within the following categories:

- 1) Articulates meaning and importance of diversity, equity and inclusion and ensures alignment with institutional mission.
- 2) Works to implement institutional inclusion by reference to internal and external laws, policies and directives.
- 3) Can articulate the educational benefits of diversity, equity and inclusion within institutions of higher learning
- 4) Can foster curriculum development that enhances educational benefits.
- 5) Can foster institutional programming to serve the diversity mission of higher education for faculty, students, staff and administrators
- 6) Implements procedures to deal effectively with bias incidents on campus
- 7) Can draw upon institutional data to benchmark and promote accountability for diversity mission of higher education institutions
- 8) Understands application of campus climate research in designing an inclusive campus
- 9) Understands specific laws, regulations and policies related to diversity and inclusion (relevant to faculty, staff and students).
- 10) Has knowledge needed to engage institutional commitment to norms of nondiscrimination, access and equity in higher education (relevant to faculty, staff and students)

The CDO/VP maintains leadership over each function, but must always work cooperatively with others to achieve the goals. For example, campus climate surveys generated for students must occur in cooperation with the Dean of Students Office. Campus climate surveys for faculty must occur in cooperation with the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. Staff issues are typically handled through the HR Office, but engagement with a Staff council may elicit other considerations that can be developed through a collateral process.

Similarly, the CDO/VP should be aware of the structure for training faculty and staff, as well as for advising faculty on how to integrate inclusion into the classroom and

¹⁴ These are posted on the NADOHE website as “National Association of Diversity Officers in Higher Education Standards of Professional Practice for Chief Diversity Officer,” approved by NADOHE Board of Directors in October, 2014.

curriculum. The CDO cannot develop and administer all of those trainings and competencies, but should structure a system where faculty, staff and students are aware of the resources and can use them.

The CDO/VP role requires continuous interface with the President, Provost, Deans, Directors, Faculty, Staff and students through the appropriate organizational structures of the University. This is another reason to have a leadership structure that is recognized by all as having expertise and competency.

(3) Alignment with Institutional Mission

Historically, most institutions of higher learning were elitist and lacked significant diversity. Therefore, during the initial phases of institutional development, the CDO functions were generally tied to student services, because the admission of greater numbers of diverse students in the 1970s carried many consequences for the campus community in terms of campus environment and the ability of the institution to respond to the different needs of students from diverse backgrounds. The Diversity role was also tied to the growth of civil rights law in the modern era, particularly compliance with equity directives embodied by Title IX and the other federal civil rights laws that govern institutions of higher learning.

Currently, both the student services and compliance functions are still necessary at each University, but the portfolio of diversity and inclusion is increasingly tied more broadly to the intellectual mission of the institution. A commitment to **“inclusive excellence”** is a **commitment by design** to foster the four goals outlined above in ways that are relevant to the student demographics of the University, its educational and research targets, and its knowledge enterprise.

The term “inclusive excellence” is not obvious to many campus constituents, who might argue that diversity and inclusion represent a “political agenda,” rather than a necessary part of the University’s mission. Where diversity and inclusion is tied to **institutional accreditation**, there is generally a greater degree of alignment of diversity, equity and inclusion with institutional mission. This is true of the UA Medical Schools, for example, which are true leaders in this space, perhaps in part because it is a key component of their accreditation process.

Increasingly, Universities are working through collaborative engagement processes with faculty, staff and students to create a Strategic Plan to implement diversity and inclusion in accordance with the University’s Mission Statement. If the University’s mission changes, as it will upon adoption of a new Strategic Plan, or if it experiences significant status changes, such as becoming a “Hispanic Serving Institution,” this will require an expansion in the portfolio of diversity and inclusion, with new metrics and target goals. The alignment of diversity and inclusion with mission is an organic process, which is exciting and challenging. However, there is also the need to establish benchmarks and metrics to ensure progress toward successful outcomes.

The best practice is to have a **proactive** and **data-driven** process for the development of diversity and inclusion and alignment with institutional mission. Too many universities are reactive in this space and crisis-driven, establishing the CDO role or campus environment advisory bodies (e.g. President’s Task Force on Diversity) to deal with student-driven demands or emergent social justice movements, rather than as a feature of institutional development. The crisis driven approach is not a sustainable approach to diversity and inclusion.

II. Assessment of Diversity and Inclusion at UA:

President Robbins has expressed a strong commitment to diversity and inclusion and he has created the Office of Equity and Inclusion, as well as a leadership position at the Vice President level that contains many of the CDO functions outlined above. President Robbins has also created a position of Chief Compliance Officer within his Cabinet, and that position also contains many of the CDO functions. President Robbins has moved the DEI portfolio into the Office of the President, which is a common approach among American universities. Because the DEI portfolio at UA was formerly within the Office of the Provost, there will be a need to harmonize some of those structures and staff positions for maximum efficiency.

This section of the memorandum contains a brief assessment of diversity and inclusion at the UA, in relation to faculty, staff, students, and diverse communities. I describe the historical development of diversity and inclusion at UA, and the current offices, roles, and initiatives that are in place and may need to be restructured to effectuate the goals of the new Office.¹⁵ With this understanding of the UA’s historic structure and the current placement of the functions of diversity and inclusion, an effective organizational plan can be generated.

A. Current Structures For Diversity and Inclusion:

The current structure for diversity and inclusion is embedded in several locations at the University of Arizona. This creates a challenge for any effort to centralize authority or create uniformly applicable policies. It also creates a challenge with senior leadership transitions, because it is hard to understand the existing structure and therefore difficult for new campus leaders to “engage” the “campus community” on diversity and inclusion.

Student and Community Engagement:

¹⁵ I have only been at the UA since August 2016, so I have relied on my discussions with faculty and staff and my own personal experience to write this summary. My position as Special Advisor was intended to be temporary and transitional, so I include reference to the process for historical interest only. The position was absolutely ineffective to operationalize institutional inclusion and should not be recreated in the future.

The University possesses strongly articulated student services and community engagement structures that correspond to the needs of the specific diversity groups. This approach has been in place for many years, and it is deeply embedded within the University culture.

Kendal Washington White, Vice Provost for Campus Life and Dean of Students, and Teresa Graham-Brett, Assistant Vice Provost for Inclusion and Multicultural Engagement, have direct supervisory authority over student issues. Like many UA staff, both leaders are quite dedicated and serve multiple roles in addition to their “official” roles on campus. The University has several student cultural centers which are organized, respectively, to meet the needs of Latinx/Hispanic students, African American students, Native American students, Asian Pacific American students, LGBTQ students, and women students. Traditionally, each cultural center has had its own distinctive mission and identity. Teresa Graham Brett is developing synergies under the rubrics of “inclusion” and “multicultural engagement,” but the identities of each center remain distinctive. In addition to the cultural centers, the UA campus also provides services to diverse campus constituents through the Disability Cultural Center, the Global Experiential Learning and Community Engagement Center, the Common Ground Alliance Program, the Immigrant Student Resource Center, and the VETS Center. There is considerable expertise embodied within each Center, and this creates a rich foundation for the understanding of diversity on the UA Campus.

The University’s community engagement structure is comprised of six Diversity Community Councils that correspond to the particular groups: Hispanic, Asian-Pacific, African-American, Native American, LGBTQ, and the University Religious Council. To my knowledge, the groups are comprised of volunteer members (many of whom are also UA alums), but each of them meets separately and they have particular agendas specific to their concerns.¹⁶ Karla Bernal Morales has served as a Program Coordinator Senior for the University’s Diversity Community Councils since 2017, when Tanya Gaxxiola, Assistant Vice President for Community Relations, left the UA. The Native American Community Council has always been under the leadership of Karen Francis-Begay, Assistant Vice President of Tribal Relations. All of the Diversity Community Councils have been housed under the UA’s Government and Community Relations Office for several years. One staff member commented recently that the Diversity Community Councils may move under the new Office of Equity and Inclusion. That person was unsure whether the Native American Community Council will also move or will stay under Government and Community

¹⁶ For example, at a recent meeting of the African American Community Council with President Robbins, the leaders shared a Strategic Plan designed to advance the needs of African American faculty and students at UA, in accordance with the objectives of the new University Strategic Plan. There is considerable expertise on the Community Council and this generated an important discussion that hopefully will be integrated into the campus priorities.

Relations in recognition of the separate political status of the 22 tribal Nations that hold lands in Arizona. This will be an issue to explore.

The University also has academic programs that facilitate the intellectual exploration of each respective group identity (American Indian Studies, Mexican American Studies, Africana Studies, LGBTQ Studies, Gender and Women's Studies), with the exception of an Asian-American Studies Program, which is currently under consideration by President Robbins. The academic focus on specific group identities implies a commitment to "equality" of resources and opportunities among all of the groups. Where this equality is lacking for particular groups, they will perceive a lack of inclusion. Because the groups are housed within different academic units, there is not a cohesive method of fostering intellectual engagement among the various departments and disciplines. This became apparent when the Strategic Planning Team was trying to figure out how to represent "diversity" and where it should be housed within the Plan. One of the challenges on the UA campus is to develop a shared understanding of diversity and inclusion that is respectful of distinct group identities, but also able to foster cohesion and collective action. I am not sure if the current funding model promotes interdisciplinary participation of faculty across units, and, if not, this should be addressed.¹⁷

The Diversity Community Councils operate, to some extent, as accountability monitors. Several of the Councils have expressed the need to know faculty and student data to ensure that representational diversity exists on campus. Similarly, faculty members and staff associated with the diverse academic programs are frequently involved in helping to manage crisis events that concern diverse student populations. There is a deep and rich knowledge of multiculturalism, critical race theory, equity, and implicit bias on the UA campus. Constituent members of the various groups know how to identify bias issues and bring them into consciousness. Often, however, this occurs because of crisis events. In my experience, there has not been an effective institutional structure to include these key constituents in positive and constructive efforts to build an inclusive campus. Rather, the groups tend to come together to express concern over bias incidents or share perspectives on contested issues at meetings of the Diversity Coordinating Council, or alternatively, at Faculty Senate meetings.

Thus, although there is considerable diversity within the programs and centers that respond to student success and community engagement, there are opportunities to create inclusion in accordance with the call of the University's new Strategic Plan.

¹⁷ When I was at ASU, I taught in both Law and Philosophy and was also able to cross-list courses. I enjoyed the interdisciplinary engagement with students and faculty, and ASU's commitment to innovation incentivizes this. When I came to UA, I was invited to teach Philosophy of Race within the Philosophy department and there was strong student interest, but there were administrative complications with this idea, and Provost Comrie advised me not to do this.

Faculty and Academic Units:

Diversity issues among faculty and academic units are largely under the authority of the respective Deans or the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. When Tom Miller was Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, he developed the University's Strategic Priorities Faculty Initiative (SPFI), which offers partial University funding for faculty diversity hires. Dr. Andrea Romero assumed the position of Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs in Spring 2019, and as a Latina administrator and long time faculty member at UA, she has the knowledge and expertise to develop this Initiative or create additional initiatives. I believe, for example, that the Strategic Plan contemplates a cluster hire that will serve the University's HSI Initiative, and a cluster hire may also be under consideration with respect to the Native American Advancement Initiative. Both efforts are important, and this may inspire other groups to request similar treatment. Going forward, the cluster hires and any new diversity initiatives must be effectuated in a way that is perceived as fair and transparent.

Each College has the autonomy to create its own diversity and inclusion structure. Many Colleges formed Diversity and Inclusion Committees when Dr. Trevino was Vice Provost, because this was a mandate from the Provost at that time. The Committees receive their charge from the Dean of their College. Currently some diversity Committees monitor and advise on faculty hiring, student admissions, and curriculum development. Other Committees eschew any substantive role and focus primarily on social "celebrations" of diversity. Some Colleges have an Associate Dean of Diversity and Inclusion, and some have a Director or other faculty or staff member with this assignment. Some do not have any formal faculty or staff administrator charged with overseeing diversity and inclusion. Some departments and colleges have a stated "diversity mission," and some do not. The lack of uniformity at the local level (College, School, Department) causes confusion about what the "University" thinks about diversity and inclusion, or what the University's shared commitments are, or what policies operate throughout the University (obviously, people are aware that Title IX and antidiscrimination policies apply broadly, but they often cannot understand how the local unit should interface with the University office). In addition, there are individuals across the Universities that have the same title (e.g. Director of Diversity and Inclusion), but have never met one another.

The lack of uniformity is a result of the University's history of decentralized leadership of diversity and inclusion, as well as the shifting nature of the University's institutional structures that serve diversity and inclusion.

B. History of Decentralized Leadership and Efforts to Centralize:

The University of Arizona's land grant mission and traditions are important to this campus community. I spoke with faculty and staff across campus to discover the history of diversity and inclusion at UA. I was surprised by how many faculty and campus leaders had been in their positions for 20 or more years. Many senior

faculty referenced President Likins' term of leadership as a time when faculty of color and women faculty enjoyed the most direct access to the President and stated that community leaders also got regular meetings with the President. This occurred because President Likins organized campus Diversity Councils and also external Community Councils that met with him on a regular basis. Many faculty members also remembered specific processes that occurred during the last decade involving the ADVANCE grant and efforts to promote inclusion of women and minority faculty and foster pathways into administrative leadership positions. Their perception is that the numbers of minority and women faculty increased as a result of this work, and that more of these faculty members were promoted into University administrative positions. Their perception is that these gains were lost in more recent years.

I do not have access to a data set that would support or negate either perception, but this is worth exploring. The literature on best practices calls for institutions to regularly examine their data and evaluate their performance in relation to key initiatives implemented to foster inclusion. The data on the ADVANCE grant is only partly accessible on the UA website today, so it is unclear whether best practices were incorporated broadly into the UA structure to foster institutional inclusion. The Commission on the Status of Women has been working on this issue and they have asked the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs to assist them in obtaining more information about the status of the information gained through the ADVANCE grant and its outcomes.

Most faculty members stated that President Hart's administration made the most significant change by shifting most of the Diversity and Inclusion functions to the Office of the Provost. Provost Comrie developed a structure where Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, Tom Miller, and his staff (most notably Laura Hunter) took care of all faculty recruitment and retention issues dealing with diversity and inclusion. Vice Provost Miller hired a staff person as Chief Diversity Officer for a time, but that individual was gone by 2014. I was told that the person was hired after a national search and had excellent qualifications as a diversity officer; however, I could not find any record of the person's reports or activities. Laura Hunter continued to work with Vice Provost Miller on faculty trainings, and she conducted all of the exit interviews with faculty who left UA and gained information about campus climate through this process. I do not know whether any of her research was made accessible to the campus community.

When I arrived in Fall 2016, a campus constituent gave me a document entitled "Faculty of Color at the University of Arizona: What We Want Heads, Deans and Directors to Know," summarizing the discussion of focus group held in Spring 2016 and attended by several faculty members of color.¹⁸ I do not know who sponsored the session or who wrote the document, but it clearly asserts that the faculty of

¹⁸ I have a copy of this document, but it does not have a named author or date beyond identifying the focus group held in "spring 2016."

color who attended the session believed that “discrimination and bias” remain a problem for the UA campus and were able to provide specific experiences in support of that assertion. The document provided statistics about the low numbers of faculty of color at UA, stating that “Of our tenure-track faculty in 2015, 2% are African-American 1% are American Indian, 10% are Asian, 7% are Hispanic and 76% are White.”¹⁹ The document states that the “upper ranks” of administrators lack significant diversity. The paper cites specific literature supporting best practices that could be adopted. The document makes an excellent case for corrective change, but it is unclear whether it was distributed to Deans and Directors, or whether any corrective steps were implemented.

Data on Diversity and Inclusion:

The institutional data on diversity and inclusion at UA is difficult to access and I have not observed concerted efforts to analyze the data or develop policy priorities. In my role as Special Advisor, I had hoped to do an analysis of institutional data to make policy recommendations on fostering diversity and inclusion.²⁰ However, during the three years that I have been at the University of Arizona, I was never given access to the University dashboards that house this data. When I joined UA, I participated in the Minority Women Faculty Association (now known as the Women of Color Faculty Association), which was then under the leadership of Professor Toni Griego Jones and Professor Andrea Romero. The MWF requested data on minority faculty, in particular women of color, and after President Robbins was hired, he agreed to provide this data to Professor Romero. The data was shared with Professor Romero just prior to our May 2018 meeting with President Robbins.²¹ Professor Romero prepared a masterful synthesis of the data, which illuminated the disparities among UA faculty as a whole and UA faculty women of color, and the President agreed that steps should be taken to improve the current situation.

After I became a Vice Provost, I was able to request data from UAIR, but the process of gathering student data takes many months, and all requests for faculty data must go through the Vice Provost of Faculty Affairs. Vice Provost Romero and I met with the UAIR team in February 2019 regarding the process to secure faculty diversity data. Although I received some student diversity data by mid-June, the faculty diversity data was not available by the time that I stepped down from my appointment on June 30, 2019. The student data indicates a growing and increasingly successful Latinx student body. The data indicates serious problems

¹⁹ Those numbers are consistent with the information that was posted on the UA website when I interviewed in Spring 2016.

²⁰ Teresa Graham Brett was also working on these issues in Fall 2018. I am unclear whether she received access and support for analysis of the UA Institutional data on diversity and inclusion.

²¹ That meeting took place on May 4, 2018 and I have the agenda and meeting notes in my files.

with Native American student retention and 6 year graduation rates. African American and Native American student enrollment numbers are also fairly low, given their percentage of the state population. I did not have time to do a complete analysis of the data, but I understand that other administrators are doing this analysis as part of separate initiatives.²²

I was also present at meetings of the Provost's and Dean's Council during the spring 2019 semester and received reports on some aspects of diversity and inclusion that I had previously not known about. I became aware, for example, that the University of Arizona has participated in a number of surveys eliciting job satisfaction performance of UA faculty (for example, the Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education or COACHE survey, which was administered in 2014 and again in 2018). I saw that each set of instruments revealed areas where the university was excelling, as well as areas where improvement might be needed. In particular, the summaries that I saw revealed significant differences between the responses of faculty from historically underrepresented groups as compared to the responses of white faculty. I am unsure whether coordinated efforts were made to respond to this data within the Office of the President or the Office of the Provost, but this inquiry should be made. Both Offices have been involved in the work of diversity and inclusion, but there appears to have been a significant lack of coordination between the two offices, at least in the recent past.

C. Institutional Structures: The Diversity Coordinating Council, Task Force, and Shared Governance

According to Provost Comrie, the Office of the Provost exercised appropriate authority over diversity and inclusion during his tenure because this was in alignment with UA's "shared governance" tradition. Following the departure of the University's Chief Diversity Officer in 2014, Provost Comrie created a campus advisory council on diversity and inclusion reporting to the Provost as "the Diversity Coordinating Council" (DCC).

The DCC was chartered by Provost Comrie as "an on-going administrative advisory council that ensures coordination and progress toward our goals of inclusive excellence and making diversity a strategic strength for the UA."²³ The DCC was designed to report to the Provost, receive its charge from the Provost, and is composed of persons that are appointed by the Provost. The majority of DCC members are "administrators with diversity responsibility," but a small number of faculty are included to serve the goals of "shared governance."

²² At a meeting on July 9, 2019 Professor Robert A. Williams told the Native American Faculty Association that he is working with a team and analyzing the Native American student data. I believe that Associate Vice Provost Cynthia Demetriou is also analyzing the data on student success among the various groups. I am unclear whether the two efforts are operating separately or in tandem.

²³ DCC, Guiding Principles Document, email from Comrie to Tsosie dated 9/13/16.

The DCC is part of the distributed leadership model that the UA has in the area of diversity and inclusion. The DCC members were already in positions of authority that included diversity functions. Within a relatively short time, the DCC members developed a Draft UA Diversity Strategy, which is a Strategic Plan designed to “build on the values, strategies, and initiatives within President Hart’s Never Settle Strategic Plan” in order to promote “equity of opportunity, participation, and treatment” of “our faculty, staff and students.”²⁴ The goal of the UA Diversity Strategy is to “transform diversity into a strategic strength for the UA.”

The DCC Diversity Strategy lists 31 “key actions and initiatives” to promote diversity and inclusion at UA. The document also creates a pyramid model for diversity leadership which would result in the creation of an “Office of Diversity Initiatives,” headed by a CDO who is empowered to work on all of these items, which extend throughout the University as it functions in relation to students, faculty (hiring, promotion, retention), staff, the community councils, the cultural centers, the financial aid office, and curriculum.

As an outgrowth of this Strategic Plan, the DCC was also charged with developing a description for a centralized administrative leadership position to head the Office of Diversity Initiatives. DCC members collaborated to draft the job description for the *Vice Provost of Diversity and Inclusion and Chief Diversity Officer* position, which was posted in November, 2015, with the following description:

“The University of Arizona seeks a collaborative, strategic and results-oriented leader to serve as its Vice Provost for Diversity and Inclusion and Chief Diversity Officer...The VP/CDO will report to the University Provost and work in partnership with the University’s Diversity Coordinating Council, deans, and other campus leaders to position diversity as one of our key competitive advantages. This is a new role that will position the UA to center diversity work in the mission of the university...as an intentional part of [the University’s] teaching, research and service mission.”²⁵

The duties listed were consistent with the functions of a CDO. The minimum qualifications required candidates to have “a graduate degree” and diversity experience. The “preferred qualifications” included “a terminal degree and established record of teaching and scholarship that might warrant an academic appointment,” and an “informed understanding of innovations in higher education

²⁴ Diversity Coordinating Council, Diversity Strategy Document, dated 4/19/16, as presented to SPBAC (I received this document from Tanya Gaxxiola when she departed from UA and Provost Comrie assigned me some of her functions).

²⁵ Posting Number A20443, Office of Academic Affairs (9902), opening date 11/12/2015, review to commence 01/20/2016, contact person listed as Laura Hunter.

that have strengthened the prominence of diversity and inclusion in their research, teaching and outreach missions.”

This is the position that I applied for because it corresponded to my view of diversity and inclusion as part of the intellectual mission of a public research University, as well as my belief that a Vice Provost role, working in collaboration with a team of campus diversity leaders (the DCC) was an optimal structure to achieve that goal. As Vice Provost of Inclusion and Community Engagement at ASU, I worked closely with the Provost, faculty, Deans and Directors. I enjoyed the intellectual components of building inclusive structures of higher education, and I hoped to grow my work at the University of Arizona. Dr. Jesus Trevino, who was at the time working as a CDO for the University of South Dakota, also applied for the position. As the two finalists for the position, we were each required to give public presentations and meet with University constituents over a two-day period. Dr. Allison Vaillancourt, Vice President of Human Resources, and Dr. Francisco Moreno, Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion at UAHS, served as co-Chairs of the search, and Dr. Laura Hunter was the administrative lead. The DCC was actively involved in the search, interviewed the candidates and stated that the person hired would work closely with the DCC. The DCC was asked to give its recommendations to Provost Andrew Comrie, who made the final decision.

The Diversity Task Force:

The decentralized approach to diversity leadership is also exemplified in President Hart’s 2016 decision to create a “Diversity Task Force” in response to a “demand letter” that was sent to the President and her senior leadership team by several student organizations who had complaints about the University’s approach to diversity and inclusion and its impact upon UA students. Although the University was already in a search process for a Vice Provost and had entrusted the diversity leadership functions to the Office of the Provost, the President created a Presidential Task Force composed of three co-chairs, Dr. Javier Duran, Director of the Confluence Center, Dr. Bryan Carter, Associate Director of Africana Studies, and Tanya Gaxxiola, Assistant Vice President for Community Relations, to advise the UA Senior Leadership Team on how to approach the demands. The co-Chairs worked with Lynn Nadel, who was then Chair of the Faculty Senate, and the Team conducted a “listening tour” throughout the University, and also created several sub-Committees to address the respective grievances.

The Diversity Task Force was a short term response to an immediate crisis. The leaders of the Task Force were extraordinary individuals, and any one of them could have easily filled the role of Vice Provost. It is astonishing to see the number of campus constituents who were engaged by the Task Force within a very short time frame. The work of the Task Force was very important because it represents a thorough evaluation of the concerns of the students. In fact, the Diversity Task Force operated strategically as a campus engagement process on diversity and inclusion, which is often recommended as a first step toward articulating a Diversity

and Inclusion Strategic Plan. The work of this Task Force, however, was restricted to the student demands, and did not extend into other aspects of diversity and inclusion on campus. In addition, the Task Force Report was only advisory in nature, presumably intended to inform President Hart on what she ought to do in order to appease the students. A Draft Diversity Task Force Recommendation Report was circulated internally in January 2017, followed by a Diversity Task Force Recommendations Prioritizations Report dated March 14, 2017. The Task Force Report is quite lengthy, but it was not well understood by the campus community and was not publicized broadly. By the time it was released, President Hart had resigned. The administrative response to the Summary and Prioritization document was vague and ineffective, likely due to the transitions in senior leadership.

The Vice Provost/CDO Role and Shared Governance Structure:

The 2016 search for a Vice Provost of Diversity and Inclusion culminated with the hire of Dr. Jesus Trevino as a full-time Vice Provost for Diversity and Inclusion and Senior Diversity Officer. Provost Andrew Comrie asked me to take a temporary appointment as his Special Advisor for Diversity and Inclusion, and stated that some of the leadership functions might transition to the Office of the President, so he wanted flexibility and would re-design the role after a year. He promised to honor my primary wish, which was to work on institutional inclusion as an aspect of the academic and intellectual enterprise, and also afford me the time to do my scholarship and teaching. He stated that Dr. Trevino would be the “boots on the ground” administrator with daily responsibility for trainings and workshops and meetings, while I would work with him on the design of inclusive excellence at UA. In August 2016, I joined the University of Arizona as a tenured Professor of Law, Regents Professor, and Special Advisor to the Provost for Diversity and Inclusion.²⁶

Between the time that I joined the UA in 2016 and now, President Ann Hart resigned and President Robbins was appointed in 2017 as President. In early spring 2018, Provost Comrie resigned and Jeff Goldberg assumed the role of Interim Provost. In late spring 2018, Dr. Jesus Trevino vacated his Office and that position was never filled. Dr. Trevino did a great deal of work, including establishing the Office for Diversity and Inclusive Excellence (ODIEX), but the Vice Provost role was not well-integrated into the structure of the University. When Dr. Trevino departed in spring 2018, no one understood the functions or responsibilities of his Office, and there was no public announcement of a transition plan. My Special Advisor role, which had been created to be temporary, was never part of the public announcements made during the 2016-17 academic year and so campus constituents had no idea what the division of responsibilities was. My name and title was posted on the website, so I fielded many questions from campus and external constituents. I

²⁶ My Special Advisor role was created through a 9 month faculty academic contract, teaching a 2/3 course load at the law school and spending 1/3 of my time on administrative activities related to Diversity and Inclusion and reporting to the Provost.

worked closely with Javier Duran and Helena Rodrigues, who served as co-Chairs of the Diversity Coordinating Council and were recognized campus leaders, as the third member of an ad hoc “diversity and inclusion triage team.”

None of us was integrated into the Senior Leadership Team, so we did our work as a matter of default, trying to manage the concerns of campus constituents. I had very little contact with the Office of the Provost after Provost Comrie resigned, but I believe that the administrative authority over diversity and inclusion continued to be managed by the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. Laura Hunter held a dual appointment, working half-time with Faculty Affairs and half-time with ODIEX. After Vice Provost Trevino left UA, Vice Provost Miller recommended the promotion of two talented UA staff members to fill the void. Teresa Graham-Brett was an Associate Dean of students working on inclusion and multicultural engagement and overseeing the multicultural student Centers. Teresa had played an important role on the Task Force, and she filled many needs related to the student services component of diversity and inclusion. In addition, she had extensive prior experience with institutional inclusion, including developing trainings for faculty. In Fall 2018, Provost Goldberg upgraded Teresa Graham Brett’s position to Assistant Vice Provost, and she took over the leadership of ODIEX and developed a collateral structure for the cultural centers, as the Office of Inclusion and Multicultural Engagement (IME). Marla Franco, who was also recommended by Vice Provost Miller, was appointed as Assistant Vice Provost for Hispanic Serving Institution Initiatives. Both individuals are extremely well-qualified for their positions, and both could serve in more senior positions should that opportunity arise.

The Changing Roles of the Diversity Offices and DCC:

In the summer of 2018, Interim Provost Jeff Goldberg and President Robbins informally asked me to take the lead on the recommendations that Javier, Helena and I had presented to them in April 2018, which would have entailed significant outreach to campus constituents and an articulated role for the DCC. Our recommendations in the April 27 memo were to (1) centralize leadership of diversity and inclusion within the Office of the President, given the importance of the new Strategic Plan; (2) to map institutional capacity and identify challenges to inclusion, working collaboratively with the DCC, ODIEX, and leaders who had served as part of the Task Force; and (3) develop and implement accountability structures including structures to coordinate efforts of President and Provost, and mechanisms to ensure that institutional compliance goals are met.

In July 2018, President Robbins announced my new title as Associate Vice President for Diversity Initiatives at the Quarterly Leadership meeting. In October 2018, Jeff Goldberg told me that a decision had been made to keep my appointment within the Office of the Provost, but upgrade my administrative position to a Vice Provost level. This required me to give up my teaching duties for the spring 2019 semester. My appointment became effective at the end of October 2018, and I was busy with the demands of my faculty position through December. At the beginning of January

2019, Jeff Goldberg advised me that President Robbins had decided to shift the leadership functions to the Office of the President and had appointed Ron Wilson as Vice President of the newly created Office of Equity and Inclusion. Consequently, my role continued to be that of Special Advisor to the Provost, but in an upgraded position that allowed me access to the Provost's Council and Dean's Council.

The DCC continued to meet during the Spring 2019 semester, but there was a lack of clarity on what the DCC's role was, in relation to the new developments. Similarly, the Faculty Senate hoped to schedule an announcement and discussion of the University's new diversity and inclusion structure but there was too much change and uncertainty to do this during the spring 2019 semester.

UA Critical Incident Response Team:

In the first week of June 2019, President Robbins assembled a strategic task force of various "Designated Responsible Individuals" following a campus crisis incident in April involving federal Customs and Border Protection Agency Officers and students on the UA campus.²⁷ That event triggered a "Campus Conversation" with President Robbins, mediated by several UA administrators and faculty, and attended by students and other campus constituents. During this "listening session," campus constituents had the ability to voice their concerns, and Jeff Goldberg made several promises of corrective action on behalf of the UA. This event led to the creation of an administrative task force under the leadership of Jon Dudas, Senior Vice President, and Celina Ramirez, Chief Compliance Officer. The President outlined 9 areas of specific attention, each under the leadership of a UA staff and/or faculty member. Importantly, many of these areas are the same as areas of institutional competence for diversity and inclusion (identified above under the NADOHE statement), such as "diversity and inclusion training for senior and other campus leaders," identifying a "structure and protocols for ongoing response to campus climate issues," and support for "immigrant students" to "ensure inclusion on campus."

The University of Arizona currently has centralized leadership over the student services and equity compliance components of DEI under the Office of the President. I am unclear whether the titles of Kendal Washington White and Teresa Graham Brett will also shift (last year they were within the Office of the Provost structure). The DCC is the University's advisory council on Diversity and Inclusion, and that body is chartered to report to the Provost. However, the Critical Incident Response Team is charged with various functions of diversity and inclusion that are central to campus environment concerns, and that task force is led by senior staff within the Office of the President. There is a need to bring the various components of DEI

²⁷ Email dated 6/3/19 from UA President entitled "Supporting Our Students" and directed to various campus constituents identifying the need to centralize objectives and implement policies through the formation of the "Designated Responsible Individual" appointed to oversee each of 9 objectives.

together within an integrated structure that allows the President and Provost to exercise appropriate leadership, and also clearly identifies the respective DEI leadership portfolios for the campus community. The website under construction by Celina Ramirez will provide an excellent opportunity to communicate the new structure and leadership responsibilities to the campus community and external constituents.

Summary:

The University of Arizona continues to follow a distributed model of diversity leadership, at least at the internal level. There is an apparent structure, located within the Office of the President, but it will continue to be challenging for the University to identify shared goals and track institutional progress toward Inclusion unless there is further integration of the UA Mission, Strategic Plan, and a coordinated approach between the offices and entities that currently reside or are titled as belonging within the Office of the Provost and the new structures located under the Office of the President.

The UA currently has an excellent opportunity to define a more functional and efficient model of diversity leadership. To accomplish this, the University will be required to engage the historical and current practices and commit to an intentional design for the future. The University will also need to communicate this very clearly to the campus community, including the Faculty Senate, the Diversity Coordinating Council, and the various community and student groups that have concerns about the University's approach to diversity and inclusion. Without a clear and articulated leadership structure, it will be virtually impossible to institute accountability mechanisms.

III. Creating a Blueprint for the Future: Building Institutional Capacity

In 2009, President Barack Obama spoke to Congress about funding for higher education, stating that: "in a global economy, where the most valuable skill you can sell is your knowledge, a good education is no longer just a pathway to opportunity, it is a prerequisite." President Obama noted that $\frac{3}{4}$ of the fastest growing occupations require higher education, and yet the United States has one of the highest high school drop out rates of any industrialized nation, and "half of the students who begin college never finish."

These are very real aspects of what it means to live in Arizona.²⁸ Most high school graduates in Arizona do not meet the prerequisites for admission to one of the three

²⁸ I currently serve as the UA representative for the Arizona Minority Education Policy Analysis Center, and when I was Vice Provost at ASU, I was also a member of AMEPAC. The information in this paragraph is demonstrated by the 2016 and 2018 Arizona Minority Student Progress Report, as well as the new Developmental Education Report issued by AMEPAC. I summarized that work for Provost Comrie

state Universities. Many of Arizona's students are at community colleges and tribal colleges, and many students (including those at one of the three Universities), will have academic deficiencies requiring remediation. This need for additional "developmental education" may increase the years required for a student to complete their Bachelor's degree by a significant margin. Many students will not finish their Bachelor's degree program. The disparities are particularly notable for Latinx, African American, and Native American students.

The University of Arizona has an opportunity to create the institutional match between its ambitious mission, embedded in the new Strategic Plan, and its commitment to diversity and inclusion that will result in "inclusive excellence." With that lofty goal in mind, the final section of this memorandum highlights the University's institutional strengths, discusses how those strengths map onto the primary goals within the Strategic Plan, and offers a commentary on what is needed to build the institutional capacity to achieve inclusive excellence.

A. Institutional Strengths and Growth Areas:

The University of Arizona has multiple strengths and areas of excellence, illustrated by the overall excellence of the University's academic units, many of which are highly ranked nationally. The University has significant faculty excellence, a successful research enterprise, and a number of unique institutes and centers that build on regional strengths, including the Environmental and Natural Resources School, and the College of Agriculture, which is supported by a separate funding source from the State of Arizona, and has an important and distinctive community extension function that enhances the University's public service mission. The University houses many innovative programs, centers and Institutes, and some of these have a strong diversity mission, such as the Indigenous Peoples' Law and Policy Program at the College of Law, and the Confluence Center.

Many of the University's areas of excellence correspond to the needs of tribal communities and Latino communities, which have long been regarded as central constituents of the diversity mission. This is also true of the University's Medical Schools in Phoenix and Tucson, which serve a diverse population and seek to meet the challenges of health disparities among Native and Hispanic populations in the Southwest. The Arizona Health Sciences units are leaders on health disparities research, and the University is rightfully proud of this legacy to the people of Arizona. The fit with other diverse groups is often obscured, and that was a theme in a recent meeting with the African American Community Council when the leaders of the Council commented that they couldn't "see themselves" in the Strategic Plan. In addition, the UA Global model occupies a separate Pillar in the Strategic Plan, and yet is a natural fit for diversity and inclusion. Increasingly, the domestic "diversity" issues are aligned with the global issues, providing an opportunity to foster new

and Interim Provost Goldberg, and can do so for Provost Folks if that would be of help. A new representative for AMEPAC will be required after I leave UA.

knowledge and understanding about the centrality of “diversity” and “inclusion” to human societies.

Student diversity:

The University of Arizona has increased its student diversity significantly, and it recently became a “Hispanic Serving Institution,” for purposes of U.S. Department of Education grant criteria, in recognition that 25% of the student body is Hispanic and a significant percent of these students comes from underserved communities, as measured by Pell Grant eligibility.

The University of Arizona has traditionally graduated the highest number of Native American Ph.D. students in the country, and the UA is nationally known for its Native American STEM Ph.D. graduates. The UA has one of the two Ph.D. programs in the nation in American Indian Studies, and for many years, it was widely regarded as having the leading AIS Program in the country. Many of the graduates of the University of Arizona have been hired into academic positions nationally, and there are actually several who are now at Arizona State University, as well as some who are at the University of Arizona.

The campus has traditionally had a higher enrollment of Native American students than most universities in the country, and a history of serving Native communities through its cooperative extension programs, health sciences programs, law programs, and educational programs. The campus has robust programs in American Indian Studies, Mexican American Studies, Africana Studies, Women and Gender Studies, and a host of other diversity-oriented academic programs (including Transgender Studies). The University of Arizona has significant numbers of Asian American students, and there is momentum to create an Asian American Studies Program. The University has an Africana Studies Program, though it lags behind peer institutions on the numbers of African American students.

The University of Arizona operates several student centers for each of the diverse student populations. This tailored approach to multicultural student diversity is unusual. For example, Arizona State University enfolded student diversity into “Culture at ASU” programming, which is open to all student groups. Only American Indian Student Support Services is a stand-alone program, in part because of the different pools of federal funding that support many of those students.

The Hispanic Advancement Initiative and Native American Advancement Initiative are natural growth areas within the new Strategic Plan, which will enable greater faculty diversity, student success, and foster the creation of relevant knowledge and community partnerships. As mentioned above, it is less obvious where the issues of the African American community and Asian American community “fit” within the Strategic Plan, and that issue was identified by the DCC during the planning process, but the new faculty leaders of Pillar 3 are well-positioned to develop these goals within the Strategic Plan.

Faculty diversity:

Although there is room to grow, the faculty diversity at the University of Arizona is notable, particularly at the Assistant Professor level. The faculty of color at UA are incredibly talented and very dedicated to the students. Many of these faculty members belong to the Professors of Color Association on campus, led by Dr. Nolan Cabrera, a faculty member at the Center for the Study of Higher Education. The Native American Faculty Association has a vibrant and diverse membership in terms of disciplinary training and tribal backgrounds.²⁹ The Native American Faculty Association is led by Professors Karletta Chief, Francine Gachupin, Stephanie Rainie, and Ron Trosper. Collectively, the UA Native Faculty represent the Health Sciences, STEM disciplines, and Law, and Education, as well as the social science disciplines that correlate to American Indian Studies. Similarly, the Latinx faculty is incredibly diverse in terms of disciplinary training and they play a major role for the growing population of Latinx students at UA. To my knowledge the Latinx faculty and African American faculty do not have separate faculty associations. However, many of the Latinx and African American faculty belong to the Minority Women Faculty organization on campus, as do Native American and Asian faculty members. The diversity faculty groups do not have a formal place within the shared governance structure, and this is an item for further institutional development of inclusion.

The University must take concrete steps to recruit faculty into the majors that are serving a large portion of the student body. Some UA departments do not have any faculty of color on the tenure track, and in some departments there are not even contract faculty of color. The University should gather data by school and department and see which units lack faculty diversity, and how student diversity is represented within the various majors and disciplines. The University should engage in a data-driven assessment of student success and develop a plan to meet its target goals. It is important to evaluate the multiple factors that facilitate student success, particularly for students from underrepresented groups.

In addition, the University should consciously monitor the retention and promotion of faculty. There is a perception that the University does not do enough to retain senior faculty of color, and that it does not foster their advancement within the academic leadership structure. An analysis of data will show whether or not those perceptions are accurate.

There is a great deal of literature on faculty diversity and leadership that could be very useful to the University if a conscious effort is made to create new initiatives

²⁹ University of Arizona Native Faculty Overview document presented to President Robbins on July 9, 2019, and listing goals and purpose of organization, as well as membership roster with bios.

and policies.³⁰ There is also literature on the problems that are associated with lack of diversity within University faculties. For example, the problems of stereotyping, bias and “tokens” are often found in departments where there are very few faculty members of color.³¹ Intersectionality (e.g. race and gender) is another aspect of faculty diversity that must be analyzed.³² I know that Dr. Romero is familiar with this literature and I believe that she will create opportunities for the University to explore best practices on faculty hiring, retention and promotion. We are very fortunate to have Dr. Romero as our Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs.

The Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs is the only Office on campus that has access to data regarding faculty recruitment, promotion, and retention. Due to confidentiality issues, this data is not shared, and therefore various faculty groups and community councils are suspicious about whether the UA is making progress or is in a time of retrenchment. Various instruments have been used to assess organizational health and faculty satisfaction, and these instruments indicated climate issues for minority faculty. Dr. Romero recently held several meetings with UA faculty designed to follow up on climate issues, and this is an excellent and innovative contribution. Dr. Romero has the position, knowledge and credibility to bring faculty and administrators together on these issues.

Town Halls:

Over the past year, Dr. Jessica Summers, a Professor of Education and Chair of the Faculty Senate, has created a space for faculty and staff engagement as part of her commitment to diversity and inclusion. The Town Halls have allowed University constituents to share their views on diversity and inclusion. I believe that Dr. Summers has collected data from the Town Halls and her findings will be very useful as the UA redesigns its approach to DEI.

Diversity Coordinating Council:

The Diversity Coordinating Council is composed of many senior staff leaders on campus, as well as a handful of faculty, who have expertise on diversity and inclusion. The DCC continues to serve as the primary structure for collective action on diversity and inclusion at UA. DCC members are incredibly dedicated professionals who possess valuable knowledge about diversity and inclusion. Many have long histories of institutional leadership. Although the membership is high capacity and meetings are well-attended, I saw very limited interaction (once or twice per year) between the Provost and the DCC. Major events occurred campus

³⁰ See, e.g., Joann Moody, *Faculty Diversity: Removing the Barriers* (2nd edition 2012); Mack et al (eds), *Mentoring Faculty of Color* (2013); Karen A. Longman and Susan R. Madsen, (eds), *Women and Leadership in Higher Education* (2014).

³¹ See, e.g., Gabriella Gutierrez y Muhs et al., *Presumed Incompetent: The Intersections of Race and Class for Women in Academia* (2012).

³² *Id.*

(such as the departure of Dr. Trevino) without any engagement with between the senior leadership and the DCC.

One of the most valuable functions of the DCC is to provide a place for members to share frustrations and observations, and to gain information by this mechanism. Yet, there is no way for the DCC to effectuate change because their role is purely advisory and any engagement with the Office of the Provost or President is sporadic. I have not seen the DCC's work shared with SPBAC or any other shared governance group. If the work is not shared outside the DCC, then the entity will have little value for institutional inclusion. This is an area to address, particularly because the DCC currently reports to the Provost, while the portfolio of DEI has been moved to the Office of the President.

B. Building Institutional Capacity:

With reference to the four goals that were identified by Damon Williams' research as essential to the success of a University's diversity mission, I would like to comment and make recommendations for the Provost and President to consider.

1) Achieve access and equity for underrepresented groups, including students, staff, administrators and faculty.

This appears to be a primary focus area for the new Office of Inclusion and Equity. The Office will need access to the relevant data for each group in order to assess the current status of "access" and "equity." Dr. Romero will have key data on faculty diversity. The University's Compliance Office and Title IX officials will also play key roles in the overall assessment. I am not sure how the respective functions are currently aligned, but this is a key need for the University and should be a goal for this year.

2) Create a multicultural and inclusive environment for the entire campus community

Campus environment is important and the assessment tools to measure campus climate among students, faculty and staff should be carefully tailored to the group and the Institutional culture. The University has done broad assessments (e.g. COACHE survey, Organization Health Index survey), and it should now measure the data gathered in the past with the most recent data to see what progress has been made. Campus environment issues are interpreted differently among groups. Jessica Summers and Andrea Romero are making significant steps to assess campus climate, and I believe that Kendal Washington White also conducts routine climate assessments for UA undergraduate and graduate students. It would be a good idea to form a campus climate assessment team to ensure that there is adequate knowledge of faculty, staff and student experiences, but there are currently very good people in charge of this process and there are many positive indicators for success. This is another area where alignment among different offices and

initiatives will be needed to collect the relevant data and make effective recommendations.

3) Enhance domestic and international research and scholarship around diversity issues

In my view, this goal is the key to achieving “inclusive excellence” within a Research I University, and yet it is the area that receives the least attention from campus administrators. In many spaces, even raising this issue causes profound confusion and elicits a puzzled look or question: “So, how *exactly* does intellectual scholarship and disciplinary knowledge interface with diversity and inclusion?” At most universities, “diversity and inclusion” is relegated to the domain of “difference” and “disparity,” and often associated negatively with the “demands” or criticisms of particular groups. I believe that this is one reason why institutions are reluctant to be transparent with their data and internal assessments. When climate assessments reveal differences that appear to track race or gender, there are often “defensive” responses by University administrators.

In fact, issues of diversity and inclusion are some of the most complex and challenging issues that we face as a national and global society. I am fascinated, for example, with the discussion of embedded patterns of bias in machine learning technologies and artificial intelligence. I came to UA with high aspirations for what could be achieved here in relation to inclusion and the University’s knowledge enterprise, having read, for example, about UA’s innovative programming on the philosophy and science of consciousness, as well as Dr. Andrew Weil’s integrative approach to medicine, which embraces diverse healing modalities. As an ASU faculty member, I attended many conferences and events with UA faculty, and I personally witnessed the transformational work of the UA faculty in the disciplines of Philosophy, Education, American Indian Studies, Mexican American Studies, and the Law.

When I arrived at UA, I was certain that innovative programming across disciplines could occur here and that was a very attractive feature of this University. Unfortunately, I never got the opportunity to connect with these amazing programs and faculty within the intellectual space of inclusive excellence, and that has been a huge disappointment. I cannot think of another University with this incredibly robust intellectual capacity. Yet, as I met with campus constituents to engage discussions, I could see how the notion of “diversity and inclusion” was marginalized from the central academic mission of many units, and was even denigrated within some disciplines that could be fostering innovation. Some units are engaged in transdisciplinary research and are committed to fostering inclusive excellence, and this is very exciting. Yet, this is not true of all units. Siloes and hierarchies persist at UA, and knowledge that could foster inclusion is sometimes marginalized and denigrated as “anti-intellectual.”

Of course, the new Strategic Plan offers multiple opportunities to recast this dynamic. I hope that the UA will take advantage of its intellectual resources and do this.

4) Prepare all students to engage and diverse and international global society.

The student diversity at UA is a rich and impressive resource, and we should be able to provide this level of education to our students. At the moment, there are options for students to join organizations and learn about diversity, and they can select among electives that might foster this knowledge. However, to really achieve the goal would require an intentional restructuring of the General Education requirements, an intentional effort to diversify the curriculum of traditional academic disciplines, and a commitment to bring thought leaders to campus, to interact with faculty and students. We must educate by example and the project of inclusion operates on many different levels.

Universities, as institutions of higher learning, have the responsibility to develop their knowledge enterprise and transfer that knowledge to students. We care about access. We care about equity. But do we really understand what type of knowledge our students need and are we committed to delivering the type of knowledge that would *actually* enable students to engage respectfully with a diverse and international global society? In my view, if we cannot meet goal number #3 above, we probably cannot achieve goal #4. So, the best approach to inclusive excellence is to work, consciously and intentionally, on each goal, with the realization that all are necessary to achieve the desired transformation.

I will transition from the discussion of these higher order goals into a final discussion of concrete “next steps” that can take place immediately.

C. Final Recommendations Specific to UA:

1. Build a positive presence for DEI on the UA Campus, explaining to the campus community how the various functions of diversity and inclusion are organized under the new structure and which leaders are charged with the various aspects of the DEI portfolio. The compliance, campus environment, and student services functions appear to be within the Office of the President. Faculty diversity, academic program development, and the intellectual mission of the University are likely to remain with the Office of the Provost. There must be careful articulation between the Office of the President and Provost to avoid gaps in leadership or inconsistency.
2. Clearly identify the main findings of the 2016 Task Force and embed this within the current functions and structure of diversity and inclusion. With every campus crisis event or discussion of change, there is a tendency for campus constituents to return to a “grievance” mode, highlighting findings of

the Task Force that were never addressed or resolved. It would be best to create a clear integration of the primary findings and recommendations of the Task Force into the new structure as goals, commitments, or initiatives. A public acknowledgement of the work of Task Force members should also occur.

3. Harness the intellectual momentum of the Strategic Plan and involve academic units in an intellectual discussion of the opportunities and capacity for building scholarship, research, and new knowledge. This can happen, for example, by creating “themes” for campus exploration, by creating a President’s Lecture Series featuring invited thought leaders and engaging campus discussants, and by offering departments and units seed funding for interdisciplinary engagement.
4. Create a master calendar of events that is accessible to every campus constituent and highlights the relevant themes, which will increase attendance and decrease the conflicts that continue to occur on the UA campus.
5. Create an integrated and positive website presence for inclusion, highlighting campus leaders, community leaders, positive events, feature messages of encouragement to students and other campus constituents.
6. Create a way for the Diversity Community Councils to engage campus constituents. Their collective experience is an extraordinary resource, but most campus constituents lack knowledge that they even exist. I doubt that most faculty or Deans would know about the strategic plans that they have developed, and yet this is vital information for programmatic development.
7. Determine the best placement for the DCC and allow the DCC to serve a structured role on campus. The Council is high capacity but under-utilized at the present time.
8. Bring diversity and inclusion into the forefront of who we are as a University, and openly acknowledge and involve the various campus constituents who have knowledge relevant to current issues.³³ The UA has incredible resources to deal with many issues, but often seems hesitant to acknowledge this publicly.

³³ For example, when the April incident involving the Customs and Border Protection agents occurred, the UA Institute for Civil Discourse was not visibly engaged on the Tucson campus, although a collateral initiative was organized that involved the UA Institute and some faculty members from the three Arizona universities. I found out about this in Phoenix from colleagues at ASU.

Conclusion:

I am honored to have had the opportunity to work with the UA faculty, staff and students over the past three years. Although my role was purely advisory, it was an incredible learning experience to be part of the UA, and I have a much better understanding of institutional inclusion than I did prior to joining UA. I have studied and worked on issues related to diversity, equity and inclusion for over 5 years, both at ASU and at UA. I now appreciate the larger dimensions of institutional inclusion within the state universities, the federal and state agencies we work with, and the private corporations that drive innovation and economic development in Arizona.

The new UA Strategic Plan aspires to solve “the world’s grand challenges” and leverage Arizona’s “unique assets and diversity” as a competitive advantage. I love those aspirations and believe in them. I also recognize that these lofty goals will require the University to come into conformity with the best practices for DEI. The UA has many areas of excellence and it has made excellent hires in key leadership positions. The University of Arizona is now in an excellent position to innovate change with respect to diversity, equity, and inclusion.