

University of Michigan School of Education
**Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion
Statement and Strategic Plan**



TABLE OF CONTENTS

A Statement of Institutional Commitments	1
The Strategic Plan.....	3
DIVERSIFYING WHO WE ARE	3
Our Students	3
Teacher Certification Programs	3
Master's and Doctoral Programs	6
Strategies/Actions	8
Recruitment	8
Admissions	10
Financial Aid and Scholarships	10
Student Support and Retention	11
Our Faculty.....	12
Strategies/Actions	13
Our Staff.....	14
Strategies/Actions	15
CULTIVATING INCLUSIVE CURRICULAR AND PEDAGOGICAL PRACTICES.....	16
Strategies/Actions	19
FACILITATING AN EQUITABLE AND INCLUSIVE ENVIRONMENT	21
Strategies/Actions	22
SECURING AND SUSTAINING THE REQUISITE LEADERSHIP	23
Strategies/Actions	24
STAGING, IMPLEMENTING, AND ASSESSING THE OUTCOMES.....	25
TABLES.....	26
TABLE 1: KEY MILESTONES, PROCESSES, AND INTENDED OUTCOMES	26
TABLE 2: DIVERSIFYING WHO WE ARE.....	33
TABLE 3: CULTIVATING INCLUSIVE CURRICULAR AND PEDAGOGICAL PRACTICES.....	35
TABLE 4: FACILITATING AN EQUITABLE AND INCLUSIVE ENVIRONMENT	37
ENDNOTES	38
REFERENCES	41

Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion: A Statement of Institutional Commitments

At the School of Education, our effort to study and improve educational practice is inseparable from our determination to develop more effective and socially just systems of education. This mission is grounded in our commitment to promote diversity and to advance equity and inclusion.

As an organization, we value and seek to increase diversity along many dimensions, including race and ethnicity, gender and gender expression, socioeconomic status, sexual orientation, language, national origin, country of citizenship, religious commitment, age, and (dis)ability status. 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 to promote and extend opportunities and outcomes for members of all groups that have been historically marginalized by these profound inequalities. It is central to that mission to ensure that each member of our community has full opportunity to thrive in our environment, for we believe that diversity is key both to individual flourishing and to the advancement of knowledge. We know that without a vibrant community of people who identify as members of these groups, we cannot progress as a school. We also recognize that without building critical mass of these groups among our students, staff, and faculty, difference can be isolating rather than productive.

We commit to developing the institutional mechanisms and social norms necessary to ensure that differences are respected, welcomed, and used to support individuals' flourishing and to advance our collective aims. The pursuit of equity entails institutionalizing policies and practices that facilitate the school's ability to recruit a highly qualified and robustly diverse community of students, faculty, and staff. The pursuit of inclusion entails both removing barriers to and providing support and encouragement for full participation of all community members in our collective work.

Principles of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion

The following principles guide the School of Education's efforts to promote diversity, equity, and inclusion:

- the diversity of our faculty, students, and staff should reflect the character and contours of our demographically diverse society and should be leveraged to develop the knowledge, interventions, and teaching and learning practices necessary for challenging entrenched educational and social inequalities;
- each member of our community (students, faculty, staff) should be recognized both as an individual with distinct talents, perspectives, and insights, and as a member of social groups who have benefited from or been disadvantaged by historical and contemporary power inequalities;
- our practices and policies must ensure the full inclusion and empowerment of persons who identify as members of historically disenfranchised groups, and must also cultivate among all community members shared competencies, sensitivities, and habits of mind fundamental to building an equitable and inclusive school environment;
- diversity of identity, culture, perspective, language, and mode of expression should be protected and actively cultivated in our research, curricular, pedagogical, and work activities;
- informal and professional interactions within the school or in relation to school business should enable courageous, respectful, and civil discourse across differences in opinion, perspective, identity, and power status;
- our institutional responsibility to enact these principles of diversity, equity, and inclusion requires that each of us—individual faculty, staff, and students—contribute to an environment that supports the learning and interactions necessary for the effective, socially just education that we seek.

Actions in Support of the Principles of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion

In order to realize our principles, the School of Education will, in a manner that is consistent with the law:

- expect school leaders to assume responsibility for coordinating and implementing practices that are aligned with our commitment to promoting diversity and to advancing equity and inclusion as core school priorities;
- make available opportunities to learn and to develop in ways that support each of us in living and enacting the school's commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion;
- develop and refine processes that seek to increase the diversity of our faculty, students, and staff;
- establish practices and policies that make visible, discourage, and restoratively respond to acts of discrimination, harassment, or personal abuse based on institutional status or social group identity;
- promote generous listening and the assumption that people are well intentioned and are doing the best they know how at a time;
- sensitize members of our community to the ways that seemingly innocent utterances or gestures may be experienced as insulting or demeaning by others whether or not such an effect was intentional;
- allocate significant time and resources to enhance our curriculum and pedagogical approaches to reflect and further strengthen the school's commitment to the roles of diversity, equity, and inclusion in the teaching and learning process; and
- identify systematic ways to monitor, regularly measure, and publicly document our progress in achieving our goals for diversity, equity, and inclusion.

Our responsibility as a School of Education is critical because we know that education can be a force for combatting social injustice and that it is key to advancing knowledge, facilitating understanding, and recognizing every group's humanity. We will act with deliberateness and humility as we seek to respect and leverage diversity, ensure equity, and promote inclusion. And we will build an inclusive learning and work environment by: eradicating unjust practices that undermine institutional access; dismantling day-to-day expressions of discrimination; removing barriers that deny the optimization of efficacy and potential; and facilitating individual, professional, and institutional growth.

Through these efforts we will celebrate and champion together what makes us distinct and find common threads that join us in our quest for excellence.

Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion: The Strategic Plan

The purpose of the School of Education's (SOE's) Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Strategic Plan (referred herein as the Plan) is to provide faculty, staff, and students with a framework and charge to prioritize, develop, and implement actions necessary to realize the commitments outlined in the school's diversity, equity, and inclusion statement. The Plan delineates three areas in which we will deliberately focus our efforts: 1) diversifying who we are; 2) cultivating inclusive curricular and pedagogical practices; and 3) facilitating an equitable and inclusive environment. The Plan also outlines the critical role of leadership in sustaining this agenda.

The SOE's diversity, equity, and inclusion statement indicates that the responsibility to enact our principles of diversity, equity, and inclusion in order to support our efforts in the areas listed above must be owned by all the members of our community. Our assumption of shared ownership and responsibility is not meant to be a declaration of consensus or unanimity among the individual members of our community. Instead, it represents a commitment of the school as an organization and institution. Thus, the framework for action that is outlined in the Plan will be enacted via the institutional norms, practices, and policies of the school, implemented in compliance with the law, and monitored for its consistent adherence to the principles of diversity, equity, and inclusion.

DIVERSIFYING WHO WE ARE

The SOE seeks to diversify its students, faculty, and staff in a manner that reflects the characteristics and contours of our demographically diverse society and for the purpose of realizing our institutional mission. The SOE currently falls short in realizing this principle as we have struggled with uneven success in our efforts to diversify our students, faculty, and staff. We are, therefore, stymied in our efforts to fully accrue the compelling educational and social benefits that derive from a diverse learning and work environment. We outline below how this is the case for each constituent group and why and how we will work to grow and affirm the diversity of our core constituencies.

Our Students¹

Teacher Certification Programs

Both men and persons of color are substantially underrepresented in our elementary certification programs and the racial and gender diversity of these programs has actually decreased over time.² Greater racial and gender diversity has been achieved in our secondary certification programs.³ This is especially the case in the secondary undergraduate program, where the proportion of men interns^{*} parallels the proportion of men in the secondary teaching force and the proportion of underrepresented minority (URM) interns is on an upward trajectory. The overall enrollment of URMs in our Master of Arts with Certification (MAC) program, nevertheless, remains nominal, and men of color are particularly underrepresented in all of our certification programs.

The socioeconomic diversity of our teacher certification programs also falls far shy of our ambitions. Using the enrollment of first generation college goers as one key measure of the socioeconomic diversity of these programs, we note that the percentage of first generation college students enrolled in our undergraduate teacher certification programs has generally been in the low single digits and has typically been less than the percentage of first generation students in the University of Michigan's (U-M's) undergraduate population as a whole.⁴ Although our MAC programs have generally evidenced greater

^{*}In our school pre-service teachers are referred to as "interns." As such, this nomenclature will be used throughout the document to refer to those students in our teacher certification programs.

socioeconomic diversity than our undergraduate programs, the percentage of first generation college goers in our MAC programs has declined over time.⁵

We also fail to recruit a linguistically diverse body of students. With the exclusion of those students who are seeking teacher certification in world languages, few students in our programs are fluent in a language other than English and especially lack fluency in those languages that are frequently spoken by English language learners in Michigan (i.e., Spanish, Arabic, Chaldean, Hmong, Albanian) or in the nation as a whole (i.e., Spanish, Chinese, French/Haitian Creole, Hmong, Vietnamese, Cantonese, Arabic, Somali, Tagalog).

Diversifying our student body is a professional imperative for the SOE. We, therefore, seek to optimize, consistent with the law, the diversity of our teacher certification programs along the range of dimensions we value (i.e., race, gender, socioeconomic status, linguistic status, gender expression, sexual orientation, (dis)ability status, religion).[†] Some of these dimensions of diversity—namely race, gender, socioeconomic, and linguistic diversity—not only mark stark divides in students’ educational outcomes and opportunities but also correspond with profound demographic shifts in the U.S. school-age population and delimit especially salient divides between the demographic characteristics of teachers and students in our nation’s schools. By strategically working to diversify our interns in terms of race, gender, socioeconomic background, and linguistic status, we will help narrow the extant demographic divide between U.S. teachers and students and make important headway in establishing the requisite social conditions for enhancing the professional preparation of all our interns.

Narrowing the Demographic Divide Between Teachers and Students

The demographics of the U.S. teaching force depart considerably from that of the U.S. school-age population. This demographic divide is especially evident along racial lines. Nationally, students of color make up more than 40% of the public school population, but teachers of color constitute only 17% of the teaching force. Although every state evidences a demographic divide between its students and teachers (Boser, 2011, p. 7), these gaps are particularly stark in large states. For example, in California 75% of the students are students of color but only 25% of the teachers are persons of color. Similarly in Texas, approximately two-thirds of the student body reflects students of color, but only one-third of the teaching force reflects persons of color (Boser, 2011). “More than 20 states have gaps of 25 percentage points or more between the diversity of their teacher and student populations” (Boser, 2011, p. 8). Our home state of Michigan registers a gap of 22 percentage points, with 29% of the students being persons of color and 7% of the teaching force being persons of color.

Demographic divides between students are not only evidenced along racial lines. English language learners constitute the fastest growing population in the U.S.; however, few U.S. teachers are fluent in a language other than English. Similarly, the number of students who live in poverty remains on the rise, while the typical U.S. teacher is born into middle class circumstances. Additionally, our schools must also effectively serve the children of undocumented residents or those children who are themselves undocumented. Although some school systems and preparation programs are taking advantage of the Development, Relief, and Education for Alien Minors (DREAM) Act and Deferred Action for Childhood Arrival (DACA) to train and employ teachers whose backgrounds or referents are aligned with that of undocumented residents, few teachers currently share these backgrounds and referents.

These gaps create two major problems, both of which are crucial to address. One problem is that minoritized students in this country rarely have teachers who look like them or who might share their

[†] Our teacher certification programs do not typically attract international students. Given the focus on educational practice within the U.S. that these programs necessarily have, this is not surprising or unexpected. Furthermore, given our commitment and responsibility to preparing professionals who will be certified to teach in U.S. schools, we believe that our efforts towards increasing the diversity of our certification programs should focus on recruiting and supporting students with strong, but not necessarily unilateral, commitments to becoming educators in U.S. schools.

experiences. Another problem is that the teaching profession lacks diversity of knowledge, perspective, skills, and experience, and thus collective professional knowledge is impoverished with respect to serving the needs of the youth in our schools. These problems of imbalance in the teaching profession mean that the SOE must actively recruit not only students of color into our teacher certification programs, but also those who are first generation college goers and graduates and those who are multilingual.⁶ The need to recruit men at the elementary level is also pressing, as men are especially underrepresented among elementary and middle school teachers.

By growing the diversity of our student body along the aforementioned dimensions, we will help narrow the student-teacher diversity gaps and thereby increase the proportion of teachers whose referents, knowledge, and practices are similar to those students who represent the extant and fastest growing populations in the U.S. school system. These teachers can then draw upon these referents, knowledge, and practices in their work with students and contribute to collective professional knowledge and instructional innovations needed to improve the educational access and opportunities of our nation's students.

Enhancing the Professional Preparation of All Interns

Growing the diversity of our student body as spelled out above as well as along the other dimensions we value (e.g., sexual orientation, (dis)ability status, religion, national origin, gender expression) will contribute to the School of Education's ability to enhance the preparation of all our teaching interns. Diversity is an essential teaching and learning resource. By increasing the diversity of the identities, backgrounds, and experiences of our student body, we create an optimal environment for creative problem solving and innovation on the part of our interns (Page, 2007). We also create an environment in which instructors, with training and support, can make purposeful use of this diversity in their instructional planning. Under diverse conditions, instructors are able to construct effective teaching and learning activities that support interns in assuming multiple perspectives, in reflecting upon their own biases, and in appreciating the cultural resources and ways of knowing that inhere in communities distinct from their own.

The diversity of the U.S. school-age population and the fact that this diversity is characterized along a wide number of dimensions (e.g., race, ethnicity, gender and gender expression, sexual orientation, religion, national origin, and linguistic-, socioeconomic-, citizenship-, and dis/ability-status) also requires every teacher to cross boundaries of difference. But students will not only differ from the teacher in terms of background and perspectives; students will also differ from one another along these lines. Consequently, teachers must not only be skilled as well as innovative in their own boundary crossing but also be able to cultivate their students' facility in navigating across difference and in engaging controversial or contested topics with responsibility and courage. SOE instructors will be better situated to cultivate the cross-cultural competencies and facilitation skills on the part of interns if the SOE recruits not only a diverse student body but also students who have already demonstrated a commitment to diversity or have worked in small and large ways to mitigate educational and/or social inequalities. Students with these commitments may be especially well primed to take up and enact instruction and professional practice aimed at advancing social justice in education. We need a demographically diverse student body and one that evidences a strong commitment to work in the interest of social justice in order to maximize the boundary crossing skills, cross-cultural competencies, facilitation practices, and innovative capabilities of our developing teachers.

Some dimensions of diversity we value and seek among our teacher certification students are less amenable to measurement because they fall under private or protected classes and/or defy simple calculations (e.g., religious minorities, LGBTQTI identified students, students with disabilities, students who range in their gender expression). Despite these constraints, we will advance recruiting efforts that signal and target the full range of diversity we value and seek and will work towards building a climate and culture that welcomes students who vary along a wide range of identity and demographic backgrounds.

In order to realize the aforementioned commitments, the SOE will work in legally permissible ways to:

- ***Increase, in measureable ways, the gender, linguistic, socioeconomic, and racial/ethnic diversity of our interns.***
- ***Recruit teaching interns with a commitment to social justice.***
- ***Attract teaching interns along the full range of diversity dimensions we value and seek.***

Master's and Doctoral Programs⁷

On average, the School of Education has been more successful than the university at large in diversifying the student bodies of our non-teacher certification graduate programs in terms of race and ethnicity. Recently, the enrollment of African Americans in SOE master's programs has been comparable to or has exceeded—sometimes by double—the percentage of African Americans in the university at large. The enrollment of Latinas/os in these same programs has also always exceeded university figures and the enrollment of Latinas/os in the Center for the Study of Higher and Postsecondary Education (CSHPE) has sometimes doubled university figures. The proportion of underrepresented minorities in our doctoral programs has also consistently exceeded the figures for the university as a whole.

This statistical advantage is not, however, unexpected. Underrepresented minorities seeking graduate degrees disproportionately concentrate in the field of education and at a rate that often exceeds the proportion of white graduate degree recipients who concentrate in education.⁸ This statistical advantage, however, masks the fact that the CSHPE master's program has witnessed a decline in the enrollment of African Americans and has experienced an abrupt dip in the enrollment of Latinas/os during the fall of 2014;⁹ Educational Studies (ES) has had only limited success in enrolling Latinas/os into its master's programs;¹⁰ and the enrollment of Native Americans in both MA programs has been nearly non-existent. In some instances our MA programs have met with greater success in enrolling Asian American students but these students were disproportionately female.

At the PhD level, CSHPE has on average had greater success in recruiting underrepresented minorities.¹¹ In 2013–2014 the proportion of underrepresented minorities enrolled in ES was 14.5% compared to 26.2% in CSHPE. The enrollment of underrepresented minorities in the ES doctoral program is, nevertheless, on the rise as the enrollment of these students has grown in both numbers and percentages since 2010–2011.¹² Despite these positive trends, the enrollment of African Americans in our doctoral programs is low compared to national figures; the number of Native Americans enrolled in any of our doctoral programs has yet to exceed a count of one; and men of color are particularly underrepresented among enrollment figures.

Given the high rates at which underrepresented minorities have traditionally sought graduate degrees in education, our recruitment of underrepresented minorities in our graduate programs falls short of what might be expected; and our general failure in recruiting Native Americans and men of color should raise particular concern.

The SOE also needs to enhance the socioeconomic diversity of our graduate student body. However, competitive institutions like our own are least likely to recruit a socioeconomically diverse student body. Seventy percent of the students attending the most selective postsecondary institutions in the U.S. come from households that rank in the top quartile of family income—a persistent trend since 1982 (Bastedo & Jaquette, 2011). In comparison, only 5% of students from these same colleges come from households that rank in the bottom socioeconomic quartile. With first generation college-going or -graduation status serving as a common proxy for low socioeconomic status, our school, like other elite institutions, struggles to recruit a socioeconomically diverse student body as is evidenced by our under-enrollment of first generation college graduates in our non-teacher certification graduate programs.

Although our enrollment of first generation college students is on an upward trend in our doctoral programs, our enrollment figures put us nowhere within reach of awarding doctorates to first generation college graduates at a rate that is consistent with national trends. Nationally, a third of doctoral recipients report that neither of their parents completed college (Hoffer et al., 2003). However, in recent years the enrollment of first generation college graduates in our doctoral programs has only reached a high of 15% in CSHPE and a high of 8% in ES.¹³ Because first generation students earning doctoral degrees are overrepresented in professional disciplines such as education (Hoffer et al., 2003), these enrollment figures are troubling.

In examining first generation student enrollment in our MA programs, CSHPE met with significant recruitment success in 2013–2014. That year first generation college graduates represented a third of the total enrollment in CSHPE's master's program.¹⁴ Outside of 2013–2014, the enrollment of first generation college graduates in our ES MA program has typically been higher than that of CSHPE with enrollment of first generation college graduates in ES peaking at 22% in recent years.¹⁵

Although our success with regards to attracting international students has varied across programs, the school has typically been successful in recruiting students from abroad into our graduate programs. Our enrollment of international students in CSHPE and ES graduate programs has commonly exceeded that of U.S. citizens and residents who are persons of color or who are first generation college graduates.¹⁶ This is consistent with larger trends of high representation of international students in graduate programs in the United States. Although these data do not establish a need for growing this segment of our graduate student body, the sustained recruitment and full inclusion of international students are crucial to our core mission. The diversity in experiences and perspectives that these students bring effectively contributes to our ability to encourage more complex views about educational practice, the organization and governance of schools, and institutionalized opportunities for and barriers to diminishing educational inequalities.

We also affirm the university's commitment to recruit and fully include undocumented or DACAmented students (i.e., recipients of Deferred Action of Childhood Arrivals) as part of our student body. As such, our school is committed to developing practices and policies as well as a climate and culture that welcomes, empowers, and actively learns from undocumented and DACAmented students.

As a research intensive institution that is committed to advancing educational practice, we seek to cultivate in our graduate student body the ability to ask and subsequently interrogate compelling research questions and to contend effectively with practice-based dilemmas. As per the diversity of knowledge and perspectives that inhere in a diverse student body, instructors, with training and support, can draw upon this diversity to support students in generating novel questions, challenging taken-for-granted assumptions, and framing, engaging, and resolving practice-based dilemmas in creative and sufficiently complex ways. In turn, a domestically and internationally diverse student body stimulates our faculty and staff to unpack their own taken-for-granted assumptions and to pose questions, engage dilemmas, and develop solutions that are mindful of and responsive to domestic variation and global diversity. Absent a critical mass of first generation college graduates, students of color, and especially men of color, however, our graduate programs will be stymied in their ability to use student diversity as a powerful instructional resource—one that will support the learning and development of all members of our community.

The school can enhance the power of this resource by also successfully recruiting a linguistically diverse student body and one that varies in terms of sexual orientation, national origin, country of citizenship, and (dis)ability status. If we fail to diversify our graduate student body along the aforementioned dimensions or stop short of fully incorporating the diverse perspectives that our international students afford us, we will be limited in our ability to advance the academic, research, and practice excellence of our graduates and their subsequent impact on the field of education. Faculty and staff will also be compromised in their ability to develop innovative scholarly and professional agendas that can contend with local, national, and global educational dilemmas.

Our commitment to diversify the students in our master's and doctoral programs (as well as in our teacher certification programs) situates race, class, gender, and linguistic status as central to our recruiting activities. These statuses correspond with the content of available data sets and common conventions that enable us to more readily track our progress in recruiting along these lines. Any individual recruit is, however, a member of multiple social categories. This means that in the effort to diversify our students along the lines of race, class, gender, and linguistic status, we will necessarily recruit students along the full range of statuses we value and seek (e.g., (dis)ability status, gender expression, LGBTQI status, religion). But it is not easy to measure our growth in diversity along these other dimensions. For example, the structure of U-M data sets, current conventions of privacy, and legal mandates pertaining to or implicating private or protected statuses impinge on our ability to track the representation of students who have disabilities, are members of religious minorities, vary in gender expression, are LGBTQI-identified, or are undocumented residents. We are, nevertheless, committed to coordinating our recruitment activities in ways that signal our commitment to attracting students from the full range of identities and backgrounds we value and seek. Moreover, in our efforts to organize our culture, policies, and practices, we must and do account for these less readily-measured dimensions of diversity and also explicitly attend to and consider them in a global context.

As per these commitments, the SOE will work in legally permissible ways to:

- ***Increase, in measureable ways, the racial, ethnic, socioeconomic, and gender diversity of students in our graduate programs, with particular interest in recruiting students (especially men) from underrepresented racial and ethnic backgrounds.***
- ***Attract graduate students along the full range of diversity dimensions we value and seek.***

Strategies/Actions

We outline below strategies and actions that should be deployed to realize the student recruitment and enrollment goals outlined for our teacher certification programs and our non-teacher certification graduate programs. These strategies and actions are organized into four categories of activity: 1) recruitment; 2) admissions; 3) financial aid and scholarships; and 4) student support and retention. Each will, of course, be undertaken in a manner consistent with any applicable legal limitations.

Recruitment

The prospect of growing the diversity of our student body is dependent on our ability to grow the number of students in our applicant pools who are of underrepresented backgrounds. We will pursue the following strategies in order to diversify our applicant pools.

- I. **Strategies/Actions that Stretch Across Programs**
 - a. Develop a suite of marketing materials likely to capture the imagination of the students whom we seek to attract to our programs.
 - b. Track and integrate into recruitment materials, platforms, and activities graduates of our programs who are working in deliberate and compelling ways to advance diversity, equity, and inclusion in their research, teaching, or practice.
 - c. Update our website to include the bios and testimonies of current students who have grown up in diverse, underserved, and international settings and who are committed to advancing social change.
 - d. Develop recruitment partnerships with a select number of minority serving institutions (i.e., historically black colleges and universities, Hispanic-serving institutions, and tribal colleges) and coordinate faculty, students, staff, alumni, and university resources for the purpose of actively recruiting students from these partnership schools.

- e. Identify programs and sources from which we are likely to find students with backgrounds and commitments currently underrepresented in our programs and send the targeted prospects information about our programs and eligibility requirements for potential waivers.
 - f. Coordinate a common campus visit day/weekend that makes visible the diversity of our students, faculty, and staff and how these constituents leverage diversity to advance various professional, teaching, and/or research agendas.
 - g. Develop a larger suite of lower-division courses and eventually a minor in education. In growing our suite of lower-division courses, a number of the newly developed offerings should satisfy the race and ethnicity requirement within the College of Literature, Science, and the Arts (LSA) (e.g., *EDUC 118 Introduction to Education: Schooling and Multicultural Society*) and should reflect cooperation with on-campus and community partners and entities that are likely to facilitate our access to and the interest of students with the backgrounds and commitments we seek (e.g., Semester in Detroit, The Edward Ginsberg Center for Community Service Learning, Center for Engaged Academic Learning, Center for Educational Outreach, local public schools and service organizations). In eventually growing this suite of courses into an education minor we will have established a reliable platform for increasing the visibility of our various programs and developed a pipeline for recruiting students into our teacher education and MA programs.
- II. **Strategies/Actions Specific to Teacher Certification Programs**
- a. Build synergistic, collaborative, and predictable relationships between the Office of Student Affairs, Teacher Education, Educational Studies, and the Dean's Office for the purpose of delineating, coordinating, and effectively engaging the cycles of and forums for recruitment.
 - b. Work with the Office of Undergraduate Admissions (OUA) to expand the list of prospects for our Teacher Education Preferred Admissions (TEPA) program to include recently matriculated students who are first generation college students and/or attended high school in underserved rural, urban, and suburban contexts.
 - c. Develop robust and mutually beneficial recruitment partnerships with key sending departments in LSA (e.g., History, English, Mathematics, Romance/World Languages, Biology, Chemistry) and sustain these partnerships through a predictable calendar of meetings and activities that make effective use of the roles, knowledge, and commitments of SOE faculty and staff.
 - d. Develop recruitment partnerships with a select number of Michigan high schools that have demonstrated success in sending students to U-M and have among their student body high proportions of racial and linguistic minorities and those who are likely to be the first in their families to attend college.
 - e. Identify and make annual recruitment visits to on-campus schools, organizations, and sites from which we are likely to recruit the students we seek (e.g., racial, ethnic, and first generation, and LGBTQTI student organizations and organizations serving undocumented residents and students with disabilities; fraternities and sororities serving minoritized or historically disenfranchised populations; organizations concerned with educational policy and practices and/or civic and social justice issues; organizations that coordinate service-learning opportunities with children, low-income communities, urban communities, or communities of color).

- f. Make annual recruitment presentations to all lower division education courses and to a select number of large introductory courses in LSA.
- g. Identify institutions, organizations, and academic and professional venues external to U-M from which we are likely to recruit the students we seek and work with and through them to increase the visibility of our programs (e.g., select liberal arts colleges within a reasonable drive to the University of Michigan; Michigan-Pursuing Our Dreams [M-POD] events as a part of the Washtenaw Community College Transfer Initiative; convenings of the Institute for the Recruitment of Teachers, Michigan Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, and Michigan/National Association of College Admissions Counselors).
- h. Identify across campus partners to facilitate access to community college students and to members of racially, linguistically, and socioeconomically underrepresented groups (e.g., Center for Educational Outreach, Office of Undergraduate Admissions, and Transfer Recruitment to Michigan) and work with these partners to increase the visibility of our undergraduate teacher education programs.
- i. Explore, propose, implement, and evaluate innovative strands in our education programs that are likely to draw the kinds of students we seek (e.g., strands that foreground preparation for urban settings or social justice, critical, or transformative educational practice).

Admissions

Our admission processes must support the admission of students likely to be successful in our programs and who are also inclined to serve diverse and underserved populations and/or take up research and/or practice dilemmas that are central to advancing diversity, equity, and inclusion. The SOE will, therefore, develop robust and holistic admissions applications and protocols towards these ends, as permissible by law. As the greatest opportunities for growing the diversity of student body rest with our teacher certification programs, our work will begin by revising the admissions applications and protocols associated with our teacher certification programs. In pursuing these revisions, the school will:

- I. Redesign the admissions application and processes to capture in substantive ways applicants' commitment to and proclivity for advancing diversity, equity, and inclusion as part of their teaching practice. These processes should include questions, interviews, and/or performance evaluations that assess applicants': propensity for engaging in teaching practices that contribute to social justice; 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.
- II. Develop admissions procedures and provide professional development opportunities to guard against unconscious bias on the part of reviewers and the inadvertent privileging of measures that do not predict student academic and teaching success.
- III. Conduct research and analysis to: facilitate the design and evaluation of the admissions applications, protocols, and processes developed in accordance with the aforementioned objectives; and inform the revision of the admissions processes associated with other academic programs.

Financial Aid and Scholarships

The SOE 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 the SOE's commitment to promote diversity and to advance equity and inclusion. Towards these ends, the SOE will:

- I. Develop the “Dean’s Scholars Program” to fund a select number of MA and PhD students who have demonstrated a commitment to working in diverse and/or underserved settings and/or on problems of research or practice that advance diversity, equity, and inclusion as pathways to achieving social justice.
- II. Fund a range of named teacher education scholarships to support undergraduate students who have demonstrated a commitment to working with or on behalf of diverse and/or underserved communities and/or have backgrounds that will increase the range of vantage points represented among our undergraduate student body (e.g., students who are first generation college goers; grew up in underserved communities; and/or have proficiency in a language other than English). Such scholarships should include the following:
 - a. *Tuition Scholarships*: Scholarships that would defray the general cost of attendance for the types of students we seek to attract and to signal in the process our institutional commitment to enroll students with these backgrounds, experiences, skills, and commitments in our school.
 - b. *Spring/Summer Scholarships*: Scholarships to support students in completing coursework during spring/summer semesters. Spring/summer course-taking allows students to better manage preparation demands during the regular academic year and supports more timely completion of degree programs. Spring/summer support could be of particular benefit to students from low-income and working class backgrounds as they lack the disposable income that would facilitate the more evenly paced progression through our teacher preparation program.
 - c. *Transportation Scholarships*: Scholarships to support students who are seeking preparation in underserved schools and districts (e.g., Detroit) and must consequently travel a considerable distance (30 miles or more from the SOE) to pursue such preparation.

Student Support and Retention

The SOE is committed to providing comprehensive support to all students who enroll in the school. Such supports inhere in our institutionalized efforts to establish scholarships, diversify our curriculum, support the development of more inclusive pedagogical practices on the part of instructors, and otherwise work to cultivate a more inclusive environment in the SOE (topics covered elsewhere in the Plan). However, the SOE also recognizes that some students may benefit from other institutionally coordinated opportunities to facilitate effective transitions into the SOE and to support student efficacy, success, and completion. In addition to the mechanisms outlined elsewhere in the Plan, the SOE will extend its capacity to support, retain, and graduate a diverse student body through the implementation of the following complementary strategies:

- I. Establish supports, guidelines, and expectations for programs that may be particularly challenged in their ability to meet the needs of a diverse student body. Such challenge may be the result of the unanticipated rise in the number or diversity of the students enrolled during a particular admissions cycle. Alternatively, it may be a function of a program’s ongoing struggle to narrow differences in the performance outcomes between student subgroups (e.g., time to degree, time to candidacy, rates of completion, competency in practicum and student teaching). These supports, guidelines, and expectations will position the programs to restructure aspects of their organization and provide students with targeted resources to support the transition to and success in the program in ways that guard against stigmatization and that ensure full empowerment and inclusion.
- II. Establish a peer-mentoring program in which an incoming student partners with a more advanced student who provides guidance to: ease the academic and social transition to U-M

and the SOE; facilitate resource-finding at the school and university; identify strategies for successful navigation of the program and school; and address transition-related issues that may be unique to the student or the social groups of which she or he may be member.

- III. Enhance the consistency and transparency with which programs communicate to students the range of program-specific and school-level academic and institutional expectations that have bearing on every student's progress through the program and time to and achievement of the degree. This will create a more equitable climate of shared information and knowledge about resources, opportunities, department and school-wide efforts, changes, and issues.
- IV. Continue to fund through a small-grants program student-initiated diversity-related efforts. The school currently supports student organizations in their efforts, but not all students are engaged in student organizations. Therefore, this would extend the opportunity for students to self-initiate diversity-related conversations, dialogues, presentations, etc. on topics and areas that may not already be addressed through other organizational mechanisms.

Our Faculty

Diversifying our faculty demographically as well as in terms of scholarly expertise is essential to advancing the SOE's commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion. A faculty that is racially, ethnically, and linguistically diverse and also varies socioeconomically by way of family background evidences a wide range of experiences and vantage points that are essential to research and pedagogical innovation and complex problem solving. Such a faculty is especially well poised to innovate and problem solve in regards to practice-based dilemmas that emerge in a society that is demographically diverse and, often, profoundly unequal. Our prospect for innovation and complex problem solving is further enhanced when our faculty reflects the collective expertise warranted to situate our national dilemmas within a global context. It is often through international comparisons that we more starkly see the nature and depth of the inequalities that plague our nation and also begin to imagine alternative means by which we can design policy and practice to stem these inequalities. Our capacity for innovation and complex problem solving will be, moreover, fully realized if our demographically diverse and globally aware faculty is also diverse in terms of its disciplinary, methodological, and content area expertise.

It may be especially important for the SOE to stretch its disciplinary, methodological, and content area expertise beyond the contours of mainstream education research as paradigmatic shifts necessarily occur at the margins of mainstream knowledge. The very notion of a paradigmatic shift means that that which was taken for granted in, or had previously operated at the center of, academic discourse has been disrupted. As such, the very scholarship that now operates at the margins of academic discourse may establish the innovation necessary for contending with the educational challenges extant in our diverse and unequal society.

A diverse faculty body is also an invaluable resource in the recruitment and sustenance of a diverse student body. A diverse student body is necessarily diverse in its inclinations, practices, and worldviews. In the absence of recruiting faculty who are also differentiated along these lines, the SOE does not retain the range of referents for making sense of and responding to the varied ways of knowing, doing, and being present in a diverse student body. The faculty is thereby constrained in its ability to meet the needs of such a body and to cultivate a fully inclusive climate.

Faculty members who vary demographically[‡] as well as in their scholarly expertise must, moreover, evidence a commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion in their teaching, research, and day-to-day interactions. In recruiting faculty members with these commitments we will be able to deploy their

[‡] As per federal affirmative action reporting guidelines and the subsequent content and logic of university data sets, we are currently best able to track the gender and race/ethnicity of faculty and staff, as opposed to other characteristics that are relevant to gauging the demographic diversity of our faculty and staff (e.g., linguistic background, socioeconomic status, dis/ability status). As such, throughout this document we have emphasized these demographic characteristics in our efforts to assess the diversity of these constituent groups.

demographic and scholarly referents in ways that will enhance institutionalized efforts to cultivate a more inclusive environment.

In recent years and as per our 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, we have made headway in diversifying our faculty racially and in building the human capital necessary to advance this agenda.

Currently, 24% (12 of 51) of our full-time equivalent (FTE) tenure-track faculty members are persons of color compared to 19% (9 of 47) in 2010–2011; and a higher percentage of these faculty members are now included among the rank of full professors (i.e., 18% or 5 of 27 compared to 4% or 1 of 27 in 2010–2011). The proportion of persons of color who are FTE clinical-track faculty members has also increased slightly between 2010–2011 and now (i.e., from 30% to 40% or from 3 of 10 to 4 of 10); and compared to 2010–2011 when all FTE clinical-track members were at the rank of assistant professors, we now have clinical-track members at the rank of full and associate professors. As was the case for student enrollment in our graduate programs, these gains should be treated cautiously given the disproportionate representation of persons of color who receive their PhDs in education.

Importantly, we also have a cadre of lecturers, upon whom we consistently rely and who are essential to our instructional mission.¹⁷ Since 2010–2011 the more senior among them (i.e., lecturers III and IV combined) have been few in number (i.e., ranging between 4 and 6), have not included any persons of color, and have been predominantly women (i.e., ranging between 75% and 100% women). During this same timeframe, the more junior lecturers (i.e., lecturers I and II combined), ranged between 48 and 57 in number and grew from having 2% (1 of 57) persons of color in 2010–2011 to 13% (6 of 48) persons of color in 2014–2015. The percentage of men among lecturers I and II ranged between 25% and 27% and included no more than two men of color.

Although we have been less successful in recruiting men of color into some faculty ranks and our most senior lecturers remain all white, we have made measurable gains in diversifying our tenure-track and clinical-track faculty as well as our more junior lecturers. We have also extended the scholarly and practice-based expertise of these faculty members through the addition of new faculty hires who are expert in critical theories and methodologies, conduct international and comparative research, foreground racial, social class, and other institutionalized inequalities in their research and practice endeavors, and have demonstrated commitment to advancing diversity, equity, and inclusion as part of their teaching, mentoring, and/or service work.

In our interest to build upon these gains, within the limits of the law, the SOE will:

- ***Continue to develop, refine, and employ recruitment and hiring processes to attract and secure a demographically and intellectually diverse faculty committed to advancing the school's goals for diversity, equity, and inclusion.***

Strategies/Actions

The strategies and actions listed below will be deployed in legally permissible ways to realize the aforementioned goals surrounding faculty recruitment and hiring.

- I. Develop and refine proactive and inclusive recruitment strategies aimed at maximizing the intellectual and racial diversity of applicant pools and especially the representation of persons of color within those pools. At minimum, these efforts will require the SOE to:
 - a. Review, monitor, and refine the recruitment principles, policies, and practices that were developed between fall of 2012 and fall of 2013 to guide conventional searches (See:

University of Michigan School of Education Principles, Practices, and Procedures for Faculty Searches and Campus Visits to Support Diversity and Equity Goals).

- II. 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 strategic and diversity mission of the school, contribute to our focus on excellence, and provide a diversity of perspectives and curricular offerings. In order to support such person-specific efforts, the SOE will:
- a. Identify and prioritize areas of potential hiring.
 - 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.
 - c. Provide written criteria for departments to propose person-specific hires consistent with university guidelines and the SOE strategic and diversity mission.

Our Staff

In order to maximize our capacity as an institution, we must also develop a staff that is diverse in terms of background, experience, and perspectives and is especially well poised to advance the SOE’s diversity, equity, and inclusion agenda.

With a staff that is currently 19% persons of color and 75% women, both men and persons of color are currently underrepresented among our staff. However, we are moving in the right direction with regards to diversifying our staff.¹⁸ In 2010–2011 our staff was less diverse. Then only 17% (24 of 138) of the staff were persons of color and that percentage had dropped as low as 15% (20 of 133) in 2011–2012. In 2010–2011 the staff was 80% (110 of 138) female and hovered between 79% and 81% between 2010–2011 and 2013–2014. Although, we do not have a reliable means of documenting the linguistic diversity of our staff and/or how their family backgrounds might vary in terms of their socioeconomic status, growing a staff that is diverse along these and the aforementioned dimensions would be an important resource in meeting the needs of a diverse faculty and student body and in otherwise taking up and advancing the school’s diversity, equity, and inclusion agenda.

We must also reexamine and retool our hiring processes with these recruitment objectives in mind. Currently, our hiring processes do not consistently and actively investigate a candidate’s previous experience with diverse populations or his/her inclination or capacity to engage initiatives aimed at advancing diversity, equity, and inclusion. Extant hiring processes may also rely too heavily on personal networks and also on candidates’ previous connections to the School of Education. As such, we need to develop a more robust and predictable staff hiring process that will enable us to evaluate a candidate’s potential for excellence as well as his/her capacity and referents for working in a diverse setting and for advancing in deliberate and effective ways the SOE’s diversity, equity, and inclusion agenda. Currently we also have no institutionalized supports or mechanisms for orienting or reinforcing staff members’ work on this agenda.

Staff members should not only contribute to the school’s commitment to advance diversity, equity, and inclusion but also personally experience this commitment in terms of their professional interactions, opportunities, and access. As such, in order to advance our commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion in relation to the staff, the SOE will pursue the following goals and accordant strategies and actions in a manner that is consistent with the law:

- ***Develop proactive and inclusive recruitment and hiring processes to attract and secure:***
 - ***a demographically diverse staff; and***
 - ***staff members who have worked in diverse settings and/or have advanced diversity, equity, or inclusion in the workplace or in an area applicable to the position to which they are applying.***

- ***Develop supports and mechanisms to orient and reinforce staff members' individual and collective work on and for diversity, equity, and inclusion.***
- ***Develop processes and practices for staff members to personally experience equity, inclusion, and opportunity in their work lives.***

Strategies/Actions

- I. Develop principles and protocols for staff hiring that are akin to those that were developed to diversify the faculty and faculty expertise. At minimum, these principles and protocols will entail:
 - a. Establishing, when feasible, hiring committees that include members who range in background, experience, and status within the SOE. In instances when a hiring committee is not appropriate, hiring decisions will require the supervisor to consult substantively with a key administrator and staff member.
 - b. Posting job positions using outlets and networks likely to facilitate the cultivation of a diverse pool of high quality applicants.
 - c. Designing an application and interview process that:
 - i. invites applicants to document (via cover letters and résumés) how their backgrounds, experiences, and commitments facilitate their ability to work productively in diverse environments;
 - ii. involves students, faculty, and staff; and
 - iii. requires applicants to demonstrate (e.g., via responses to interview questions and engagement with performance-based assessments or simulations) that they have requisite skills and/or dispositions likely to facilitate the SOE's agenda to promote diversity and to advance equity and inclusion.
 - d. Documenting in writing the search, interview, and selection process for review by the chief administrative officer (CAO) and the Education Diversity Advisory Committee (EDAC) and to generate permanent records of all hiring activity within the SOE.
 - e. Requiring EDAC to review these records prior to extending hiring offers to make sure that the search, interview, and selection processes were in compliance with the school's diversity, equity, and inclusion agenda.

- II. Structure opportunities to cultivate the commitment and overall capacity of the staff to contribute to the SOE's efforts to promote diversity and to advance equity and inclusion. At minimum these opportunities will entail:
 - a. Providing supervisors with training in how to search for, hire, and supervise diverse staff.
 - b. "On-boarding" new staff members by having the director of human resources and/or the supervisor orient them to how the duties and responsibilities of their positions contribute to the school's diversity, equity, and inclusion agenda.
 - c. Identifying, posting, encouraging, and tracking staff participation in SOE-specific and campus-wide opportunities designed to cultivate diversity-related skills and dispositions.
 - d. Establishing peer mentoring and other professional development opportunities through which staff will be able to learn from and collaborate with others in developing their professional practice in ways that advance the school's diversity, equity, and inclusion agenda.

- III. Make opportunities for professional advancement more transparent and opportunities for learning and development more accessible. Towards this end, the SOE will:
 - a. Document, when feasible, the extant career ladders within the SOE and the proficiencies, expertise, and accomplishments that facilitate movement up that ladder.
 - b. Build systems for advancement that guard against unintentional bias, discriminatory practices, and favoritism.
 - c. Establish formal opportunities for staff members to discuss their long-term professional ambitions with their supervisor to identify prospective professional opportunities that are consistent with the staff member's current role but establish a platform for developing the

knowledge, skills, or practices consistent with his/her ambitions. Staff members will be able to invite a peer or other mentor to meetings organized for this purpose.

- IV. Develop mechanisms to otherwise increase the satisfaction of the staff and the ability of other constituents to work and interact with staff in a respectful and professionally generative manner. At minimum, such mechanisms will entail:
 - a. Identifying and developing, via a staff committee, a plan to make better sense of and address areas of particular staff dissatisfaction as per the findings of the 2013–2014 staff climate survey.
 - b. Cultivating, in consultation with staff, an assessment in which staff members would document and evaluate their experiences with faculty members and supervisors as a means of developing faculty members' and supervisors' knowledge, skill, and accountability in facilitating and contributing to a more equitable and inclusive environment (e.g., a 360 review for supervisors and faculty administrators).
 - c. Designing faculty and student professional development opportunities to enhance faculty and student awareness of, inclination to, and skill and etiquette in working with staff in a respectful, equitable, and inclusive manner (e.g., orientations, workshops, annual school coordinated exchanges between staff and faculty).

- V. Relocate the Office of Human Resources to a more conducive space. The new location will address concerns raised around privacy and confidentiality and will establish a space for job postings, training, on-boarding of faculty and staff, and private conferencing to manage HR matters and concerns.

- VI. Manage salary equity concerns at the school level in a systematic and proactive manner. On an annual basis, the chief administrative officer and the director of human resources will review all staff salaries. In order to ascertain whether staff members are being equitably compensated, the review will capture all staff full time rate (FTR) salaries, university average information per title, degree held, years of service, and market information when available. Potential equity issues will be addressed and resolved with the staff member's supervisor as part of the annual staff performance assessment process.

CULTIVATING INCLUSIVE CURRICULAR AND PEDAGOGICAL PRACTICES

The School of Education's commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion must be especially evidenced in our curriculum, instructional practices, and classroom norms. However, as per the findings of the spring 2013 graduate student survey, the substance of our community discussions between fall 2012 and spring 2014, and students' written accounts of their classroom experiences, the content of our curriculum is not sufficiently diverse and our classrooms are not fully inclusive.

Although the SOE offers select courses that foreground issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion, students and faculty members expressed concern that the school does not feature a visibly robust and/or coherent suite of courses that provides students with opportunities to study salient and compelling issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion with sufficient breadth and depth. Of particular concern is the extent to which courses or programmatic requirements that are designated as core, foundational, or required address issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion. These central learning opportunities should also occur in sites that afford students substantive insight into how practice (e.g., administrative, teaching, leadership, research) might be leveraged in the interest of diminishing inequitable educational experiences or outcomes (e.g., schools successfully serving demographically diverse or underserved populations; internship sites that effectively serve or advocate on the behalf of historically marginalized populations). Additionally, students reported via the all-school climate survey that exclusion and marginalization characterized many classrooms and that they or their peers had experienced stigma or isolation as a consequence of unjust, biased, or prejudicial interactions with instructors as well as classmates.

These reports and observations indicate that all SOE instructors (tenure-track, clinical-track, lecturers, graduate student instructors) need to integrate diverse perspectives into course content and class discussion more intentionally and skillfully and must grow in their capacity to cultivate inclusive classrooms. As conceptualized by Saunders and Kardia (2011):

Inclusive classrooms are classrooms in which instructors and students work together to create and sustain an environment in which everyone feels safe, supported, and encouraged to express her or his views and concerns. In these classrooms, the content is explicitly viewed from the multiple perspectives and varied experiences of a range of groups. Content is presented in a manner that reduces all students' experiences of marginalization and, wherever possible, helps students understand that individuals' experiences, values, and perspectives influence how they construct knowledge in any field or discipline. Instructors in inclusive classrooms use a variety of teaching methods in order to facilitate the academic achievement of all students. Inclusive classrooms are places in which thoughtfulness, mutual respect, and academic excellence are valued and promoted (p. 1).

In the SOE we aspire to achieve this conception of inclusive classrooms with one exception: in co-creating classrooms where all students are empowered, where marginalization is diminished, where course content can be viewed from diverse perspectives, and where all students experience academic achievement, we seek to create “brave” rather than “safe” spaces.

According to Arao and Clemens (2013) “safety” is not an appropriate or reasonable expectation for honest and empowering dialogue about diversity and justice. They explain:

The word *safe* is defined...as ‘free from harm or risk...affording safety or security from danger, risks or difficulty...unlikely to produce controversy or contradiction’...We argue that authentic learning about social justice often requires the very qualities of risk, difficulty, and controversy that are defined as incompatible with safety. These kinds of challenges are particularly unavoidable in participant groups composed of [members from historically and institutionally marginalized groups as well as from historically and institutionally advantaged groups]. In such settings, [those who have been marginalized and advantaged] take risks by participating fully and truthfully, though these risks differ substantially by group membership and which identities hold the most salience for a given participant at a given time (p. 139).

Nor is safety and the avoidance of risk compatible with learning as a whole. Citing Boostrom (1998), Arao and Clemens (2013) indicate that “learning necessarily involves not merely risk, but the pain of giving up a former condition in favour of a new way of seeing things” (p. 141). As a consequence, if we in the School of Education seek to create powerful learning opportunities for our students across boundaries of difference and about issues of diversity, equity, and social justice, we must create brave rather than safe spaces for teaching and learning.

Brave spaces are spaces not only where participants are respected and valued but also where honest and courageous dialogue is encouraged, where tokenism is challenged, where students are provided voice, and, where individuals—including instructors—are not extended the privilege to opt out of conversations that produce discomfort. More specifically, brave spaces advance norms that enable participants to: engage controversy with civility; own their intentions as well as their impact on others; challenge and expect to be challenged firmly and respectfully; reflect on when and why they opt out of challenge, including how their social group membership may play a role in those decisions; and commit to “no personal attacks” with the understanding that the experience of having your ideas challenged will likely be uncomfortable and may be viscerally experienced as an attack—leading to defensive responses that warrant exploration. Ultimately, brave spaces push the boundaries of participants' comfort zones to produce powerful learning around diversity, equity, and social justice issues.

Currently, the SOE falls short of realizing the ambitions outlined by Saunders and Kardia and Arao and Clemens. We must, therefore, establish the requisite supports to achieve our ambitions. Such supports will entail cultivating all instructors' awareness of how pedagogical choices can lessen, rather than perpetuate, exclusionary classroom environments. Additionally, instructors must receive the requisite support for developing their skill in enacting practices and establishing norms, such as the creation of ground rules that support inclusion and brave spaces. We must simultaneously develop instructors' inclination and ability to invoke pedagogy in ways that situate diversity as a resource for cultivating academic excellence. Further, we must establish systems of accountability for instructors and programs to ensure that we are adequately meeting our goals related to diversity, equity, and inclusion in our coursework and classroom pedagogy. No matter how skilled instructors are, however, we will continue to fall short of realizing our goals if students do not embrace their shared role in cultivating brave spaces that support inclusion. Students need opportunities (beyond the classroom) to develop and practice the skills needed to engage in inclusive dialogues and they, too, need to be held accountable for engaging in behaviors that promote and support dialogues across differences (e.g., honoring classroom norms).

At the SOE we must not only improve the culture of dialogue and interaction in classrooms; we must also assess and enhance the content of individual courses to improve opportunities for students to engage diverse scholarly perspectives as well as view course content from the vantage and experiences of different social groups. Our goal is to avoid instances in which readings, discussions, and assignments that take into account the perspectives of marginalized groups or discourses are relegated to a single class meeting. Instead, these perspectives should be integrated thoughtfully and more substantively over the course of a semester. As such, instructors will require support to actively and productively incorporate issues related to diversity and inequity into assigned readings, class discussions, and formal assignments and to respond to some students' resistance to these efforts.

Students should not be able to graduate from programs having had no courses that take up topics of diversity, equity, and inclusion in transparent or robust ways. Students for whom diversity, equity, and inclusion are central to their professional agenda must have access to a wide selection of courses or developed course sequences aimed at supporting their professional and academic goals. The SOE must, therefore, develop and predictably offer additional courses and/or course sequences that center on issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion. We must also provide core courses and programmatic requirements that focus on issues related to diversity, equity, and inclusion and require them for all students. In developing these courses, we need to discuss and delineate what it is we want students to know and be able to do, and what we want them to have experienced regarding issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion.

Diversifying our curriculum also means providing all of our students with the opportunity to develop their teaching, administrative, or leadership practice in practicum sites serving and/or advocating on the behalf of demographically diverse, historically marginalized, or underserved populations. Currently, a substantial proportion of our students experience such opportunities via our partnership schools, Rounds Project, ESL Endorsement program, Tri-County Project, and select MA internship and student teacher preparation sites. However, it is vital that every student in our teacher preparation and MA programs has the opportunity to learn and enact what constitutes skillful practice in such settings.

In failing to confront the problem of infusing diversity, equity, and inclusion into the curriculum and instruction in our own school, we inadvertently contribute to the legitimacy and reproduction of entrenched social and power inequalities that often go unacknowledged and unaddressed in systems of teaching and learning. We, therefore, embrace the opportunity to revise, elaborate upon, and embolden our curriculum and pedagogy as a means of challenging practices of exclusion in our daily work and in the work of those who are affected by our choices. This is particularly critical in a school of education, as we are doing the parallel work of teaching our own students, and teaching them to teach their students. How we perpetuate or redress exclusion in our own classrooms and through our own curricular and pedagogical choices has implications for how our students will perpetuate or redress exclusion in their own work with young people. Our efforts must seek to strengthen and transform practice in support of socially just classrooms, schools, and educational systems.

In light of the aforementioned challenges and the opportunity for building upon our long standing institutional commitment to advancing teaching and learning in multiple contexts, the SOE will:

- ***Develop the SOE curriculum such that issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion are treated in robust, transparent, and coherent ways.***
- ***Increase, in significant ways, instructors' pedagogical knowledge and skill in cultivating inclusive classrooms that feature multiple perspectives and courageous conversations.***
- ***Cultivate students' ability to engage multiple perspectives and to contribute to instructors' efforts to create brave and inclusive spaces for teaching and learning.***

The SOE will pursue the aforementioned goals to situate diversity, equity, and inclusion as a curricular and pedagogical imperative via the incentives, professional development opportunities, and accountability mechanisms that follow.

Strategies/Actions

The SOE will incentivize and facilitate programs', instructors', students', and staff members' engagement with teaching, learning, and planning efforts that will build our collective capacity to instantiate our commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion in our curriculum, instruction, and interactional norms. Further, the SOE will consistently recognize the diverse group of instructors who work with students and teach in our courses, including faculty members, graduate student instructors, and other course instructors (e.g., mentor teachers, field supervisors), and will actively provide opportunities to support and monitor the instructional commitments and activity of all groups. More specifically, the SOE will:

- I. Include questions about diversity, equity, and inclusion in the teaching and learning process in all applications and interviews associated with hiring new instructors (i.e., tenure-track and clinical-track faculty members, lecturers, and graduate student instructors) to assess applicants' inclination for this work and to build awareness at an early stage that the SOE places a high value on these issues.
- II. Create a fund to:
 - a. Sponsor collaborative retreats in which program chairs, instructors, students, and/or staff members voluntarily convene to advance some teaching and learning agenda central to realizing a sufficiently diverse curriculum and/or inclusive norms and practices.
 - b. Support instructors' travel to and/or enrollment in professional development workshops aimed at developing their pedagogical expertise in cultivating inclusive classrooms.
 - c. Support efforts on the part of individual instructors to develop the diversity or inclusiveness of their courses.

Instructors receiving these funds would be expected to share the nature and outcomes of their efforts with the broader SOE community to grow our collective capacity.
- III. Recognize, via honorary and financial awards and public receptions, excellence in and commitment to: a) teaching in ways that maximize diversity, equity, and inclusion in formal instruction; and/or b) leading efforts aimed at realizing the school's pedagogical and curricular commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion.
- IV. Establish systems of accountability that delineate the roles and expectations of administrators, instructors, students, and staff members in terms of advancing the school's commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion via its curricular and pedagogical agenda. At minimum, accountability will be delineated as follows.

- a. The dean and/or the associate deans will:
 - i. Identify, in consultation with program chairs, faculty members, and experienced graduate student instructors, options for midterm evaluation mechanisms that would support faculty in assessing the inclusiveness of their pedagogical practices (e.g., CRLT's midterm student feedback; peer observation and feedback; individually developed surveys or feedback forms). Faculty would be encouraged to take advantage of some midterm mechanism as a means of receiving feedback to improve upon their practices during a given term.
 - ii. Identify and pilot, in consultation with program chairs, faculty members, and experienced graduate instructors, Evaluation and Examination End-Term Evaluation survey items and/or open-ended questions from which instructors must select in the interest of evaluating their efforts to facilitate more inclusive classroom environments.
 - iii. Design, in consultation with program chairs and the SOE Executive Committee, Faculty Annual Reports that require faculty members to record their goals and progress as they pertain to teaching and learning activity related to diversity, equity, and inclusion.
 - iv. Conduct faculty annual reviews to illuminate, in part, areas of accomplishments and areas that warrant development on the part of faculty members in terms of advancing the SOE's curricular and instructional agenda in the service of diversity, equity, and inclusion to identify/refine relevant benchmarks and/or goals for the upcoming academic year.
 - v. Convene annually a meeting of program chairs to outline and share program-specific curricular and instructional goals related to diversity, equity, and inclusion and to develop and share strategies for implementing these goals. The dean will also facilitate end-of-year and possibly mid-year reviews as it applies to these goals.
 - vi. Design more systematic opportunities for the training, mentoring, and support of graduate student instructors across all coursework.

- b. Program chairs will:
 - i. Conduct an audit of extant courses to assess where we have strengths and where we warrant improvement in terms of advancing our curricular and pedagogical agenda concerning diversity, equity, and inclusion.
 - ii. Facilitate the development of course offerings (required and/or elective) that redress areas of weakness when it comes to enacting our commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion via our curriculum (disciplinary, content area, and/or methodologically specific). Further, program chairs will examine the ways in which current programmatic requirements do and do not support or align with courses more focused on issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion and make needed adjustments.
 - iii. Facilitate the development of units or specializations that bring together the scholarly and teaching expertise of instructors around some diversity or equity agenda that would enhance our institutional capacity to engage research and practice on issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion and would support the recruitment of students and faculty with these interests.

- V. Establish mechanisms for increasing instructors' awareness and enactment of specific teaching strategies and routines that facilitate diversity, equity, and inclusion in the classroom. At minimum, the SOE will:
 - a. Identify, coordinate, and publicize, each year, a range of in-house and/or cross-campus professional development opportunities to enhance the ability of faculty members and graduate student instructors to embed issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion into the teaching and learning process and expect instructors to participate in or select from among them to advance shared and/or personal curricular or instructional goals. The

shared options will revolve around some theme or area of work that was established as worthy of deliberate study and development over the course of the academic year (i.e., akin to how the subject of “listening”—actively and across boundaries of difference—was threaded throughout the many professional development and community building activities that were scheduled during the 2014–2015 academic year).

- b. Identify instructors who excel at pedagogical work that advances diversity, equity, and inclusion and/or who are eager to build school-wide capacity around this work, and provide them with the requisite supports and resources to co-design and co-facilitate professional development efforts for both faculty and graduate student instructors towards this end.
 - c. Create explicit programmatic or school-wide norms for discussing and engaging with one another in classrooms around diversity, equity, and inclusion that will help to foster more inclusive, trusting, equitable environments in our classrooms.
- VI. Establish mechanisms to grow students’ capacities to contribute to the cultivation of inclusive classrooms. At minimum, the SOE will:
- a. Coordinate school-wide or program-level orientations for new students to learn how to participate in difficult, courageous, and constructive dialogues concerning diversity, equity, and social justice.
 - b. Establish one or two other educational forums for students to contend further with issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion as part of their academic, research, or professional development.

FACILITATING AN EQUITABLE AND INCLUSIVE ENVIRONMENT

Diversifying our students, faculty, and staff and extending our research, curriculum, and pedagogical agendas to include diverse content and multiple ways of knowing and doing are essential to cultivating an equitable and inclusive environment in the School of Education. Such diversification and extensions are not, however, sufficient as the inclusion of diverse bodies, content, perspectives, and practices requires members of our community to engage difference in complex, unfamiliar, and often uncomfortable ways. We must, therefore, work to develop norms within the SOE that support the development of attitudes, interactions, and orientations necessary to bridge and engage difference in sensitive, mindful, and productive ways. The cultivation of these norms must be done with explicit attention to the extant status hierarchies (e.g., between staff and faculty, between faculty and students, between tenured and untenured faculty, 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. The cultivation of those attitudes, interactions, and orientations necessary for bridging and engaging differences of identity, perspective, and status, therefore, warrants an empowering environment that fosters the same brave spaces we are seeking to develop as part of our students’ curricular and pedagogical experiences. The brave spaces for which we strive will establish an environment in which all members of our community are able to take risks and are also individually and collectively invested in and accountable for the work ahead. In order to facilitate risk-taking, investment, and accountability on the part of all SOE members, the SOE will work to:

- ***Facilitate shared values, norms, and practices that foster mutual respect, courageous conversations, constructive disagreement, and democratic collaborations.***
- ***Ensure all members of our community feel recognized and supported.***
- ***Increase the cross-cultural competencies of all constituents.***

Towards these ends, we forward the following strategies and actions, which will be implemented in a manner that is consistent with the law, to complement and extend those strategies and actions previously outlined in this document.

Strategies/Actions

- I. Communicate the SOE's commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion on the SOE website and in other public places. Use these venues also to communicate about our efforts to fulfill the ambitions outlined herein.

- II. Host a series of all-school events that facilitate community building and also host teaching, learning, and assessment forums that make evident our commitment to and progress towards building a more equitable and inclusive environment. These events should be hosted at *protected* times and/or with permissions or releases (e.g., from work or class attendance) that would facilitate maximum participation across all constituencies. Towards this end, the SOE will:
 - a. Continue hosting the all-school meeting at the beginning of the year and include in the agenda reports from the dean, associate deans, and program chairs that outline the diversity, equity, and inclusion goals and/or activities for the current academic year in light of the dilemmas or achievements of the previous year.
 - b. Establish an end-of-the-year meeting in which the dean, in collaboration with associate deans and program chairs, reports on and facilitates discussion about institutionalized efforts that were aimed at advancing diversity, equity, and inclusion. This forum would establish an interactive opportunity for all members of the SOE community to think together about our accomplishments over the past year, where improvements are needed and why, and what work is warranted in the coming year.
 - c. Coordinate social events that showcase the talents, commitments, and personal and cultural biographies of members of our community and diminish status divides between community members by providing opportunities for members of different constituencies to interact with each other on more equal footing (e.g., dance party; BET's Outspoken).
 - d. Design all-school professional learning opportunities to help establish norms and practices that facilitate mutual respect, constructive dialogue across difference, brave spaces for difficult conversations, and collaborative work and agendas surrounding diversity, equity, inclusion.
 - e. Host public forums that make evident to ourselves, the university at large, and the broader community the SOE's commitment to showcasing and/or advancing research, practices, and policies that forward diversity, equity, and inclusion. These forums would include, but would not be limited to, the Race and Social Justice in Education Symposium and Workshops, and the MLK Children's Day Event.

- III. Develop accessible and visible means by which individuals can make sense of, document, and/or seek counsel or redress for inequitable, exclusionary, or biased interactions or practices that were reported to them or that they personally witnessed or experienced. Towards this end, the SOE will:
 - a. Educate community members about policies and practices designed to protect against bias and discrimination (e.g., U-M policies and practices concerning discrimination, mandatory reporting, sexual harassment, protection of minors, etc.).
 - b. Delineate and make highly visible those offices, outlets, and individuals within the school and the university at large charged with advising and/or adjudicating issues relevant to access, equity, and bias (e.g., ombudspersons; Office for Institutional Equity; LGBTQI allies; Expect Respect; anonymous reporting to the dean via the SOE website).
 - c. Publicize and encourage participation in training opportunities aimed at growing our collective capacity to meet the needs of a diverse population (e.g., Ally Development Training; Training Group Processes of Intergroup Dialogue Facilitation).
 - d. Coordinate in-house professional development opportunities and/or socialization programs aimed at advising and supporting members of our community about how to respond when they witness, experience, or receive reports of bias or exclusion.

- IV. Develop visible and accessible 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.
- V. Recognize annually or biannually via honors, awards, and/or public receptions members of our community who have contributed substantively to the SOE's commitment to advancing our diversity, equity, and inclusion agenda. Each of the honors/awards should be named in a way that makes evident the nature of the contribution and should allow for the recognition of members from each constituent group (i.e., students, staff, and faculty).

SECURING AND SUSTAINING THE REQUISITE LEADERSHIP

The development of this strategic plan reflects an ongoing change process in the School of Education to advance diversity, equity, and inclusion as an institutional imperative. The Plan builds upon and extends the school's increased efforts to take more deliberate action over the last few years to promote diversity and to advance equity and inclusion via our policies, practices, and norms.[§] Moreover, the Plan codifies and makes transparent our institutional vision for diversity, equity, and inclusion and establishes a road map to marshal and direct in coordinated ways the human and material resources necessary for realizing our vision.

Senior leadership must continue to guide the change journey. Without diminishing the importance of individual and collective efforts that draw upon the resources, commitments, and leadership of students, faculty, and staff to fulfill our institutional vision for diversity, equity, and inclusion, the final responsibility for guiding the change process and the implementation of the Plan rests squarely with senior leadership. Those in positions of decision-making and power actively advance positive institutional transformation. As stewards of the SOE's vision for diversity, equity, and inclusion more generally and the Plan more specifically, senior leadership ensures adherence and accountability to the vision at all levels of the institution. Without the deliberate advocacy for and management of the vision and plan on the part of senior leadership, efforts to build a sustaining institutional culture that consistently champions diversity, equity, and inclusion will flounder and we will achieve less than optimal results. In particular the dean, associate deans, program chairs, and key staff administrators provide critical leadership for the realization of this vision. By prioritizing diversity, equity, and inclusion as a central feature of their administrative efforts, these leaders will sustain the momentum necessary to instantiate diversity, equity, and inclusion as core values in the School of Education.

The SOE is at a critical juncture with regards to securing the leadership warranted to sustain our change effort. We are currently engaged in a search for the next dean of the school who will begin his or her term in the fall of 2016. Consistent with our efforts to recruit faculty over the last few years, the search process for the next dean should be guided by our commitment to institutionalize our value for diversity, equity, and inclusion in all of our efforts. As such, this process should require candidates to evidence their

[§] Over the last few years we have: 1) piloted faculty search principles and protocols that have resulted in diverse applicant pools and short list candidates who evidence backgrounds, knowledge, and commitments likely to advance the school's diversity, equity, and inclusion agenda; 2) piloted interview practices for staff hires that made visible the prospect that applicants would be able to work productively in a diverse work environment and contribute to our diversity, equity, and inclusion agenda; 3) grown the diversity of our staff as well as our faculty; 4) developed a marketing platform for our teacher education program likely to be attractive to a demographically diverse pool of applicants and those who are committed to social justice; 4) organized a range of professional development and community building events to cultivate individual and collective commitment and capacity to facilitate an equitable and inclusive environment; 5) coordinated recruitment activities and fielded scholarship options to recruit a more diverse student body; 6) laid the groundwork for piloting efforts to revise admissions processes that better select for characteristics that incline interns to learn how to teach a diverse student body; 7) raised the visibility of diversity, equity, and inclusion as central tenets via communication efforts, research symposia, and graduate student workshops; and 8) nurtured new school partnerships and elaborated upon old ones to improve our sites and resources for building our institutional capacity and intern preparedness to serve diverse and underserved student populations.

personal commitment and ability to contribute to and lead the diversity, equity, and inclusion agenda of the school as evidenced in this Plan. But commitment is not sufficient.

Transforming an institution culturally and organizationally to promote diversity and to advance equity and inclusion requires heavy lifting—many hands across multiple constituencies must be productively coordinated for the work ahead. Such transformation also requires the skill and courage to manage and redirect the resistance and hesitancy that commonly emerge in pursuing change efforts of this kind. As such, our dean should have had experience and success leading diversity related initiatives; such experience should especially speak to his/her ability to identify and cultivate the internal leadership, buy-in, and team-work required to sustain our change process as well as the commitment and know-how to deploy material and organizational resources to support this change. The dean should also be inclined to learn from and with the SOE community in determining how to best marshal and coordinate our work. Over the course of pursuing our diversity, equity, and inclusion agenda, we have had to repeatedly pause, reinvigorate, or modify our emerging practices and policies in light of our developing knowledge of resources, opportunities, and challenges. The dean should be oriented to learn, reassess, and revise, in consultation with others, the partnerships and processes required for advancing our vision and strategic plan. The dean must continually invigorate the inclination and accountability of associate deans, program chairs, and key administrators to champion and define diversity, equity, and inclusion as program and administrative priorities. In sum, our leadership related goals are to:

- ***Recruit a dean with the requisite commitments, experience, knowledge, learning orientations, and team-building practices to sustain the school's momentum in pursuing our diversity, equity and inclusion agenda.***
- ***Identify and secure senior leadership personally committed to making diversity, equity, and inclusion an institutional priority.***
- ***Facilitate senior leaders' ownership of and policy guidance for realizing the school's vision for diversity, equity, and inclusion and for implementing the Plan.***

Ultimately, leveraging diversity, equity, and inclusion as a vital strategic and coordinated activity requires vision, action, and courage of leadership. Our statement of diversity, equity, and inclusion constitutes our vision, the strategic plan provides a blueprint for action, and steadfast and skillful leadership will shepherd the implementation of the Plan. The following strategic actions will help us secure and encourage the courageous, steadfast, and skillful leadership required for this enterprise.

Strategies/Actions

- I. Work with the provost's office to field a dean search committee and to devise a search and selection process that proactively recruits for candidates whose backgrounds, experiences, and commitments, dispositions, and skill sets are likely to advance the diversity, equity, and inclusion agenda of the school.
- II. Require all senior leadership (i.e., dean and associate deans, program chairs, chief administrative officer) to plan for and document their contributions to advancing the school's vision for diversity, equity, and inclusion and to implementing those aspects of the Plan that are applicable to their program or administrative area. This requirement will entail senior leaders:
 - a. Developing and publicly reporting on their annual goals towards these ends.
 - b. Documenting publicly and as part of their annual review process their progress towards these goals.

STAGING, IMPLEMENTING, AND ASSESSING THE OUTCOMES OF STRATEGIES AND ACTIONS

The School of Education is a complex and dynamic unit. In order to accomplish its goals, this Plan is intentionally ambitious, proactively responsive, and yet flexible in structuring movement toward the identified outcomes. The school understands that the multiple layers of work identified in the Plan must, in many cases, proceed simultaneously. At the same time, we must establish clear priorities and sequenced actions that can stimulate sustained change. The identification of these priorities also helps us target important immediate concerns, capitalize on current investments, and catalyze behaviors and actions that can leverage momentum into the future. Our priorities are focused on establishing a set of key milestones and processes to facilitate our progress, mark our accomplishments, and alert us to the need to reassess or reframe particular goals, strategies, or action steps.

Although each of the areas in the Plan is important to the achievement of our goals, over the next three years the school will give priority attention to a core set of objectives, milestones, and processes that will facilitate our individual and collective commitment and ability to: recruit and support diverse students, faculty, and staff; develop inclusive curricular and pedagogical practices; and cultivate an overall equitable and inclusive climate and culture.

We outline in Table 1 the nature and staging of these focal activities as well as that which we seek to achieve through our work. The proposed staging and objectives of our strategic efforts represent important levers for tangible achievement in those areas our community has identified as necessary to demonstrate serious progress toward our goals. These milestones, processes, and intended outcomes create actionable pathways to assist designated groups in scheduling activities that move us toward our articulated goals, and will be incorporated in a manner that is consistent with the law. They help us create expectations that work will be accomplished in certain timeframes so that our students, colleagues, and others can anticipate results and we can hold each other responsible for achieving these outcomes. Further, the milestones can suggest strategies for assessing the impact of these efforts at various points. Although the milestones are intended to push the process, they are not intended to be inflexible and can be adjusted as time and circumstance require. Table 1 also delineates the body or unit that will take the lead in coordinating this element of our work. Because we are working towards a collective agenda, the lead body or unit will necessarily consult with other constituent groups and parties as would be relevant to achieving the stated objectives and accordant milestones and/or processes.

We also establish in the remaining tables (i.e., Tables 2, 3, and 4) key metrics and methods of tracking our progress in pursuing our diversity, equity, and inclusion goals. Our application of these metrics and the methods of tracking will be deployed in legally permissible ways. We detail the logic of these metrics and modes of assessment following Table 1.

TABLES

TABLE 1: KEY MILESTONES, PROCESSES, AND INTENDED OUTCOMES

INFRASTRUCTURE AND OVERSIGHT

Objectives	Timeframe	Key Milestones/Processes	Intended Outcomes	Lead Body/Unit
Internal approval of Statement and Plan	Winter/ Spring 2015	All SOE constituents have opportunity for final review and discussion of diversity statement and strategic plan culminating with a plan adoption statement from the dean.	Modifications are made to milestones, processes, and basic metrics as would be warranted given discussion. SOE publicly announces and establishes its organizational commitment to promoting diversity, and to advancing equity and inclusion.	Dean and EDAC
Facilitate a dean search and selection process consistent with the Plan	Winter/ Spring 2015	SOE shares with the provost the diversity, equity, and inclusion statement and Plan to emphasize the school's interest in fielding a search team and coordinating search practices likely to cultivate a candidate pool and the selection of a candidate well positioned to advance the school's diversity, equity, and inclusion agenda.	The composition and practices of the dean search committee result in the appointment of dean who has the commitment and capacity to advance our vision for diversity, equity, and inclusion and to implement the Plan.	EDAC
Refine work priorities	Spring/ Summer 2015	Dean's office, EDAC, program chairs, governing bodies, and constituent groups confer with each other to determine what objectives, strategies, and actions outside of those recommended herein should be prioritized in Year 1, Year 2, and Year 3 of Plan implementation and who are the operational leads for achieving particular ends.	A predictable and transparent means to track and present for public review and discussion the progress and implementation of the Plan is created.	Dean
Create public accountability mechanisms	Spring/ Summer 2015	Develop a progress report template or scorecard for incorporation into dean's report to the SOE at the all-school meeting each fall.	Processes are generative and data and information are being used for public accountability, public celebration, and personal and community growth.	Dean and EDAC

Objectives	Timeframe	Key Milestones/Processes	Intended Outcomes	Lead Body/Unit
External review and approval of Statement and Plan	Fall 2015	Request a final review of Statement and Plan by the Office of General Counsel and seek approval of the Statement and Plan from the Diversity Equity Leadership Team for Academic Affairs (DELTA).	Statement and Plan are in compliance with university level efforts to advance, diversity, equity, and inclusion via the development of unit- and university-level diversity strategic plans.	Dean
Implement Plan	Fall 2015 through Winter 2021	Enact and elaborate upon means for staging and coordinating the work of key players and for collecting, analyzing, and disseminating data and information to evaluate the status and outcomes of Plan implementation.	Work activity is effectively paced and coordinated and appropriate oversight and handoffs are conducted.	Dean and EDAC, in collaboration with other school leaders
Develop and present Diversity Report	Winter 2018 and Winter 2021	Provide three-year updates on the status of the Plan and present to the community at an all-school end-of-the-year meeting.	Comprehensive review of work is completed. SOE community's assessment and discussion of the review determines warranted revisions and additions to the Plan and whether priorities need to be adjusted.	EDAC and dean

FACULTY

Objectives	Timeframe	Key Milestones/Processes	Intended Outcomes	Lead Body/Unit
Actively recruit and hire faculty	Summer/ Fall 2015	Solicit the observations and assessments of search committee members, recent hires, program chairs, associate deans, and Executive Committee to inform the revision of the faculty search and campus visit protocols.	SOE generates improved protocols for recruiting and yielding faculty with the requisite expertise and commitments for advancing the school's diversity, equity, and inclusion agenda.	Dean, in consultation with EDAC
	Fall 2015 and beyond	Implement fully the revised search processes as evidenced by compliance with new procedures and use of checklists.	SOE has institutionalized recruitment and hiring processes that maximize opportunities for diversifying our faculty demographically and in terms of their scholarly and practice-based expertise and commitments.	Dean's office, academic units, and chairs of search committees
	Fall 2015	Generate priority list of potential person-specific hires over the next three years.	SOE is proactively increasing the diversity of its faculty as budget allows.	Department chairs and dean, in consultation with EDAC

STUDENTS

Objectives	Timeframe	Key Milestones/Processes	Intended Outcomes	Lead Body/Unit
<p>Actively recruit, admit, yield, and support students</p>	<p>Summer/ Fall 2015</p>	<p>Key strategic actions for recruiting and sustaining a diverse student body prioritized by unit heads, assigned as work projects and provided necessary resources for implementation. These actions will include:</p>	<p>Student diversity within SOE is increased.</p>	<p>Dean’s office, program chairs, and the Office of Student Affairs (OSA)</p>
	<p>Spring/ Summer 2015</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishing incentives for faculty to co-plan and teach innovative undergraduate courses to establish a pipeline to our teacher certification and MA programs. 		
	<p>Summer/ Fall 2015</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instituting academic scholarships in 2015–2016 likely to attract and yield applicants with the backgrounds, skills, and orientations we seek. • Designing and pilot-testing in 2015–2016 modifications to the TE application and/or admissions process to increase our likelihood of identifying and yielding applicants with the backgrounds, skills, and orientations we seek. 		

STAFF

Objectives	Timeframe	Key Milestones/Processes	Intended Outcomes	Lead Body/Unit
<p>Actively recruit, hire, and support staff</p>	<p>Spring/ Summer 2015</p>	<p>Develop and prepare to pilot staff search principles, protocols, and checklist that will support the recruitment of a diverse staff body and staff members with backgrounds, experiences, skills, and dispositions that will contribute the school's efforts to promote diversity and advance equity and inclusion.</p>	<p>Staff diversity and staff capacity to contribute to the school's diversity, equity, and inclusion agenda are increased.</p>	<p>CAO and staff advisory body, in consultation with dean and EDAC</p>
		<p>Prioritize key strategic actions for facilitating equity and inclusion among staff and to support staff commitment and contributions to an overall equitable and inclusive environment within the SOE. Afford lead individuals or work groups the necessary resources for planning and implementation. These actions will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifying and developing, via a staff committee, a plan to make better sense of and address areas of particular staff dissatisfaction as per the findings of the 2013–2014 staff climate survey. • Designing and piloting in 2015–2016 an assessment in which staff can document and evaluate their experiences with faculty and supervisors. The outcomes of this assessment will be used to plan professional development opportunities for faculty and supervisors. 	<p>Staff experience climate as more equitable and inclusive and feel a sense of ownership and capability in growing the equity and inclusion of the school as a whole.</p>	

CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

Objectives	Timeframe	Key Milestones/Processes	Intended Outcomes	Lead Body/Unit
<p>Advance curriculum and instruction</p>	<p>Spring/ Summer 2015</p>	<p>FAR revised to include pilot questions related to faculty efforts and accomplishments associated with diversifying the content of the curriculum and/or cultivating inclusive pedagogical practices. The outcomes of the pilot will be evaluated in preparation for developing the FAR for the 2015–2016 academic year</p>	<p>Issues of equity and diversity are infused in the curriculum and inclusion is more robustly documented or evidenced in the instructional practices of instructors.</p>	<p>Dean, in consultation with Executive Committee and program chairs</p>
	<p>Summer/ Fall 2015</p>	<p>Key strategic actions for building faculty commitment to and capacity for diversifying the curriculum and for cultivating inclusive classroom norms and practices prioritized. Lead individuals or work groups are afforded the necessary resources for planning and implementation. These actions will include:</p>		<p>Dean's office and program chairs, in consultation with Executive Committee</p>
	<p>Fall 2015</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishing and supporting 1 or 2 voluntary workgroup(s) in which instructors will work to advance some element of their practice likely to engender a more diverse curriculum or more inclusive classrooms. Workgroup(s) will share their learning and outcomes with other instructors. 		<p>Dean's office, in collaboration with program chairs and Executive Committee</p>
	<p>Fall 2015/ Winter 2016</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Piloting and evaluating the set of diversity questions from which faculty should select in designing their end-term course evaluations. 		<p>Associate deans for academic affairs (ADAA), in coordination with program chairs and in consultation with EDAC</p>

CLIMATE AND CULTURE

Objectives	Timeframe	Key Milestones/Processes	Intended Outcomes	Lead Body/Unit
Improve culture and climate	Spring/ Summer 2015	Define the diversity, equity, and inclusion “theme” around which the school will organize professional development and community building activities during the 2015–2016 academic year.	SOE has an organizing framework by which it strategically builds the capacity of its constituents to contribute to the school’s diversity, equity, and inclusion agenda.	Dean’s office, in collaboration with program chairs and Executive Committee
	Summer/ Fall 2015	Develop, confirm, and publicize the channels by which community members can report: 1) incidents of bias and exclusion that impinge on our realization of our diversity, equity, and inclusion agenda; and 2) experiences that evidence the school’s progress in building a more equitable and inclusive environment.	SOE has reliable and safe reporting mechanisms by which we can collect additional and unanticipated data that will assist us in gauging our progress and challenges in building a socially just environment.	EDAC
	Winter 2016	Present first set of annual or biannual awards that recognize students, faculty, and/or staff who contributed substantively to the school’s diversity, equity, and inclusion agenda.	SOE publicly recognizes and builds individual and collective commitment to and engagement with the vision and the Plan.	Dean and EDAC
	Fall 2017 and every three years thereafter	Complete an all-school climate assessment to gauge progress in addressing areas of concern that were identified in light of survey responses to the spring 2013–winter 2014 all-school climate assessment.	SOE community makes progress in becoming a more inclusive and welcoming community for faculty, staff, and students.	EDAC and dean’s office
	Fall 2017 and every three years thereafter	Evaluate climate survey responses to identify any intergroup disparities on measures of positive sense of belonging and community equity.	Growing sense of an inclusive community is recognized equally by diverse constituents.	All programs

In Tables 2, 3, and 4, we provide a set of key metrics and modes of tracking the progress and outcomes of our efforts. These metrics and modes of tracking represent fundamental and readily available means of evaluating, learning from, and advancing our organizational momentum towards our goals. We categorize these metrics and modes of tracking as fundamental because they represent the types of data that must be collected *at minimum* in order for us to mark and assess our progress. They are readily available in the sense that the University of Michigan or the SOE already has means of tracking these data or can easily and/or appropriately create mechanisms of tracking these data (e.g., as per the current design or prospective redesign of admissions applications, the requirement to comply with federal affirmative action mandates, and current conventions or legal mandates surrounding private or protected statuses).

In some instances it may be technically feasible to collect or analyze data but to do so would risk the anonymity or privacy of some members of our community. For example, although the SOE values the contributions and seeks the inclusion of members of our community who are LGBTQI-identified, are of minoritized or marginalized religious faiths, and are persons with special needs or disabilities, there is no ready, safe, and non-controversial means of tracking individuals of these statuses via data sets that are already available to us or others that we might readily create. We can and will, however, document and analyze the inclusion of these community members via our climate surveys, which provide a confidential and anonymous means for these populations to report on their experiences within the SOE.

Because of the data and analysis constraints we have outlined above, we anticipate that additional, sufficiently differentiated, and often more robust means of assessing and monitoring our progress towards our goals will be proposed and developed in the process of pursuing the focal objectives described above.

**TABLE 2: DIVERSIFYING WHO WE ARE
Key Metrics and Modes of Tracking**

Constituency Group	Goal	Metric/Tracking	Lead Body/Unit
Students	Increase the demographic diversity of our student body	Document annually changes in the demographic diversity of the student body in each of our programs as evidenced by the following characteristics at minimum: race/ethnicity, gender, first generation college attendance/completion, fluency in a language other than English. Documentation evidences a growth in students of color, first generation college goers or completers, men in our teacher certification programs, and students who are fluent in a language other than English.	EDAC, in collaboration with OSA
	Attract students who have demonstrated commitments to advancing equity and social justice	Document after each admissions cycle the students yielded who have demonstrated commitments to advancing equity and social justice and what constituted evidence of these commitments. Documentation evidences that the SOE is increasingly recruiting cohorts in which higher proportions of students have demonstrated these commitments in robust ways.	EDAC, in collaboration with program chairs
Faculty	Increase the demographic diversity of our faculty	Document annually changes in the demographic diversity of our faculty body as evidenced by the following characteristics at minimum: race/ethnicity and gender. Documentation evidences a growth in our faculty of color and especially in men faculty of color.	Dean, in collaboration with EDAC
	Attract faculty members who have research agendas, teaching/mentoring commitments and practices, and/or service orientations likely to facilitate the SOE's agenda to promote diversity and to advance equity and inclusion	Document how new hires are likely to contribute to our efforts to promote diversity and advance equity and inclusion. Documentation evidences a strong alignment between the resources the faculty member brings and school's priority efforts.	Search committees, EDAC, dean, and program chairs

Constituency Group	Goal	Metric/Tracking	Lead Body/Unit
Staff	Increase the demographic diversity of our staff	Document annually changes in the demographic diversity of our staff body as evidenced by the following characteristics at minimum: race/ethnicity and gender. Documentation evidences growth in staff of color and also equitable representation of men and women in a manner that is consistent with logic and objectives of U-M's <i>Affirmative Action Program for Women and Minorities</i> .	CAO, in collaboration with EDAC
	Attract staff who have backgrounds, experiences, skills, and/or dispositions likely to facilitate the SOE's agenda to promote diversity and to advance equity and inclusion	Document how new hires are likely to contribute to the SOE's agenda to promote diversity and to advance equity and inclusion. Documentation evidences a strong alignment between the resources the staff member brings and the school's priority efforts.	CAO, in collaboration with EDAC

**TABLE 3: CULTIVATING INCLUSIVE CURRICULAR AND PEDAGOGICAL PRACTICES
Key Metrics and Modes of Tracking**

Focal Area	Goal	Metric/Tracking	Responsible Body/Unit
<p>Curriculum</p>	<p>Enhance students' opportunities to engage diverse scholarly perspectives as well as view course content from the vantage and experiences of different social groups</p>	<p>Document the revision or creation of courses or areas of study that provide for these opportunities (as evidenced in syllabi, FARs of faculty members and program chairs, and organization charts).</p> <p>Document the revision or creation of co-curricular opportunities that provide for such learning (as evidenced by the content of the FARs of faculty members, program chairs, unit leads, and associate deans)</p> <p>Documentation evidences an increase over time in the opportunities for students to engage diverse scholarly perspectives.</p>	<p>Program chairs, in collaboration with faculty members and in consultation with dean's office</p>
	<p>Increase opportunities for students in our teacher certification programs to observe and/or student teach in demographically diverse and/or underserved schools</p>	<p>Document annually the number of interns who are being prepared to teach in demographically diverse (i.e., schools in which no single racial/ethnic or socioeconomic group constitutes more than 50% of the student population) and/or underserved schools (i.e., schools in underfunded districts or whose student population is predominantly students of historically marginalized or minoritized backgrounds). Documentation evidences an increase over time in the proportion of students who are being prepared to teach in these contexts.</p>	<p>Teacher Education (TE) chairs, in collaboration with TE faculty and staff</p>
	<p>Increase opportunities for students in our non-teacher certification MA programs to intern in sites that directly serve or work in the service of demographically diverse, historically marginalized, or historically underserved communities</p>	<p>Document annually the number of master's students who complete internships in sites that directly serve or work in the service of demographically diverse or historically marginalized or underserved communities. Documentation evidences an increase over time in the proportion of students who completed CSHPE or ES internships in sites of these kinds.</p>	<p>Program chairs, in collaboration with key faculty advisors and internship coordinators</p>

Focal Area	Goal	Metric/Tracking	Responsible Body/Unit
Classroom instruction	Increase faculty efficacy and facility in developing classroom norms and engaging instructional practices that support the creation of a courageous and inclusive classroom climate for all students	Document through FARs and in aggregated responses to relevant items in the ADVANCE climate survey efforts towards these ends. Documentation evidences increased efficacy in faculty members' knowledge of and ability to engage practices that support the cultivation of an inclusive classroom and increased student satisfaction with the inclusiveness of their classroom experiences, with no substantive differences in student responses across programs or demographic groups.	Program chairs and dean, in collaboration with faculty members and in consultation with ADAA and EDAC
Mentoring	Increase faculty efficacy and facility in mentoring students	<p>Document through FARs and in aggregated responses to relevant items in the ADVANCE climate survey efforts towards these ends. Documentation evidences increased efficacy in faculty members' ability to mentor students and increased student satisfaction with the mentoring they receive.</p> <p>Document student completion rates and median time to candidacy and degree. Documentation evidences higher completion rates and reduced median time to candidacy and degree with no substantive distinction between students of different demographic backgrounds (i.e., as per outcomes of Rackham program reviews).</p>	Program chairs and dean, in collaboration with faculty members and in consultation with ADAA and EDAC

**TABLE 4: FACILITATING AN EQUITABLE AND INCLUSIVE ENVIRONMENT
Key Metrics and Modes of Tracking**

Constituency	Goal	Metric/Tracking	Responsible Body/Unit
Students	Increase student satisfaction with the SOE climate and culture	Document through the student portion of the ADVANCE climate survey progress in student satisfaction. Documentation evidences growth in relation to this goal.	Dean and EDAC, in consultation with GSCO and BET
	Reduce substantive differences in student satisfaction across programs or across demographic divides	Document through the student portion of the ADVANCE climate survey how students' responses differ across programs and across demographic groups within each program. No analysis would be conducted that would jeopardize the anonymity of participants. Documentation evidences a reduction of substantive differences.	EDAC, in collaboration with GSCO and BET
Faculty	Increase faculty satisfaction with the SOE climate and culture	Document through the faculty portion of the ADVANCE climate survey progress in faculty satisfaction. Documentation evidences growth in relation to this goal.	Dean and EDAC, in consultation with Executive Committee
	Reduce substantive differences in faculty satisfaction across rank and statuses	Document through the faculty portion of the ADVANCE climate survey how satisfaction differs across rank (assistant professors, associate professors, professors) and status (i.e., clinical track, tenure track, lecturers, and research professors). No analysis would be conducted that would jeopardize the anonymity of participants. Documentation evidences a reduction of substantive differences.	EDAC
Staff	Increase staff satisfaction with the SOE climate and culture	Document through the staff portion of the ADVANCE climate survey progress in staff satisfaction. Documentation evidences growth in relation to this goal.	CAO, in consultation with EDAC and staff advisory council
	Reduce substantive differences in staff satisfaction across demographic groups and offices	Document through the staff portion of the ADVANCE climate survey and through analysis by an external party how satisfaction differs across demographic groups and offices. No analysis would be conducted that would jeopardize the anonymity of participants. Documentation evidences a reduction of substantive differences.	CAO, in consultation with EDAC

ENDNOTES

¹In assessing the diversity of our student body, we rely on the 2010–2011 through 2013–2014 enrollment figures to discuss trends over that time span. Data for the current academic year (i.e., 2014–2015) will provide the benchmarks by which we will assess the effectiveness of our efforts going forward. As per standard University of Michigan discourse, references to underrepresented minorities (URMs) include Latinas/os, African Americans, and Native Americans. References to persons of color include URMs plus Asian Americans. Students of color only include those who are U.S. citizens or permanent residents as the University of Michigan does not include international students from racially minoritized groups in its calculations of students of color.

²During the academic year 2013–2014, only 8.6% of the interns in our undergraduate elementary certification program were men, and that percentage included no men of color. Although the percentage of men in our ELMAC program (16%) approached the percentage of teachers nationally who are men and are serving in elementary and middle schools combined (18.3% and an appropriate referent as we offer K-8 certification in our elementary programs), our ELMAC program which certifies interns for K-8 instruction also had no men of color enrolled. Between 2010–2011 and 2012–2013, we have had no more than one man of color enrolled in our undergraduate elementary program and no more than two men of color enrolled in ELMAC. In both programs the percentage of underrepresented minorities enrolled has exhibited a downward trend since the fall of 2010—going from 12.1% in 2010–2011 to 9.5% in 2013–2014 in our undergraduate program and 20.0% in 2010–2011 to 5.3% in 2013–2014 in our graduate program. We have, however, had recent success in recruiting Asian American women to our undergraduate certification program. Six Asian American women were enrolled in 2013–2014—double our previous high of three Asian American students in 2010–2011. Our ELMAC program previously enrolled a high of four Asian American women in 2011–2012 but has otherwise had no more than one Asian American woman enrolled. No Asian American men were enrolled during this same period and African American men were not represented at the undergraduate level. Since the fall of 2010, we have yet to enroll a Native American student in either of our elementary programs.

³During the 2013–2014 academic year, men constituted 41.9% of the students in our undergraduate secondary program and 41.5% of the students in our MAC program. This gender diversity is consistent with the representation of men in the secondary teaching force (i.e., 42%). In this same year, men of color constituted 22.5% of the men in the undergraduate program and 17% of the men in our MAC program, but they were disproportionately represented by Asian American men, who were six of the fourteen undergraduate men of color and all of the men of color in the MAC program. In terms of other men of color, we had a high of five Latino men and a high of seven African American men enrolled in our undergraduate program in 2012–2013. However, no Latino or Native American men have enrolled in our MAC program since fall of 2010 and the number of African American men in our MAC program has been nominal at best. The proportion of underrepresented minorities in the undergraduate program has increased since the fall of 2010—going from 11.6% in 2010–2011 to 13.5% in 2013–2014 and the enrollment of underrepresented minorities in the MAC program has remained small throughout this same period (i.e., ranging between 7.3% to 10% of any cohort between 2010–2011 and 2013–14).

⁴The enrollment of first generation college students in our undergraduate elementary program reached a high of 4% in 2010–2011, included no first generation college students in 2011–2012, and represented only 2% of the 2012–2013 and 2013–2014 enrollment. The enrollment of first generation students in the secondary program remained between 2% and 3% between 2010–2011 and 2012–2013 and jumped to 7% in 2013–2014. During this same time period the enrollment of first generation students in the U-M undergraduate population as a whole was between 5% and 6%.

⁵In 2010–2011 the enrollment of first generation college goers was 2% and 14% in our ELMAC and SECMAC programs respectively. By 2013–2014 the enrollments of first generation college goers had dropped to 11% in the ELMAC program and 5% in the SECMAC program.

⁶As of fall of 2015 we will begin documenting the number of students who are fluent in languages other than English. We will also explore whether we might identify reliable measures by which we can tabulate those students who enter into our program with social justice orientations. As such, we will be able to evaluate whether these two sub-populations are also growing over time.

⁷Although our joint programs operate outside the scope of this strategic plan given their distinct organizational and administrative structure, it is important to note that the Combined Program in Education and Psychology (CPEP) boasts the greatest racial/ethnic diversity of all SOE related programs and the Joint Program in English and Education (JP EE) is almost wholly white. In contrast, 42% of the students enrolled in CPEP are underrepresented minorities—a percentage that has varied little since 2010–2011. More specifically, the percentage

of African Americans has ranged from 20.0% in 2010–2011 to 26.3% in 2013–2014 in this four-year span and the percentage of Latinas/os has ranged from 12.8% (2012–2013) to 23.3% (2010–2011)—representing an upward trend in the enrollment of African Americans and a downward trend of Latinas/os since 2010–2011. Native Americans have not been enrolled during this four-year period and the number of Asian Americans enrolled has remained less than a handful. During this same span of time, the JPEE enrolled only one student of color, with the exception of 2011–2012 in which two students of color were enrolled. African Americans represent the only students of color enrolled in the JPEE program during this time span with no men being included in that count.

With regards to the enrollment of first generation college students, CPEP has also been the most competitive in recruiting first generation college graduates. Their enrollment of these students is, however, on a downward trajectory (going from 20% in 2010–2011, to 17% in 2011–2012, to 13% in both 2012–2013 and 2013–2014). In 2010–2011 and 2011–2012 JPEE had no first generation students enrolled but in 2012–2013 and 2013–2014 8% and 13% first generation students were respectively enrolled.

CPEP has also fared competitively in terms of enrolling international students. The enrollment of international students ranged between 14% and 18% between 2010–2011 and 2013–2014 with the last two years in this window registering enrollments of 18%. In the same period, JPEE had no international students enrolled outside of in 2010–2011 when the program enrolled two international students (8%).

⁸At the MA level 28.2% of white master's degree recipients concentrate in the field of education (Aud, Fox, & KewalRamani, 2010). In comparison 27.7% of Black MA degree recipients, 32.7% of Latinas/os, and 32.2% of Native American or Alaskan Natives concentrate in the field of education (Aud, Fox, & KewalRamani, 2010). In 2011, 11.9% of whites who received their PhD received their doctorates in education. In comparison, 23.5% of Native American PhD recipients, and 26.0% of Black PhD recipients received their doctorates in education. Latina/o PhD recipients received their doctorates in education at a rate comparable to whites (11.6%) (Survey of Earned Doctorates, Table 23).

⁹During the academic year 2013–2014, 22% of the students enrolled in CSHPE's MA program were underrepresented minorities. No Native Americans were included in this count and the enrollment of African Americans was at its lowest since 2010–2011, with only 5.6% being African Americans (and including a minuscule proportion of African American men). In contrast during the previous academic year the enrollment of African Americans reached a high of 10%. The proportion of Latinas/os in the CSHPE MA program was, however, at its highest since 2010–2011. Latinas/os represented two-thirds of the URMs enrolled in 2013–2014 and was double the enrollment of Latinas/os in the previous academic year. CSHPE has also had reasonable success in enrolling Asian American students, with 9.7% of the students enrolled in 2013–2014 being Asian American—bringing the overall percentage of persons of color to 32.0%. As with URMs, men are severely underrepresented in this count.

¹⁰Educational Studies' 2013–2014 enrollment of URMs in its MA program is equivalent to that of CSHPE's (i.e. 21%). And as is also the case with the CSHPE MA program, these students are disproportionately represented by women. Since 2011–2012 the enrollment of underrepresented minorities has been reasonably consistent (hovering between 19.8% and 21.7%) and represents an increase over the 2010–2011 enrollment of URMs (i.e., 16.1%). Over this four-year span, the African American enrollment has risen with the percentage of African Americans representing an uneven upward trend since 2010–2011—going from a low of 5.4% in 2010–2011 to 13.0% in 2011–2012 to 9.9% in 2012–2013 to 11.3% in 2013–2014. The number of Latinas/os enrolled has generally hovered around 8.5% with the exception of an enrollment of 10.7% in 2010–2011. Newly enrolled URMs (i.e., those who enrolled for the first time in fall of 2013) are disproportionately represented by African Americans and no Native Americans are included in this count. No Asian Americans were enrolled in the ES MA program during 2013–2014 after having recruited a nominal number of Asian American students equally divided between males and females. When lower numbers of Asian Americans were enrolled during 2010–2011 and 2011–2012 only women were included in these counts.

¹¹During the 2013–2014 academic year, underrepresented minorities represented 26.2% of the students enrolled in CSHPE's doctoral program, with the majority being of Latino descent, a third being of African descent, and a nominal number of Native Americans. Unlike our other graduate programs, the African American enrollment has been fairly evenly split between males and females since 2010–2011 but the enrollment of Latinas has been double or triple that of Latino men—with the exception of 2010–2011 when Latino men approached the enrollment of Latinas. The smaller representation of Native Americans over this same time span included only women. And while the enrollment of Asian Americans has ranged from a low of 6.6% in 2013–2014 to a high of 9.9% in 2010–2011, no Asian American men have been enrolled during this period. In the fall of 2013 no newly enrolled students were underrepresented minorities.

¹²The enrollment of underrepresented minorities in ES (14.5%) is proportionately less than that of CSHPE (26.2%), but that enrollment has grown in both numbers and percentages since 2010–2011—going from

approximately 12% in 2010–2011, 2011–2012, and 2012–2013 to 14.5% in 2013–2014. And although the males and females of Latino descent have been enrolled in the program at comparable levels, the enrollment of African American women has dwarfed the enrollment of African American men. The enrollment of Asian Americans is currently down in number compared to previous enrollments of Asian American students. No Asian Americans enrolled during the fall of 2013; and a nominal number of African Americans and Latinas/os enrolled that same fall. The enrollment of Native Americans has paled in comparison to these figures.

¹³In 2013–2014 CSHPE's enrollment of first generation students reached a high of 15% and ES reached a high 8%. In 2010–2011 the enrollment of doctoral students who were first generation college graduates was 3% in ES and 9% in CSHPE, in 2011–2012 it was 4% in ES and 10% in CSHPE, in 2012–2013 it was 6% in ES and 12% in CSHPE.

¹⁴Prior to that year first generation college graduate enrollment in the CSHPE MA program was 14% in 2010–2011, 10% in 2011–2012, and 15% in 2012–2013.

¹⁵The high of 22% was achieved in 2011–2012 when 10 of the 46 students enrolled were first generation students. In 2010–2011, 2012–2013, and 2013–2014 the enrollment of first generation students was 18%, 13%, and 18% respectively.

¹⁶Between 2010–2011 and 2013–2014, the enrollment of international students in the ES doctoral program has ranged between 13% and 18% (2010–2011, 18%; 2011–2012, 16%; 2012–2013, 13% ; 2013–2014, 15%). In that same time period the enrollment of international students in CSHPE's doctoral program ranged between 10% and 18% (2010–2011, 18%; 2011–2012, 10%; 2012–2013, 11%; 2013–2014, 10%). At the MA level international student enrollment in ES has been increasing over time going from 9% in 2010–2011 and 2011–2012 to 16% in 2012–2013 and 22% in 2013–2014. The only exception to these patterns of enrollment are in CSHPE's MA program where no more than 4% of the enrollment has been international. This is to be expected as the MA program in CSHPE, as is the case for our teacher certification programs, emphasizes the preparation of professionals for work in institutions that educate or otherwise serve postsecondary populations or those who are seeking postsecondary degrees or training.

¹⁷The school also employs intermittent lecturers and adjunct lecturers or professors. Between 2010–2011 and 2014–2015, we saw a steep decline in the number of intermittent lecturers upon which we relied—going from employing 47 intermittent lecturers in 2010–2011 to nine in 2014–2015. That decline included a corresponding decline in the percentage of persons of color within this rank (i.e., from 9% to 0%). The percentage of women intermittent lecturers ranged between 61% (in 2010–2011) and 80% (in 2011–2012) with 67% of the intermittent lecturers being women in 2014–2015. Adjunct lecturers and professor were few in number. They ranged between three and five between 2010–2011 and 2014–2015 and were 25% persons of color and 50% women in 2014–2015. No men of color were included among adjunct lecturers or professors and intermittent lecturers hit a high of two men of color in 2010–2011. There were no men of color among intermittent lecturers in 2014–2015.

¹⁸ In 2010–2011 staff demographics were 17.4% persons of color and 79.7% female; in 2011–2012 they were 15% persons of color and 79.7% female; in 2012–2013 they were 16.1% persons of color and 81.5% female; in 2013–14 they were 15.2% persons of color and 78.6% female; and in 2014–2015 they were 19.1% persons of color and 75.3% female.

REFERENCES

Arao, B., & Clemens, K. (2013). From safe space to brave spaces: A new way to frame dialogue around diversity and social justice. In L. M. Landreman, *The Art of Effective Facilitation: Reflections from Social Justice Educators* (pp. 135- 150), Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing

Aud, S., Fox, M., & KewalRamani, A. (2010). *Status and trends in the education of racial and ethnic groups: NCES 2010-2015*. Washington DC: National Center for Education Statistics.

Bastedo, M. N. and Jacquette, O. (2011). Running in place: Low-income students and the dynamics of higher education stratification. *Education Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 33, pp. 318-339.

Boser, U. (2011). *Teacher diversity matters: A state by state analysis of teachers of color*. Washington, DC: Center for American Progress.

Page, S. E. (2007). *The difference: How the power of diversity creates better groups, firms, schools, and societies*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Saunders, S. & Kardia, D. (2011). *Creating inclusive college classrooms*. Ann Arbor, MI: The Regents of the University of Michigan.



School of Education

University of Michigan

1110 School of Education Bldg.

610 East University Ave.

Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1259

www.soe.umich.edu