

## Faculty of Color FSU Meeting

April 19, 2019

### Executive Summary and Recommendations

We, faculty of color, recognize that the FSU has done many good things for faculty both on and off the tenure track and appreciate the efforts that have gone into making these gains. We also recognize that there are many areas of faculty need and areas of inequity within the university not related to race or ethnicity, especially, but not limited to, inequities between those on and off the tenure track. Simultaneously, we believe that the racial inequities within the University should be recognized and proactively addressed by the FSU on behalf of all members, and particularly those who are faculty of color.

In our discussions about the experiences of faculty of color within the university, and our experiences of how the FSU has or has not addressed issues related to faculty of color, our major message to the FSU ExComm is that to meet the needs of the UMB faculty and faculty of color generally, the *FSU as an entity and FSU leadership in particular needs to think (and act) beyond the contract*. Our perception is that there is a general lack of courage or will from union leadership to express faculty desires to administration, to advocate for faculty, to support faculty, or to offer much beyond contract compliance. More specifically, there has been no advocacy or leadership by the FSU to support faculty of color or address identified issues of inequity that are affecting faculty experience and creating or maintaining inequities.

The central issues identified below relate to discrimination, both interpersonal and institutional, and often discrimination that is not intentional or deliberately targeted by or towards specific individuals, but is present and impactful nonetheless. Most of these issues have been supported by research indicating inequities within the academy nationally and some have already been specifically identified by research within UMass. Some of these issues may not be contract issues but they are all issues that we believe that the FSU should be concerned about and *take action on*, through faculty organizing, advocacy with administration and other offices (e.g. HR, ODEI, OFD), demanding increased transparency, or addressing structural issues within FSU. Even for issues that may be contract issues, we believe that often the first steps should be advocacy and organizing, with contract being the consequence of failed accountability by the University administration. In these cases, we believe the FSU should be advocating for contract changes to ensure accountability.

The following major areas were identified by faculty of color as problematic and needing to be addressed by the FSU through advocacy, organizing, and contract bargaining:

1. Experienced Racial Discrimination within the University
2. Unequal Burden in Service and Advising Responsibilities
3. Accountability for Existing Diversity Structures or Prior Initiatives to Address Inequities.
4. FSU Leadership and FSU Process (governance, bargaining, member meetings) Is, Itself, Racially Problematic

Expansion of the meaning of each area and specific perspectives and experiences related to each area are included below.

We also provide recommendations for concrete actions/initiatives that FSU could take to begin to advocate for change and challenge discrimination, to address inequities within the FSU itself, and/or to consider in relation to the next contract, in order to *begin* to address some of these issues.

### Recommendations for Initiatives

***We request that the FSU take action on the following recommendations, beginning with the first three.*** If it is the case that the FSU has already taken action on any of the requests below, the faculty of color participating in these discussions is not aware of this, which indicates an additional issue of communication, transparency, and member involvement that needs to be addressed by the FSU.

1. FSU should initiate a review and gender/race equity analysis of current faculty contracts (both TT and NTT) including salary, courseload, and service expectations.
2. FSU should initiate a review and gender/race equity analysis of hiring practices (for both TT and NTT) including salaries, start up, courseload (including initial courseload reduction), and promotion, tenure, and retention (loss of faculty).
3. FSU should initiate a review of retention and loss of faculty by race, ethnicity, and gender, including promotion, tenure, and retention (loss of faculty).

The above three recommendations would begin with advocacy for data and transparency, including the release of data that would enable these analyses of inequities. Should inequities be found, FSU should advocate (generally or contractually) for equity via practice and policy.

4. Request and advocate for the administration to address inequities and issues identified in the PROGRESS report and in the previous climate survey.
5. Advocate for the requirement of racial diversity training for the following people, to address institutional racism, with consideration of the impacts on both TT and NTT faculty.
  - a. All administrators
  - b. Department Chairs
  - c. Hiring committees
  - d. Senior faculty serving on review committees
6. Establish a paid ombudsperson (faculty member) to address diversity issues.
7. Advocate with the university for an individual or office to actually take up the issue of support for faculty of color (beyond the compliance aspect of ODEI). This could/should be a faculty member(s), accountable to the faculty rather than the administration, who receives adequate compensation/recognition for this role.
8. Appoint (and credit) a faculty member to provide mentoring and information about faculty rights and serve as a resource person about the contract and faculty rights. This person should do more than a grievance officer is formally charged with, going beyond contract violations and compliance.
9. Advocate for the university to clarify and publicly disseminate information and policies (e.g. expected support, limitations of that support) related to immigrant and international faculty. Advocate for clearer and more streamlined access to resources and legal advice.
10. Advocate for the removal of course evaluations as part of personnel review and tenure or promotion review, given the known biases related to race and ethnicity.

11. Address inequities in salary and responsibilities related to NTT status (as compared to TT status) and additional inequities for NTT faculty of color.
12. Request and advocate for the release of information and ongoing transparency from administration regarding the number of legal cases related to diversity and inequity that have been settled by the University.
13. Diversify the FSU leadership through active outreach and invitations to faculty of color. For this to be successful, the FSU would need to demonstrate a changed climate and approach, given the established issues that faculty of color have experienced (see below).
14. Diversify the bargaining team through open calls for bargaining members with clear criteria for selection.
15. Increase member input into bargaining priorities and transparency of the bargaining process.

### **REPORTED EXPERIENCES and PERSPECTIVES: RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### *Experienced Racial Discrimination within the University*

FSU has not advocated for administration or faculty gatekeepers to address discrimination experienced within the University and within departments by faculty of color. This discrimination may be active or indirect, general or specifically related to discrimination in hiring, work conditions related to retention (e.g. course load, course assignment and timing, etc.), and evaluation of faculty (e.g. annual reviews, major personnel reviews). FSU has not even advocated for greater transparency from administration that would minimally enable an evaluation of possible bias that might lead to more active demands for accountability through procedures, policy, or contract.

#### Hiring Issues and Experiences

FSU has not advocated for the administration to address issues related to the lack of racial diversity amongst faculty, or inequities in the hiring process. These issues include:

1. Lack of faculty diversity: not enough faculty of color to address needs.
2. Inequities in evaluation of candidates (e.g. related to scholarship areas of faculty of color, educational background, etc.). This is sometimes more overt (e.g. discounting scholarship on race or ethnicity) or sometimes occurs in ways that fail to consider structural inequities (e.g. racial and related socioeconomic discrimination or barriers to Ivy League schools).
3. Lack of consideration of diversity as an active asset in candidate evaluation.
4. Racial inequities in starting salary, start up, course releases, etc. Related lack of transparency: while administration protests against these perceptions of inequity, they are unwilling to release the data to evaluate possible inequities.

#### Retention

FSU has not advocated for the administration to address issues related to experienced inequities in workload, course load, course assignment and timing, or changes in work conditions that affect retention of faculty of color. The lack of advocacy from FSU includes not advocating for transparency related to these issues. These issues include:

1. Faculty of color seem to leave the University at higher rates than other faculty and describe to other faculty of color that they have experienced discrimination or marginalizing environments related to their decision to leave. Administration has not been willing to release information about rates of or reasons for faculty leaving before tenure review and analysis of racial make up/inequity.
2. Faculty of color experience inequities in workload generally, including course assignment and scheduling, as well as service expectations.
3. Faculty of color experience challenges in finding appropriate mentorship that addresses their unique experiences as faculty of color. The university invests little in providing structures for racially and ethnically responsive mentorship, or providing resources to support the unique experiences of faculty of color.
4. Faculty of color experience racial and ethnic discrimination (see general issues below)
5. International and immigrant faculty experience little support related to their status, rights, or entitlements as university faculty. This includes a lack of structural and administrative support for addressing issues related to immigration (e.g. visa issues); insufficient understanding of immigration pathways, processes and technicalities by HR personnel charged with these matters, and their denial of responsibility for the same; a lack of clarity of university procedures and policies (e.g. university contributions to visa applications); and a lack of timely response from the University or extensive bureaucracy to access resources that should be available to faculty.
6. Faculty of color off the tenure track often experience even more marginalization. In addition to inequities related to being off the tenure track and related inequities of pay, they also experience the issues of inequity related to the discrimination described here (e.g. pay inequity, scheduling, etc.) and other issues of tokenization such as more demand for courses (e.g. if they are offering the diversity courses in an area)
7. When problems do arise with current faculty of color, FSU is not (pro)active in seeking out faculty perspective, hearing from faculty, understanding the issues, or supporting faculty through advocacy or in legal proceedings.
  - a. Structural examples: Lack of FSU support for receivership of Africana Studies, without FSU ExComm actually speaking to faculty, exploring needs, offering support at the individual level; faculty from CPCS (including many faculty of color) experienced lack of support from FSU related to being forced to transfer departments and negotiating MOUs with expectations that these faculty take on more courses or activities than others in the department to which they were transferring (e.g. the FSU refrained from giving advice or advocating for these faculty with administration or providing guidance or support to advocate for equity).
  - b. Individual examples: Multiple discrimination suits brought against University (some successful) without FSU support or advocacy

### Evaluation, Review, and Promotion

Faculty of color experience discrimination and inequities related to evaluation, promotion, and review. We experience a lack of response and advocacy from FSU to address these inequities. These issues include:

1. Gate keeping from senior faculty and Chairs for faculty of color wanting to go up for review: faculty of color being told that they cannot go up for review or being subjected to

inequitable criteria or additional procedural steps. The FSU is not willing to advocate for these faculty to address inequities.

2. Lack of support or knowledge provided about rights and procedures for individual faculty to address or protest inequity, or simply to navigate the system (e.g. what to do when the Chair is not supportive or is biased—explicitly or “unintentionally”).
3. Racial discrimination, either direct or indirect related to higher expectations for faculty of color, lack of recognition of emotional burden, lack of recognition of the validity and importance of doing work related to race or ethnicity, lack of recognition of the challenges of doing such work in teaching or in research (e.g. evaluation bias in course reviews, bias in acceptance rates of manuscripts for focused on racial and ethnic issues, bias in grant reviews, etc.).

### General Issues of Discrimination

1. Lack of FSU recognition, publicizing, or disseminating information related to discrimination, preventing discrimination, or the importance of addressing discrimination within the academy. FSU has not seemed willing to take up this issue as a priority.
2. Lack of union support for faculty who actually experience harassment or discrimination, from colleagues, from campus police, from Chair, from students. Faculty of color do not experience the FSU as helpful in advocating for them, providing resources, or acting to prevent such discrimination (e.g. through advocating for training)
3. FSU does not provide sufficient support to faculty to discuss or advocate for legal action for issues of discrimination or inequity that affect faculty of color

### ***Unequal Burden in Service and Advising Responsibilities (specifically)***

FSU has not advocated to address experienced and documented (both internally and nationally) inequities in faculty responsibilities that create unequal burdens on faculty of color. These issues include:

1. Service responsibilities:
  - a. Basic issue that faculty of color do more service work (as established in the PROGRESS report).
  - b. Expectations within departments that faculty of color take on diversity issues within service work that creates disproportionate burden. There is not a clear cultural expectation across the campus of burden sharing and turn taking. White male faculty (who have the most power) do less or feel more entitled to do less service and faculty of color (who may or may not be personally inclined to do such service) do more.
  - c. Lack of recognition or credit for additional service, including lack of recognition that this service is not really “optional” or self-selected given the role of faculty of color.
  - d. The lack of attention to issues of racial equity (unequal burden, experiences of discrimination, different expectations, student needs, etc.) are not centered in department and university discussions/committees. The needs of faculty of color and students of color and related issues may not be addressed or proactively considered given this marginalization (even if unintentional). Faculty of color who recognize this may feel a greater need to do more service on more committees to ensure these issues are addressed, not only because they may

prioritize these issues, but also for their own survival, to ensure that they are not detrimentally affected by the lack of attention to these issues.

- e. Inequities in expectations for evaluation (see above) contribute to faculty of color participating in increased service.
2. Student advising:
    - a. Advising burden is unequal
      - i. Students of color seek out faculty of color, which may be rewarding to many faculty of color, but the issue of expectation or felt obligation is burdensome. Senior White male faculty avoid advising without consequence, or do not develop necessary skills and understanding.
      - ii. Faculty of color off the tenure track, especially but not limited to those who diversify the department faculty, experience more demand for student advising than White NTT faculty, who are protected from such demands or don't need to do.
      - iii. Students of color talk with faculty of color about their needs and lack of sufficient or sensitive advising, requesting help. Faculty of color, given own experiences and values, feel a greater push to respond to these students, whereas other faculty may not feel this or respond to it.
    - b. The added burden and emotional labor of faculty of color is not recognized or credited.

### ***Advocacy and Ensuring Accountability for Diversity Structures or Prior Initiatives to Address Inequities***

FSU has not advocated or addressed the ways that administration has not empowered or created structures to actually address known issues or has not followed up with past attempts to do so.

Identified issues include:

1. ODEI:
  - a. To date, ODEI's emphasis has been primarily emphasis on compliance. Does ODEI staff believe they should have a mission or base for action, accountability to faculty that goes beyond compliance? Could the FSU advocate to clarify ODEI's mission or role to address needs of faculty of color?
  - b. FSU advocacy/support in relation to ODEI
    - i. Complaints are brought to ODEI, but not always handled well. FSU is not taking this up or advocating with ODEI or administration on behalf of faculty beyond contract compliance.
    - ii. At the compliance level: FSU does not consistently offer to accompany faculty in relation to complaints, or proactively let faculty know that this is an option.
    - iii. PSU has an article in their contract about affirmative action violations that seems more explicit than that in FSU contract. Could FSU do similarly?
2. Results from prior climate survey led to no follow through or initiatives to address identified issues. FSU has not advocated for this.

3. Results from PROGRESS report are not being taken up. Issues of inequity represented in the PROGRESS report are not being publicized by FSU or addressed through advocacy with the administration or consideration of contract language.

***FSU Leadership and FSU Process (e.g. governance, bargaining, member meetings) Is, Itself, Racially Problematic***

1. FSU is a remote entity. FSU is not perceived as advocating for faculty (generally), or for faculty of color. Many faculty of color perceive that the FSU does not effectively convey to us what our rights are.
2. Union leadership has not (prior to this time) seemed interested in hearing from faculty (generally), or faculty of color. Although faculty are tokenly invited to participate, there is little outreach and when faculty of color do attend or attempt to advocate for an issue or initiative related to their needs, this is often dismissed, deflected, or tabled.
3. Multiple faculty of color report experiencing FSU ExComm leadership as unsupportive, dismissive, marginalizing, interpersonally discriminatory/oppressive, or acting as barriers to involvement or desire to participate as an FSU member.
4. The lack of diversity within FSU leadership is problematic; FSU leadership does not take active steps to diversify the ExComm.
5. Lack of racial diversity in bargaining team, especially Black/African Americans.
6. Lack of transparency in bargaining.