

# **Inclusion Council Policy and Procedures Work Group Report and Recommendations May 7, 2021**

## **I. Introduction**

The Policy and Procedures working group was charged to identify and make recommendations regarding the creation or modification of policies to ensure inclusive practices and procedures at UMBC, within USM, and the State. Melody Wright (Staff, BIOL and NESS President), Carole McCann (Faculty GWST), and Haley Owens (Undergraduate) were assigned to Co-Chair the work group and Adriana Arnold was designated as the OEI Liaison to the group. Work group members included UMBC community members who signed up through the Fall 2020 call for participants. They are: Doha Chibani, (Graduate Student), Olabode Fuwa (Graduate Student), Preminda Jacob (Faculty, VART) Justin Leonard (Alumnus), and Laura Taylor (Staff, Office of Sponsored Programs). The work group met bi-weekly for the purpose of identifying policy/procedures that could be immediately addressed and to make recommendations on how they should be addressed.

## **II. Summary of the Subcommittee Work**

Given the wide potential scope of the work group, prior to the first meeting of the full membership, the Co-Chairs met with the OEI Liaison to discuss the policy/procedure areas where the work group could best focus our attention. In addition, at the first full meeting of the work group, we solicited input from members about the issues of greatest concern to them and homed in on four topics at the second work group meeting. Through these conversations the group decided to focus our efforts in four topic areas of UMBC policy: Hate and Bias policy, Implicit Bias Training and DEI Standards for Staff Hiring, Recognition of DEI in Promotion and Tenure Policies, DEI in Disability Services. Given the diversity of these issues, the work group assigned one or two people to do research on the current state of UMBC policy and, where applicable, national best practices related to each of these topics. In bi-weekly meetings, members reported on the results of their research, outlined their next steps, and received feedback from the full committee. Meeting agendas, notes, and documents gathered by group members were shared in google drive. Through this process, the full committee developed the recommendations included below. The work group did not pursue policy issues related to topics covered by other Inclusion Council work groups such as policing or sexual misconduct. In addition, we limited our scope to UMBC policies. The specific research process and recommendations for each of the four topics is presented below. The order of presentation is not intended as a priority list. All four topics are of equal importance.

## **III. Subcommittees and Recommendations**

### **A. Hate and Bias Policy**

The Hate and Bias subgroup, consisting of Melody Wright and Preminda Jacob, researched the current policies in place and looked outward to other USM institutions, and other university systems, both public and private, for best practices in crafting new Community Standards. Our liaison to OEI, Ariana Arnold, guided our understanding of the overlapping nature of having a Hate/Bias Policy and freedom of speech, and where those two policies can conflict. The subgroup shared available resources and the working group discussed ways in which the university could have a greater impact on establishing a hate/bias policy in supporting our community members.

Over the last year, UMBC has seen an increase in hate speech and marginalization of members of our community. The pandemic has only increased the number and severity of incidences to which our community members find themselves subjected. Incidences of hate, bias, and discrimination can involve racial intolerance as well as racially motivated bias; religious based hate and/or bias; bias based on sexual orientation, gender-identity, and transphobia; and discrimination and bias against individuals with disabilities.

Currently, faculty, staff, and students who feel they have been the victim of hate or bias related incidents can fill out a form on the OEI website. Students have a Code of Conduct, which lists hate incidents as an aggravating factor in an already actionable crime. Bias language is included in the faculty and staff handbooks as it relates to hiring practices only. Current policies do not include language as to the definitions of hate and bias incidents and what, if any, restorative practices are in place for the injured or the offending party. UMBC must clearly communicate, in easy-to-understand language, the ideals we hold ourselves to as a community of inclusive excellence, and how hateful and discriminatory statements harm everyone in our community and will not be tolerated.

Some best practices based on hate/bias policy that we collected from other institutions were:

- An easy to access policy on hate and bias on the university's website (versus one that was buried within a pdf on Student Conduct Handbook).
- A policy statement along with the complaint and resolution procedure (with link to reporting an incident).
- Definition of terms - hate, bias, microaggression, free speech, etc. (i.e. what is an off the cuff comment on someone's race).
- Examples of hate and bias incidents, including an archive of reports by academic year.
- The harms that happen when hate speech is tolerated. An explanation about the [traumatic impact](#) of hate and bias crimes/incidents.
- Proposed syllabi language that communicates standards within classes and the university.
- Campus response teams that work to mitigate the impact of hate and bias incidents through education and support for victims.
- Prominent links to online resources.

- UC Santa Cruz (<https://reporhate.ucsc.edu/>) and Lewis & Clark (<https://www.lclark.edu/live/profiles/3660-harassment-and-hate-or-bias-motivated-conduct>) have comprehensive policies in place that can be modeled at UMBC.

### **Recommendations:**

The Provost's website currently houses "policies" as it relates to Students, Faculty, and Staff, to include in the handbooks for each. We suggest creating, on the Provost's or the OEI website, a Community Standards area that is clearly written and communicates the community of inclusive excellence that the campus community has envisioned for itself. UMBC's [Vision Statement](#) clearly states that we promote social justice, and in that spirit, we should communicate our intolerance for hate and bias incidents within our community. As each of the current policies is specific to student, faculty, and staff populations, and siloed for each, we recommend that the Community Standards language be inclusive of all of these constituencies, be prominently placed, and campus communications be crafted to increase awareness. The new Community Standards website will include links to additional resources, as listed in the best practices above. The website should be linked and reached from multiple other existing sites.

Recommended language for the introduction of Community Standards:

"Preventing acts of hate and bias includes being watchful for the more conscious or unconscious acts, including off-handed comments or even slurs by faculty, staff or students that may be offensive to others. Even in an environment where academic freedom and freedom of speech are paramount, it is important to identify patterns of behavior and make it clear that promoting a welcoming environment is the responsibility of all administrators and staff. [and add: is the responsibility of all faculty, students, administrators, and staff and expected of all visitors to the UMBC campuses.]" [The Lead Fund](#), 2018

In partnership with the new Community Standards, it is also recommended that training be created, and required, to educate all constituencies about the definitions of hate/bias incidents, the traumatic outcomes of such incidents, and steps each person can take to combat these incidents and become an ally for those that are targeted by the same. A badge should be awarded to each person completing the training and follow-on training (non-mandatory) to increase allyship. These badges would serve to identify allies to which constituents could seek advice. We further recommend that messaging via posters and stickers be created and displayed across campus (such as "[There is no place for hate](#) at UMBC"); and positive messaging that promotes unity, openness, community, and tolerance that *implicitly* conveys the anti-hate/bias culture of our campus. Bathroom stalls are often seen as a refuge from unwelcome attention, or a place to collect oneself after an incident, therefore bathrooms would be one suggested location for positive, reaffirming, messages.

Resources Needed to implement this recommendation:

- Human resource (time) for someone to craft the language of the policy
- Web designer to create the web pages and links

- Marketing staff assignment to advertise this policy (posters/stickers)
- Training staff assigned to craft training related to the new policy
- Creation of a campus response team/committee to respond to incidents

## **B. Implicit Bias Training and DEI Standards in Staff Hiring**

The DEI Standards in Staff Hiring subgroup, consisting of Laura Taylor, researched the procedures and guidance that are currently in place at UMBC and within the University System of Maryland to promote Staff DEI and reduce implicit bias in Staff Hiring. Currently, at the USM level, there exists a Policy on Recruitment and Selection that guides USM institutions to develop appropriate recruitment and selection procedures to hire employees of diverse backgrounds. This policy does not specify any particular procedures institutions must have in place to promote DEI in hiring. At the UMBC level, Human Resources offers resources for inclusive hiring, including the Search Committee Toolkit and a Search Committee Chair Training Workshop for Fostering Inclusive Searches. Use of the Toolkit material and attending an inclusive search committee training are currently optional for all search committee chairs and members, meaning only those who seek out such materials will gain this insight into reducing hiring bias at UMBC.

The subgroup shared the currently available resources and the working group discussed ways in which the tools could have a greater impact on promoting DEI in staff hiring. In addition to researching top-down solutions such as requiring HR implicit bias training for search committees, the subgroup also researched examples of peer-led DEI initiatives for hiring, including UMBC's STRIDE faculty diversity initiative. The subgroup communicated with Dr. Autumn Reed, Director of UMBC-STRIDE, to gather knowledge of STRIDE's inception and the nature of its work in order to brainstorm a possible replica of the program for UMBC staff.

### Recommendations:

1. Require Staff Search Committee Chairs to participate in an Inclusive Search Committee Training
2. Develop a peer-led DEI staff hiring initiative modeled off of UMBC's STRIDE faculty diversity initiative.

### Recommended Campus Partners:

1. UMBC Human Resources
2. STRIDE Director Autumn Reed and STRIDE fellows
3. Non-Exempt Staff Senate
4. Professional Staff Senate

### Recommended Next Steps

1. Convene meeting between HR staff and OIA staff to discuss development and administration of an implicit bias/inclusive search committee training for all staff search committee chairs.

2. Convene a meeting between STRIDE partners and interested NESS and PSS members to discuss launching a UMBC Staff STRIDE group

### **C. DEI in Promotion and Tenure**

In recent years, UMBC adopted a requirement that as part of their application dossier all candidates for full-time faculty positions submit a statement of commitment to and experience with diversity, equity, and inclusion. This requirement was a vital step to strengthening equitable practices in faculty hiring. However, it has not been followed up by the incorporation of diversity, equity and inclusion (DEI) expectations as part of faculty responsibilities. Specifically, UMBC faculty review policies do not explicitly recognize and reward DEI activities among the criteria for the evaluation of teaching, research, or service. Thus, faculty are not evaluated on their contributions to DEI after their initial hiring. At the same time, faculty service obligations, and particularly DEI work within the university, fall more heavily on members of underrepresented communities, yet neither the value nor the weight of this service is recognized by the faculty review policies. The lack of recognition and reward for DEI contributions in faculty review policies has the potential to undermine efforts to create an inclusive community for faculty, staff, and students. With this in mind, the Promotion and Tenure Sub-Group consisting of Carole McCann investigated if and how DEI work is included among the stated expectations for faculty review policies at other USM research campuses, such as College Park, and at UMBC peer institutions. Where policy language existed, it was collected and shared with the work group as examples UMBC might follow. Those examples are discussed in the next paragraph and the relevant text is quoted in the attachments to this report. In addition, we also reviewed recent campus processes by which interdisciplinary activities and community-engaged scholarship were added to criteria for promotion and tenure to understand the steps and identify the relevant campus groups that would need to be involved in any effort to revise current faculty review policies. Lastly, the subgroup met with the Curriculum Work Group Co-Chair to ascertain what, if any, overlap there might be between our goals. The Curriculum Work Group Chair noted that the work group has not focused on faculty review processes but did endorse our effort.

A preliminary review of the promotion and tenure policies at USM and Peer institutions yielded several useful examples of policies/procedures that recognize and reward DEI contributions as part of tenure and promotion criteria. At both Stony Brook and University of California, Santa Cruz (UCSC), the P&T guidelines explicitly call for the recognition of DEI contributions in all three areas of evaluation: teaching, research, and service and link this to their mission. Stony Brook adds “correcting discrimination and encouraging diversity” to the SUNY Board of Regents enumerated criteria. At UCSC, the campus published an extensive manual for the evaluation of DEI contributions in response to a 2020 revision to P&T criteria made by the University of California Board of Regents. The document states that the UC System commitment to “excellence and equity” in its mission “requires that faculty contributions to diversity receive recognition and reward in the academic review process.” The bulk of the document provides an in-depth discussion of standards for the evaluation of DEI contributions by all levels of P&T

review. As such it provides a rich resource for initiating discussions of P&T criteria at UMBC. The New Jersey Institute of Technology (NJIT) P&T guidelines recognize DEI contributions in the areas of teaching and service. For teaching it requires documentation of success in creating “diversity-friendly and student-centered learning environments.” For service the NJIT service criteria include “supporting diversity goals” in the list of evidence of “sustained leadership.” In the College Park P&T policy only the teaching criteria speak directly of DEI contributions. Candidates there are required to include a statement of their contributions to diversity within their required teaching portfolios. The College Park policy also includes a provision for periodic assessment of P&T policy criteria that requires inclusion of a statement of progress toward diversifying the tenured faculty. Assessment of progress toward the goal of increasing faculty diversity as part of the periodic review of promotion criteria would seem to provide a regular, structured way to evaluate if and how implicit bias may be continuing within faculty review processes. The College Park policy also calls for proactive procedures to support fair and equitable reviews, including an annual statement of the importance of fairness and equity from the Provost’s office and encouragement to faculty to speak up in real time if they have concerns about bias in review committee discussions or processes with links to resources for reporting those concerns.

The subgroup shared the examples and the work group discussed ways in which these examples might guide revision of UMBC faculty review to effectively recognize and reward DEI contributions of faculty. The work group also discussed what additional resources would be necessary to fully implement the faculty review policies that recognize and reward for DEI contributions of faculty members. We noted that to ensure fairness and equity in faculty reviews, the campus will need to provide workshops, training, and consultation service to support faculty knowledge of and skills in up-to-date DEI practices in their teaching, research, and service activities. At the same time, workshops and training in fair and equitable evaluations of DEI work will be needed for faculty review committees.

### **Recommendations:**

1. Revise faculty review policies including, but not limited to, promotion and tenure, to recognize and reward DEI work in the areas of teaching, research, and service. Several steps will be necessary to implement this recommendation and will require the involvement of senior administrators, shared governance groups, and the colleges and academic departments and programs. As an initial step, we recommend that the Provost, in consultation with the Faculty Senate, form a committee to:

- investigate further how USM and peer institutions have instituted DEI expectations in their academic review policies and identify/adapt best practices to the UMBC context;
- recommend model language for UMBC faculty review policies to incorporate DEI work among the criteria for teaching excellence, department and university service, and scholarly activity where appropriate to faculty field(s) of expertise;
- propose standards for the evaluation of DEI activities in faculty reviews;

- propose a procedure for periodic review of faculty review policies that assess progress towards increased diversity of the tenured faculty; and
- develop a timeline for implementation through shared governance and academic units.

The Committee should be charged to complete this work within one academic year. To ensure a timely completion of this recommendation, the Committee membership should be broadly representative of the Faculty Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate, the URM Faculty Committee, and the Inclusion Council members.

2. Develop the material and staff resources to provide multiple and varied training opportunities and workshops for faculty to gain and strengthen their DEI skills. On one hand, these trainings and workshops should provide faculty with state-of-the-art pedagogies and practices to ensure diversity, equity, and inclusion in teaching and learning and in group/committee work. On the other hand, STRIDE-like peer workshops on best practices for fair and equitable evaluation practices should be developed for academic review committees, including but not limited to P&T Committees. As an initial step, we recommend that a committee with representatives from the STRIDE program, OEI, and the Center for the Advancement of Learning and Teaching (CALT) to:

- Investigate national models of workshops and training for faculty in state-of-the-art DEI pedagogies and committee meeting practices.
- Develop a plan for adapting these models to the UMBC context, including a budget for necessary materials and staff to deliver the skill-building trainings/workshops.
- Develop a plan for creating a STRIDE-like peer workshop program on equitable practices in academic review committees. Again, the plan should include a budget for necessary materials and staff.

The Committee should be charged to complete this work within one academic year and its work should be coordinated with the policy revision committee to ensure that the necessary training resources are in place when the policy revisions are enacted.

#### **D. DEI in Disability Services**

For the DEI in Disability Services subgroup the research was done by Doha Chibani. An initial meeting was held with UMBC Student Disability Services (SDS) Staff: Tawny McManus, Stephanie Lazarus, and Cassie Thompson, for input.

People with disabilities constitute 25% of the population based on census data. According to our SDS office our most recent number is 9% of the UMBC population is registered for support. Learning disabilities (LD) and attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) have constituted the largest number of those in need of services, until recently mental health diagnoses have slightly surpassed them. Per SDS staff, these individuals do not necessarily need more support, but they have seen an increase in the requests for accommodations for course incompletes, especially with the pandemic.

UMBC has made great strides into centering the conversation around diversity needs for all ethnoracial, sexual and gender minorities, but there appears to be a lack in elevating the needs of people with disabilities. This is highlighted when many of the inclusion and diversity training provided by the university focus on all identities but those with varied abilities. As is for all marginalized people, representation and participation in decision making matters. Furthermore, racial, ethnic, socioeconomic and other identity marginalization intersect with disability and often exacerbate the inequity.

One of the top issues of inequity in disability access is the language requirement for all students at UMBC towards a bachelor level degree. UMBC is the only remaining institution within the University System of Maryland that still has the language requirement for all bachelor level students. The requirement necessitates competency to the 201 level thus requiring some students to take three courses consecutively (101, 102 and 201) of one chosen language. When students are approved for a disability related substitution, they are only required to take one culture class which saves time towards graduation and money.

SDS requires recent and specific psychoeducational testing and reports in order to ensure the student has a need for the exception. Students of limited means, and others such as transfer students who may not have had any recent educational testing will find this testing to be a barrier to securing this exception. With the high healthcare cost and insurance barriers to psychoeducational testing to prove the need for exemption, those with more means, access, and social capital are often the ones that benefit the most from the alternative to the level 201 language policy.

### **Additional Concerns Regarding Inequities in Requirement of 201 Level Language**

Students who go to well-resourced public and private middle and high schools often are able to satisfy the language requirement through proof of completion of language at the equivalent of the 201 level before attending UMBC.

International students may be able to satisfy it through testing, but are required to schedule and pay for that standardized testing (CLEP?) on their own, which may represent a barrier for some.

Community College students do not need a language to get an AA degree. These students earn their associate degree with the intention to transfer to one of the USM institutions. Some transfer and find out about the UMBC language requirement exception after transferring, thus adding a nine credit burden (and related costs) to attaining their bachelor's degree.

We are therefore concerned that the current language requirement may have the result of increasing time and costs to graduate for: students from less well resourced high schools, international students, transfer students and non-traditional students (who may be reentering college after a several year absence).



## **Overall Accessibility Concerns:**

Additionally, the pandemic has highlighted the need for fully digitized accessible technology. UMBC has no policies and procedures about digital access. We are in need of an information technology accessibility policy (Towson, and University of Maryland College Park have implemented such policies). Furthermore, our office of student disability services is not staffed with sufficient and specifically trained instructional technology trained to personnel, which speaks to the devaluing of the population's needs. Per SDS, a committee started 11 years ago to implement such change. It is time we finalized it.

## **Recommendations:**

1. SDS engage with the community to identify SDS' priority needs on an annual basis.
2. OEI and Undergraduate Affairs gather, review, and analyze data regarding the impact on 201 level language requirements on students from less-well-resourced communities, international students, transfer students, and non-traditional students with respect to equity issues, and time and cost to graduate. (data on race, age, ethnicity, income etc.)
3. Investigate the need for continuing to mandate a 201 level language requirement towards the bachelor degree and the ability to provide accessible, equitable and cost effective alternatives that address the need for and importance of multicultural education and diversity and inclusion requirements. We would suggest this be done by or in coordination with the Office of Undergraduate Affairs.
4. Implement a university wide IT accessibility policy similar to other USM institutions (USM & UMCP consolidated accessibility policy)
5. Recruit IT trained personnel dedicated to the office of Student Disability Services.

## **IV. Conclusion**

As this report suggests, the work group has identified a number of important topics where policy and procedures need to be reviewed and revised and gaps where policy needs to be developed. In all cases, we also recognize that making policy and developing procedures is only the first step. We stress that in each instance, additional resources, funding and staffing is absolutely necessary in order for the policies and procedures we have identified to be created, examined or modified and successfully implemented.

This group was not able to address all issues that we were made aware of during our work. We would like to note that there are a number of additional issues that could be addressed by the continued work of this working group, including:

- Post-doc search and selection process
- Staff internal promotions, reclassifications

## V. Appendices

### A. Hate and Bias Policy Resources

In the order of best resources available to our subcommittee:

#### **University of California, Santa Cruz (public university)**

<https://reporhate.ucsc.edu/>

1. Report an Incident (links to forms and in-person);
2. Hate/Bias Response Team (program process; archived reports by academic year);
3. Complaint Resolution & Resources

#### **Lewis and Clark University (private university, Washington State)**

Harassment and Hate or Bias Motivated Conduct Policy

<https://www.lclark.edu/live/profiles/3660-harassment-and-hate-or-bias-motivated-conduct>

1. Policy Statement
2. Scope of Policy
3. Prohibited Conduct
4. Protected Characteristics
5. Discrimination
6. Harassment
7. Hate or bias motivated conduct
8. Reporting and Resources
9. Complaint Procedure

#### **TOOLKIT ON CAMPUS HATE AND BIAS: Strategies to Create More Inclusive Campuses (2019)** The Lead Fund,

[https://www.aaaed.org/images/aaaed/LEAD\\_Fund/LEAD-FUND-Toolkit.pdf](https://www.aaaed.org/images/aaaed/LEAD_Fund/LEAD-FUND-Toolkit.pdf)

#### **University of Maryland (public university)**

University Policies: Statement of Free Speech Values (created: 2018)

<https://policies.umd.edu/statement-free-speech-values/>

Office of Diversity and Inclusion - Resources (links to Hate/Bias information)

<https://diversity.umd.edu/resources/>

Hate-Bias: Terms and Definitions

<https://diversity.umd.edu/docs/Hate-BiasTermsDefinitions.pdf>

The Traumatic Impact of Hate-Bias Incidents and Hate Crimes

<https://diversity.umd.edu/docs/RACIALTRAUMA.pdf>

Hate-Bias: Online Resources (Links to external resources including federal sites)

<https://diversity.umd.edu/docs/Hate-BiasOnlinedownloadableResources.pdf>

### **B. DEI-Promotion and Tenure: Examples from USM and other Institutions**

## **University of Maryland, College Park**

Under teaching innovations, list course or curriculum development, including the creation of courses that focus on underrepresented populations, the integration of diverse cultural perspectives into existing courses, and the use of varied pedagogical strategies to meet the learning styles of a diverse student body. Include any other advising and mentoring activities, like advising student groups, underrepresented students, special assignments, recruiting, faculty membership mentorship, and recruiting/advising/mentoring activities that enhance diversity and inclusion, etc. (UMD, APT Manual, 2020, p 15).

In addition to materials for the tenure and/or promotion dossier, the candidate will prepare a teaching portfolio, according to Department guidelines, which could include the following types of items: course syllabi; a statement of teaching philosophy; a statement about how the candidate addresses diversity and inclusion in teaching; reflective assessments; learning outcomes assessment materials; and mentoring accomplishments, such as placement of advisees in academic and professional positions. More information about the teaching portfolio is included in the Appendix. (UMD, APT Manual, 2020, p. 16)

Each college, school, and department shall develop brief, general, written Criteria for Tenure and/or Promotion. The criteria should be reviewed periodically by the unit, as deemed necessary, but no less frequently than once every five (5) years. This review should include consideration of the unit's progress toward increasing the diversity of its tenured faculty. (UMD, UMD Policy and Procedure on Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure of Faculty, p.15)

## **University of California, Santa Cruz**

The University of California Academic Personnel Policy governing faculty appointment and promotion (APM - 210) requires that faculty contributions to diversity receive recognition and reward in the academic review process. (UCSC, "Evaluating Contributions to Diversity for Faculty Appointment and Promotion Under APM 210, p 1).

The University of California is committed to excellence and equity in every facet of its mission. Contributions in all areas of faculty achievement that promote equal opportunity and diversity should be given due recognition in the academic personnel process, and they should be evaluated and credited in the same way as other faculty achievements. These contributions to diversity and equal opportunity can take a variety of forms including efforts to advance equitable access to education, public service that addresses the needs of California's diverse population, or research in a scholar's area of expertise that highlights inequalities. Mentoring and advising of students and faculty members, particularly from underrepresented and underserved populations, should be given due recognition in the teaching or service categories of the academic personnel

process. (UCSC, "Evaluating Contributions to Diversity for Faculty Appointment and Promotion Under APM 210, p 2).

### **New Jersey Institute of Technology**

Documentation of success in creating an innovative, diversity-friendly and student-centered learning environment should include summaries of classroom evaluations by students and peers over the last several years, descriptions of new courses and activities developed, course or laboratory notes and/or manuals prepared, teaching related publications, and other pertinent material reflecting a commitment to diversity and to innovation in education. The documentation should also include a listing of undergraduate and student supervision and of post-doctorate positions under the direction of the candidate. As available, identification of post-degree career positions of MS and PhD students can be an important indication of the value of the graduate experience offered by the candidate. (NJIT, Provost Memo to University P&T Committee, "Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, 2020, p. 2).

A pattern of sustained leadership is expected in the range of relevant activities: teaching; student supervision; scholarly activities; funded research; service to the academic unit and university including support of diversity goals; and service to the profession and the public. (NJIT, Provost Memo to University P&T Committee, "Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, 2020, p. 3 and 4.)

### **Stony Brook University**

To further the commitment to affirmative action at SUNY Stony Brook, the following additional criterion will be applied when evaluating candidates for promotion and/or continuing appointment (tenure):

"(f) Contributions to enriching the life of the University by correcting discrimination and encouraging diversity – as demonstrated by teaching, University service, or scholarship concerning women and minorities. Besides reports from professionals within a field, colleagues, and students, a candidate's effectiveness may be assessed by accepting a diverse range of publications and modes of service that address the contributions, interests and special needs of minorities or women and promote efforts to achieve equal opportunity. (Stony Brook University, P&T Procedures, 1.1 Criteria, p.3-4)