To: Anti-Racism Task Force Core Council  
From: Jamie Ball, Co-chair, Sub-Committee 4  
Dr. Gertrude Pannirselvam, Co-Chair, Sub-Committee 4  
Date: September 11, 2021  
Re: Sub-Committee 4 Report  

---

Introduction

On June 12, 2020 SIUE’s senior leaders made an important announcement, portion of which is excerpted below:

“Earlier today, SIU System President Dan Mahony sent a system-wide message that racism is an issue that must be addressed. Last Wednesday, June 3, the Chancellor invited Dr. Jessica Harris, Interim Assistant Provost for Academic Equity and Inclusive Excellence, and Lindy Wagner, Director of the Center Student Diversity and Inclusion, to attend Extended Chancellor’s Council to discuss the pressing concerns of disrupting racism at our campus and preparing our graduates and community members to confront racism whenever they may encounter it.

At that meeting, Dr. Harris proposed a Task Force on Anti-Racism to propel the University forward to action. Our leadership team recognizes the “Fierce Urgency of Now” as she and others have urged us to do. Our next steps will no doubt include listening and learning, but we must ACT. We recognize there is hard work ahead, but creating change is critical to our University community and essential for nurturing a sustainable future.

Accordingly, we are creating a Task Force to address four specific areas, which are included in the attachment. [Sustained and Effective Communication, Access and Success, Curriculum, Faculty and Staff: Hiring, Retention,& Promotion]. We have heard the pain and frustration among our students, staff and faculty. Emails and town halls will not be enough. Action and urgency are essential.” (emphasis added)
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The charge to the Task Force on Anti-Racism was to propose actions relative to four specific areas aligning with Goals 1, 2, and 3 of the University’s Diversity and Inclusion Strategic Plan. Each of the four specific areas required require working groups whose task was to develop timelines, required resource descriptions and plans for implementation. Sub-Committee 4 was tasked with focusing on the Hiring, Retention, and Promotion of Faculty and Staff.

**Process**

As it began its work, Subcommittee 4 was asked to consider the following questions:

A. How do we augment the Strategic Hiring Initiative to more successfully recruit Black, indigenous and other faculty and staff of color? Can cluster hiring within designated disciplines be an effective approach?

B. How do we better equip our search committees to challenge racism and enhance the diversity of SIUE? How do we address inequities in our current search process?

C. How do we increase the number of mentors that students have to inspire them, to challenge them, to instruct them?

D. Could we invest in Black, indigenous and other graduate students of color (e.g., doctoral scholarships; leadership training), so they might become SIUE faculty and staff of the future?

E. Similarly, can we create partnerships with HBCUs to develop pipelines for future faculty and staff?

F. How do we enhance faculty P&T processes and staff development to increase retention of Black, indigenous and other faculty and staff of color at SIUE?

G. How do we recognize faculty contributions to diversity and inclusion efforts in the P&T process?

H. What opportunities exist to promote Black, indigenous and other faculty and staff of color to leadership positions? Can Leadership Academies and/or Fellowship Programs build capacity?

I. Can we enhance our own faculty and staff through Scholar in Residence programs in partnership with HBCUs through year-long SIUE residencies?

J. How do we support advocacy by our own faculty and staff?

K. What University policies present barriers for faculty and staff retention, promotion and success? Also review government and agency regulations that present barriers (SUCSS).

L. How do we acknowledge and reward the invisible labor of Black, indigenous and other people of color?

Based on these questions, Sub-Committee 4 was further organized into Working Groups focused on the topics that were indicated by these questions.
Working Group Assignments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recruitment</th>
<th>Hiring Practices</th>
<th>Development &amp; Leadership Training</th>
<th>Evaluation &amp; Promotion</th>
<th>Support and Recognition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jamie Doss, Career Development Center</td>
<td>Beverly Bevineau, Human Resources</td>
<td>Laura Baker, University Counseling</td>
<td>Dr. Kimberly Carter, Social Work</td>
<td>Dr. Wai Cheah, Applied Communication Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Katie Poole-Jones, Art &amp; Design</td>
<td>Dr. Lakesha Butler, School of Pharmacy</td>
<td>Dr. Tisha Brooks, Literature</td>
<td>Dr. Tom Foster; Physics</td>
<td>Dr. Mark Poepsel, Mass Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Gertrude Pannirselvam, Marketing</td>
<td>Emily Colton, Textbook Services</td>
<td>Tiffany Caguitla, East St. Louis Center</td>
<td>Capt. Justin Lieberman, SIUE-PD</td>
<td>Dr. Katie Robberson, Marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Gloria Sweida, Marketing</td>
<td>Dr. Diane Hayes, Applied Communication Studies</td>
<td>Dr. Gunes Ercal, Computer Science</td>
<td>Dr. Timothy Lewis, Political Science</td>
<td>Bethany Sherrrow, University Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rex Johnson, University Housing</td>
<td>Jennifer Wagner, University Counsel</td>
<td>Katie Zingg, University Athletics</td>
<td>Patricia Merritt, University Marketing &amp; Communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Leopold, Enrollment System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Content and Scope of This Report

Members made extraordinary investments of time, effort, and emotional energy to work of this Sub-Committee. The Work Groups were encouraged to take an expansive approach to thinking about the problems and potential solutions and generated a broad range of ideas and additional critical questions that can inform continued work. With minimal edits, this report endeavors to represent the authentic voices of the team members who developed content for this report.

For purposes of this report, a limited number of high-priority recommendations are identified as urgent actionable steps upon which the University can and should focus as a way forward.
Priorities

In approaching how to prioritize potential initiatives, we have contemplated this rough model which conceptualizes the foundations for the work of the University, which is most fundamentally, to educate our students. The bedrock is the people of the University, who are the source of all of the knowledge, creativity, commitment, and energy which make everything else possible. Accordingly, it is critical that the University highly prioritize structural changes and initiatives which focus on addressing ways in which interpersonal and structural racism which affect minoritized faculty and staff.
RECOMMENDATIONS

Investing in the People We Have

1. Problem Statement

For Faculty

Loopholes in the evaluation process with candidates for tenure, which is likely to disadvantage faculty of color. Departmental and college operating papers mostly frame the acquisition of tenure around a three-fold paradigm: teaching scholarship and service. However, TENURE POLICY AND GUIDELINES, SIUE, Section X. Criteria for Evaluating Tenure-Track Faculty includes a fourth criterion for which candidates do not submit a write-up. This fourth criterion is "the candidate's potential for continuing contributions to the department, school or college, and University." This sets up a system in which faculty, specifically Black faculty, to meet all criteria of the three-prong process for which they submit write-ups and evidence, yet allows the provost to deny qualified candidates based on a presumption that the faculty does not fit in the University community.

Invisible demands on faculty of color create a system where service work is not evenly distributed, compared to non-White faculty. Specifically, at SIUE it is faculty of color who are expected to perform the bulk of the "diversity and inclusion" service without compensation and often receive little to no reward in evaluation and promotion processes.

Biased perceptions of the merit of scholarship agendas and outlets for dissemination also pose problems. Faculty of color often engage in qualitative or exploratory lines of inquiry and publish their work in community outlets that shape direct practice or policy or in smaller journals that have community appeal. Use of faulty measures of scholarship like journal impact factors, and numbers of citations of publications have been shown to have a negative impact on tenure and promotion considerations. Thus the definition of scholarship is faulty and based on white metrics of academic success. This problem is further complicated by the inordinate amount of service, isolation, and stress faculty of color feel navigating the white academy which compromises scholarship productivity (Jones, Wang, Bustamante, 20155). Griffin and colleagues speak to this in their research looking at differences in black faculty discourse on tenure and promotion. One quote in particular that stands out is

"When assessing a professor's research, decision makers often focus not only on how much a professor has published, but what kind of research he or she has done and where it was published (Blackwell, 1988; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). Reyes and Halcon (1983) note that, given White ethnocentrism, "the general perception is that minority-related topics do not constitute academic scholarship . . . and that they are inappropriate and narrow in scope" (p. 307). This assertion is supported in recent research by Joseph and Hirshfield (2011), suggesting that faculty
who focus on race and ethnicity in their scholarship are ignored or devalued by their colleagues."

Student evaluation of teaching allows racism to disadvantage faculty of color. It has been widely reported in the literature that the classroom itself can be a space of racial stress for faculty of color (Ngwabi, 20127, Pittman, 20108) The most glaring evidence of a policy that gives no remedial consideration to faculty of color is University Policy 117 – Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET). This policy admits that there is an inherent bias in the use of SETs and that such bias may be compounded when class content may "awaken students to discriminatory ideology", which often leads to antipathy..." (see Section III, Subsection A—Preamble). However, the policy provides no remedial policy for faculty subjected to these biased evaluations.

SIUE policy on SETs in the promotion and tenure process allows racism from its majority-White student population to disadvantage faculty of color and other minority faculty; thus undermining the university's claimed value of inclusion. Additionally, within the student evaluation of teaching (SET) core instrumentation questions, there is no requirement for an instructor to employ pedagogy for diversity, inclusion, equity, or any such concept.

SIUE policy fails to promote an evaluative system that actively dismantles conceptions that the classroom is a White-only space by a failure to necessitate diversity in pedagogy. Faculty of color often experience isolation in their respective departments for a variety of reasons including, but not limited to: little or no racial diversity, dismissal of research published, and demands for appropriation in dress, speech, and social activities. At SIUE, one Black scholar reports being asked to dress "less fancy" to fit into the department's environment.

For Staff

The evaluation process of administrative professional staff employees is virtually non-existent (see Policies for Administrative Professional Staff Employees). This “policy” creates a system that had manifested inequitable treatment for Black staff, including little to no consideration for promotions, mentoring, disparate staff reviews, and denial of professional development requests.

The only “policy” this working group could find was Policy 2.12 Performance Appraisal and Evaluation, which says:

The supervisor shall conduct an oral and written performance evaluation based on the written job description and any mutually agreed upon developmental goals for all employees. This evaluation should be completed during the Spring semester each year. Each employee shall be given a copy of all written review(s). Copies shall be maintained in the individual’s official University personnel file located in the Office of Human Resources. Any employee may submit a written response to his/her review to be placed in the personnel file.
This is unacceptable as a policy and leads this working group to develop the following problem statements:

1. The evaluation of staff rests upon the sole opinion of one supervisor. These mostly White supervisors have no mandate for diversity, inclusion, and equity training, which would equip them to understand how racial identity shapes workplace culture and behavior. This also means that reviews are highly subjective as there are no clear identified benchmarks, or even a rubric that can be fluid throughout departments, leading to high inconsistency in staff reviews.

2. There is no way for the subordinate staff to assess/review the performance of their supervisor, specifically their ability to create a welcoming and inclusive work environment.

3. There is little, to no, empowerment of staff, especially staff that are not a part of unions—a White structure. Staff that may be experiencing disparate treatment has no assurance or protections from retaliation when reporting supervisors.

4. There is an immense sense of isolation reported from Black staff, as the supervisor who writes their evaluations, shape departmental cultures around Whiteness.

Other problems relate to:
1. Social Isolation
2. Higher Workloads
3. Disproportionate level of scrutiny
4. Negative assumptions about ability that is related to their ethnicity
5. Experience of micro-aggressions or additive stressors that may compromise work efficiency or inter-personal connections to work team members.
6. Lack of Mentoring to prepare/promote to roles of leadership

How and why did the problem(s) occur?

The multifaceted nature of these problems would leave the pro-racist scholar to assert every reason but racism. But, if we follow established scholarly qualitative methodologies, such as grounded theory, racism is essentially the cause for these occurrences. And this subgroup has outlined the following ways in which racism led to some of the outlined problems:

1. Applying Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.'s four-legged theory of unjust laws, the tenure process itself is racist. Dr. King affirmed that any rule in which a minority group must follow, yet the minority group had no say in the construction of the rules is inherently unjust, because it lacks the perspective of a group it impacts. Therefore, tenure as a process is a carryover from European academic tenet. Though it is commonly believed to originate with John Dewey, it predates his time. Even using John Dewey's references to tenure, it must be acknowledge that this idea of tenure was framed by White ideals of the academy, so inherent in this culturally mono- lithic viewpoint, it was only natural that non-white persons would have to figure out how to navigate a system not designed by or for them. This working group questions if the tenure process at SIUE has before now taken survey of Black faculty to see how racism can be removed from the process.
Remember, that if something is made to be racist, it demands active steps to make it racially equitable—systemic/institutional racism does not just go away.

2. **White traditionalism** also contributes to these problems. White traditionalism, or White culturalism, is the default stance to support ingrained institutional traditions developed and adopted by Whites under the assumption that it is normative (Bell, et al., 2016). This White traditionalism is expressed at SIUE through poor policies (explained more below). It is often the position of the university to default to laws or rules, solely merited in White traditionalism as the appropriate response, and this is the primary way White culturalism manifest according to Bell, et al. (2016).

3. **Poor policies** are one of SIUE’s biggest failures in an equitable review of promotion processes.
   a. No reward or compensation for the invisible labor of faculty of color would prompt one to believe that the university’s asserted value of inclusion is nothing more than propaganda;
   b. No mechanism that is actively anti-racist in the tenure process;
   c. Lack of structure around the staff review process reeks of racism, because it leaves mostly White supervisors who are untrained in racial identity dynamics to review a diverse department.

4. **Failure to require/mandate those in management and supervisory roles to undertake diversity, inclusion, and equity training.** The inability of the university to require such training is a demonstration of institutional racism because it informs that the university’s stance can only be determined by the state of its institutions—applying the principle of James Baldwin.

**A Broader Context for the Problems**

Here are some examples in which to contextualize the biased nature of the tenure process in a broader context:

1. As referenced above, loopholes in the evaluation of candidates for tenure are likely to disadvantage faculty of color. When the Provost can add an additional component to tenure decisions like “goodness of fit” or “candidate potential,” it adversely affects faculty of color. This problem is more than theoretical conjecture. As of right now, there is a national movement to protest the denial of tenure to Dr. Paul C. Harris, Assistant Professor at the University of Virginia, who has spurred an online movement under the hashtag #TenurePaul.

2. Additionally, as referenced above, the workload expectation for faculty of color is heavier, but not only at SIUE. This is the culture of the higher education system. Rucks-Ahidan (2019) writes, “The work involved in supporting and mentoring students, legitimizing one’s research, and navigating ethno-racial microaggressions is part of the ‘invisible labor’ that most colleges and universities do not recognize in the tenure and promotion process.” Rucks-Ahidan affirms that colleges and universities have failed to acknowledge the invisible labor of non-White faculty and staff and fail to understand how it is imperative to departmental success.

3. Within the current racial environment, it is clear that America and its institutions are not post-racial. But, even within higher education, the cost of racism to faculty and staff of color is immense. Dr. Ashley Woodson was recently denied tenure at the University of
Missouri over student evaluations, even though she demonstrated herself as a premier scholar, who performed the race-focused pedagogy she was employed to perform.

What are the various factors at work contributing to the problem(s)?
- White/Eurocentric evaluation measures; Inappropriate measures which are not culturally sensitive
- Individual overt and covert discrimination and bias
- Systemic biases
- Lack of mentorship
- Inadequate support for faculty and staff of color
- Policies which perpetuate inappropriate evaluation and abuse of power
- Lack of clarity on policies and lack of communication detailing job standards and expectations

2. **Action Step: Re-evaluate the evaluation process**

- Enact policy that ceases use of student evaluations of teaching in promotion decisions in favor of peer-review model.

- Core Instrumentation should include questions on the instructor’s efforts to make classroom learning diverse and an environment that values diversity.

- REMOVE the fourth criterion for tenure – "The candidate's potential for continuing contributions to the department, school or college and University." The University should eliminate this from the TENURE POLICY AND GUIDELINES, SIUE, Section X.

- Add a fourth criterion to the tenure process that rewards faculty and staff “invisible labor”--notable service in diversity and inclusion, mentoring, and other efforts.

- Create a standard/baseline review process for staff that outlines: (1) review of staff cannot be unilateral—that is done by one supervising authority; (2) allow staff to review their supervisor.

- Clarify policies and guidance around retaliation; provisions that places severe punishment on supervisors who engage in retaliation;

- Mandated hours for supervisors/administrators of Faculty and Staff to take trainings on creating an inclusive and equitable work environment [while working in compliance with various University Unions]

- The Chief of Staff for the Chancellor and the Director of Equal Opportunity are required to verify the evaluation and promotion of all Professional staff.

- Use the evaluation process to identify specific training and development needs and formulate annual training plans to support continued growth of employees.
a. Plan for Implementation

As an interim measure, it is recommended that there be an immediate suspension of the use of SETs in the tenure and promotion process. This would allow for a more meaningful evaluation of the impact of SETs on the tenure and promotion process, and would also allow for a more meaningful accounting of the racialized trauma that may be resulting from the biased feedback that the SETs may be eliciting.

New evaluation guidelines and training for evaluators can and should be developed within six months, as this would allow for evaluators to be trained before the next cycle of evaluations, which would generally take place in late spring/early summer.

b. Sustainability/Organizational Capacity Building

A more complete and equitable evaluation process will be more time-intensive for existing personnel, but would likely not require significant structural changes. Because training is a key component (training for evaluators and training for employees based on needs identified in the evaluation process), the University should be prepared to commit appropriate resources to support this training.

c. Accountability and Assessment

As a further assessment strategy, it is recommended that anonymized evaluations be analyzed in order to determine if significant differences in evaluations can be identified on the basis of race.

Investing in the People We Need

1. Problem Statement

The problems are the Affirmative Action plan accountability factor and the SIUE Hiring Process. How and why the problems occur are discussed in the report. The problems are situated locally in the faculty and staff hiring process. The various factors at work contributing to the problems is the intersection of racism and patriarchy shaping academic and civil service policies that limit economic and promotional opportunities for black, brown, and indigenous people. This framework allows for a multilevel approach of contributing factors such as social identities, domains of institutional power, and cultural -historical context. It is critical to change the narrative of structural barriers that is systemic in nature.

Additionally, a low level of African Americans and people of color being represented in current staff at all levels. There is a lack of diversity on search committees and no formal hiring committee procedures. And problematic civil service restrictions involving residency requirement. In academia there is a culture of silence that creates a power differential. Thus, people of color who are first generation academics are less successful in negotiating a fair salary
or finding resources to help them in their negotiations. Also, the limited outreach to a diverse candidate pool that requires a relocation commitment to this campus.

Furthermore, a lack of training for all employees on search committees in the areas of equity, inclusion, and diversity practices. There is also a need of transparency and accountability in the hiring process. Finally, these problems are a barrier in the hiring of faculty and staff of color in the greater Metro-east and beyond. The sources are: 1) the Intersectionality research model; 2) the SIUE Affirmative Action Report-2020-2021; Alton Affirmative Action Report-2020-2021; East Saint Louis Affirmative Action Report-2020-2021; 3) the Implicit Bias research; the Civil Service process; 4) Handbook for Best Practices for Faculty Searches; 5) Human Resources residency requirement and target for African Americans; 6) SIUE Employee Demographics Information; 7) Coloring Outside the Lines; 8) Hiring Practices and Retention.


There must be consistent accountability from all levels of responsibility in consistently implementing the Affirmative Action Plan. This would include cluster hiring which would make diversity goals explicit and develop supporting strategies to achieve these goals, such as expanding recruitment and targeting disciplines where diversity is more prevalent. Search committees that emphasize equity and inclusion would allow the senior colleague outside the subfield to serve as committee chairs but would not have a participant vote. There would also be members of a senior specialist in a subfield from within the unit; a junior specialist in the subfield from within the unit; a specialist in a related field from outside the unit; and a member from the diversity committee from within the unit.

2b. Hiring Process Improvements

These improvements start before the initial process of hiring black, brown, and indigenous people with both the faculty and the staff. They include such steps as writing unbiased job descriptions for Civil Service and Academia; providing robust training to all departments and staff involved in hiring; Human Resources must insure that all open positions are widely advertised for people of color to apply for them.

One of the most promising opportunities we have as it relates to the hiring process is the introduction of Equity Advisors to support searches. As part of the current ADVANCE grant initiative, a small group of Equity Advisors have been identified, trained, and have begun work in support of a select number of faculty searches. It is recommended that the University plan to scale up this program to have Equity Advisors available for all searches.

When an offer is extended to a candidate there should be a mentoring process in place that include the state salary being made available. Hiring goals for both faculty and staff where there are low numbers must make every effort to have representatives from people of color to increase their numbers. We must work with all universities that are under SUCSS mandated rules of hiring to review the testing and credential requirements to apply for positions. This should
include the residency requirements especially at SIUE as we currently offer state tuition opportunities to increase enrollment to border states. New hires are expected to uproot their families which creates undue hardship and stress for all family members such as traveling distance and school changes.

i. Plan for Implementation

The first recommendation of the Affirmative Action accountability factor should occur immediately with a 0-6 months timeframe. Though it is an annual document there has been no real serious work on all departments adhering to this plan. For the second recommendation for Hiring Process Improvements these suggestions can occur continuously as well over a period of time such as 1-to 3 years.

ii. Sustainability/Organizational Capacity Building

The sustainability/organizational piece for these two initiatives suggest that there be changes to SUCSS, EOA, and all hiring departments. It is sustainable if funding is redirected to make long lasting impactful change to the infrastructure.

iii. Accountability and Assessment

Accountability and assessment are ultimately the Chancellor’s responsibility with each department and staff supervisory head implementing, monitoring, and reporting their findings to the appropriate source.

Conclusion

It is important to recognize that as we have lived and worked through this reckoning on how racism is showing up in our community, the harms of racism are now being felt even more acutely. It is one thing to be ignorant of the problem and do nothing, it is quite another to open one’s eyes to the problem and then still do nothing. The “fierce urgency of now” is indeed upon us. And as noted in Chancellor Pembroke’s message to the community on August 3, 2020: “To paraphrase a valued colleague, “How much disrespect must a Black employee endure before the University takes it seriously?” The answer should be that no disrespect should ever be allowed. We must work diligently to change the current perceptions associated with this question, and we recognize that we can only do so through our consistent actions of anti-racism.” We must move quickly to make the changes that we now see are necessary; a failure to do so would be to force Black employees to endure further disrespect.