



College of Social Science
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY



DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION
Strategic Planning
Report

2022
2023

Table of Contents

Foreword.....	1
Strategic Planning Process and Timeline.....	3
Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Strategic Plan.....	6
Climate Assessment Executive Summary.....	12
Additional Sources of Data.....	14



Foreword

During the 2022-2023 academic year, the College of Social Science (SSC) at Michigan State University (MSU) completed a strategic planning process to advance our goals of diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI). This work began with the conclusion of the 2017-2022 College Strategic Plan and we undertook it for a myriad of reasons. One was to align with MSU's values of equity and excellence and mission to make DEI central to our excellence. To attest to the importance of these values, the university developed a stand-alone DEI plan to center equity in everything we do and integrated DEI throughout the MSU 2030 Strategic Plan. When asked what aspects of the MSU 2030 Plan were of most interest, our community and unit leaders communicated a strong desire to direct energies toward advancing DEI. Such efforts are consistent with research evidence that indicates that diverse and inclusive environments enhance learning and can increase innovation and employee engagement and will build on the strides taken to advance DEI-related goals under the previous College strategic plan. Our College, as the most diverse College at MSU, has the opportunity to continue to serve as a model for how to build a community that integrates DEI into our work in an intentional way.

The process began in the Fall of 2022 with the College's first ever climate assessment, which was conducted by an external consultant. Despite the challenges inherent in such assessments, the initiation of this work, the lessons we learned, and the dialogues generated represent significant accomplishments. There was success in simply starting the process and it yielded foundational information from which we can continue to learn and grow. The findings were one of many sources of data and feedback that informed the building of the DEI plan in the Spring 2023 semester. Findings were synthesized with institutional data from our units and the College, additional University climate data, and College community feedback to construct a broad picture of our assets and needs. A review of the College's progress on the previous strategic plan, DEI initiatives across the MSU campus, and the MSU 2030 Strategic Plan also shaped our thinking. The goals and objectives will provide direction for our collective commitment to advance DEI as we move into the important stage of the process - implementation and continual assessment of our progress toward accomplishment of our goals. To continue to advance our inclusive excellence, over the summer the plan will be presented to the incoming Dean, along with potential options for implementation structures, implementation strategies compiled from our planning and feedback sessions this year, and communications for the upcoming year to keep the College community informed while a comprehensive communications plan is developed. Incoming leadership will prioritize goal areas and objectives and finalize the structures, strategies, and metrics to implement the plan.

We are proud to say that all of this work was accomplished in community, with guidance and regular feedback from students, staff, and faculty from across the College. As a result of this participatory and collaborative approach, many members of our College established or reinforced working relationships with individuals in other units and roles. We are deeply appreciative of the bonds that were strengthened and the new ones built this year. A climate of trust, built on strong relationships and forthright and respectful dialogue, is critical to the success of DEI initiatives. We feel confident that our community will continue to engage in this way to ensure the success of the plan as we move forward.

In closing, we want to express our sincere gratitude to everyone who participated in the process this year. The College provided the structure to complete the work, but the climate assessment and plan are the result of a grassroots effort. We look forward to how it will advance our community, as a collective, in the coming years. This work will remain important as we fulfill the land grant mission - to serve all the people of the State of Michigan - into the next decade and beyond. In the words of a [recent report by the Boyer Commission](#) on the future of research universities, "excellence without equity (privilege reproducing privilege) is not true excellence, and equity (mere access) without excellence is unfulfilled promise."

Mary A. Finn, Dean

Carole Gibbs, Acting Associate Dean for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion



Strategic Planning Process and Timeline

In the 2022-2023 academic year, the College of Social Science (SSC) at Michigan State University (MSU) undertook a strategic planning process to advance our goals of diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI), in alignment with MSU's mission to make DEI central to our excellence. The SSC initiated a climate assessment in the Fall of 2022 as one component of our planning process. Our goal was to gain insights into the lived experiences and perceptions of members of our community, such that these insights, combined with other sources of data, would inform the development of a holistic plan to advance DEI in the College. We contracted with Strategic Diversity Initiatives (SDI) to utilize their expert knowledge and build trust in the process of data collection and analysis, in part by ensuring privacy to participants by granting SDI contractual ownership of the primary data collected.

GUIDANCE FROM WORKING GROUP AND STAKEHOLDER GROUP

All aspects of the climate assessment and strategic planning processes were guided by a Working Group and a Stakeholder Group. The Working Group was visioned holistically to include approximately 15 representative members of faculty and academic staff, support staff, and graduate and undergraduate students in the College. This group played a critical role in shaping data collection instruments, communications, making sense of data gathered from our climate assessment as well as institutional data from our units and the College, and the formulation of the DEI strategic plan document. The Stakeholder Group comprises approximately 15 representatives from our key administrative units and governance bodies and served as a consultative body and as a sounding board at key stages of the climate assessment and strategic planning process.

PRIMARY DATA COLLECTION FROM EXTERNAL DEI CONSULTANT

Informed by, and in conjunction with, institutional data from our units and the College, SDI conducted our first ever climate assessment in two phases via a survey and series of focus group sessions, with the goal of capturing a broad set of perspectives and voices in our community to inform the strategic plan. Members of the College were identified based on the definition of who had voting privileges in governance among employees assigned to our College. All employees with at least a 25% appointment in the College were invited to participate in the climate assessment. All students (graduate or undergraduate) enrolled in an on-campus major or secondary major in the College were invited to participate.

An invitation to complete the survey was distributed directly to the College community via email and through posted flyers, was highlighted on the College website, and was communicated by unit leaders to their employees and students. The survey was open for respondents to access from September 27 to October 7, 2022. For purposes of analysis, the data were intended to be disaggregated by role (i.e., tenure-system faculty, teaching-focused or fixed-term faculty, academic staff, support staff, graduate students, undergraduate students) and by social and personal identities (i.e., race and ethnicity, gender identities, sexual orientation, disability). Consistent with MSU institutional data, response categories for racial and ethnic identities were based on the federal Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) guidelines; respondents could also elect to self-identify in alternative ways. Using these response categories was important in informing efforts to maintain anonymity to facilitate disaggregating results by subgroup. Response categories for gender identities were consistent with MSU's work to recognize the distinction between birth-assigned sex and legal gender. SDI did not track IP addresses of respondents. The survey purposely did not ask for respondents to identify their unit, as doing so, combined with their role and personal and social identities would likely lead to concerns with anonymity.¹

Twenty four virtual focus group sessions – 11 for faculty and academic staff, 7 for professional staff, and 6 for graduate and undergraduate students - were scheduled during a two week period in November 2022. In addition to general sessions by role, some sessions were organized topically to discuss climate issues related to specific social and personal identities that are traditionally marginalized, although any person could join any session and participate if they chose. A schedule of sessions and Zoom links were provided to the College community via email; to ensure anonymity, participants were not asked to sign up for a specific session(s). Each session could accommodate up to 15 participants and anyone unable to enter the Zoom room could complete the focus group prompts in writing and submit their responses to SDI anonymously. Participants were invited to participate in the way they felt most comfortable (e.g., with or without cameras, using pseudonyms, and/or via the chat).

¹ Our goal was to understand the overall climate of the College as a whole, as opposed to singling out each unit's climate. Our future priorities and actions to address climate will be based on efforts to improve climate across the board and not differentially based on unit level differences. Units interested in engaging in further understanding of their unit level climate are encouraged to do so and we hope that the College level process will foster such dialogue.

SOLICITATION OF COMMUNITY INPUT THROUGHOUT THE PROCESS

In addition to these opportunities to give voice to one's experiences and perceptions of the College climate, this process was designed to be collaborative by soliciting input from a cross section of the SSC community at multiple points in the process. A DEI retreat was held on October 26, 2022 to present the preliminary climate survey findings and discuss the current College efforts to advance DEI, the barriers to advancing DEI, the most pressing DEI challenges in the College, and ideas for addressing those challenges in breakout sessions that engaged participants from different units and roles (i.e., students, faculty, staff) in conversation about these prompts. Over 150 members of the College community attended, including the Working and Stakeholder Groups, Chairs and Directors, and College Senior Staff. Participants also included delegations of faculty, staff, and students from every College unit (i.e., school, department, program, center, and institute). Delegates were asked to make themselves available for climate conversations, to receive the feedback with an open mind, and to integrate what they learn into the discussion at the retreat. In short, the delegates served as representatives of the broader unit. Finally, participants included any member of the College who responded to an open invitation to the remaining spaces available - about 50 slots. Those unable to attend could provide feedback through their unit delegation or direct communication with SDI.

BUILDING THE GOAL AREAS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE DEI PLAN

A second retreat with the members of the Working and Stakeholder Groups was held on January 26, 2023. Participants reviewed climate assessment and institutional data and feedback from the retreat to inform brainstorming sessions about goal statements and objectives for the strategic plan. A decision was made to retain the initial goal areas proposed based on the MSU DEI plan. The feedback and ideas from this retreat were then used to formulate a draft plan, which was subsequently reviewed by the two guidance groups, Chairs and Directors, College Senior Staff, and the entire College community. College community feedback was gathered via a series of coffee hours for each of the four goal areas in February 2023 and a virtual feedback period from March 15-24, 2023. Comments were also solicited from the MSU Chief Diversity Officer, Dr. Jabbar Bennett, and the Associate Provost for University Outreach and Engagement, Dr. Kwesi Brookins.





Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) Strategic Plan

This document represents the first phase of strategic plan development in which we conceptualize our aspirational goals and specific objectives that will help us achieve those goals. These goals and objectives have been constructed based on a review of existing data, brainstorming by the Working and Stakeholder Groups (that include faculty and academic staff, support staff, graduate students, and undergraduate students), and broader feedback from the College community via the October 2022 retreat, February 2023 coffee hours, and a virtual feedback period in March 2023. Developing an implementation plan that will specify strategies and metrics to assess progress is the second stage of strategic planning. In phase two, the College is committed to embedding a continual process of assessment and accountability within the implementation plan. It will also strive to work in partnership and collaboration with the units and individuals who want to be actively engaged in advancing the objectives and goals developed by our College community. The intent is to implement a specified set of strategies and achieve the objectives by co-sponsoring structures, processes, people, and programs with units in the areas of the plan the unit identifies for contribution.

SSC VISION

Our Science transforms the human experience and inspires leaders.

SSC MISSION

We will be global leaders in top-tier research while advancing engaged learning and societal well-being.

SSC VALUES

Quality - We hold ourselves to the highest standards to achieve lasting influence.

Inclusiveness - We foster a culture in which all individuals are valued, respected and engaged so that diverse voices can enrich our work.

Connectivity - We link with campus and external communities to leverage our strengths and collectively realize our shared goals.

Integrity - We are honest, transparent, and courageous in our discovery and dissemination of knowledge.

Creativity - We imagine innovative approaches to understand and improve the world.

Empowerment - We equip individuals and communities to make informed and just decisions.

MSU Conceptualizations of DEI

Diversity: To ensure our varied collective and individual identities and differences are represented, affirmed, and valued.

Equity: To ensure access to resources that promote success and address past and present educational and professional disparities.

Inclusion: To intentionally include and welcome people who have historically been excluded. Inclusion is demonstrated by an intentional commitment to ensure access for diverse identities, perspectives, and voices.

INCREASE DIVERSITY

People | Curriculum | Research

Goal Statement: Our College actively and intentionally embraces a diversity of people and ideas through ongoing intellectual and social engagement across individual and collective identities and communities.

Objectives:

- Increase the proportion of underrepresented faculty and staff utilizing proactive recruitment, hiring, and retention strategies.
- Increase the proportion of faculty engaged in impactful community-based research with underrepresented communities.
- Increase the proportion of underrepresented students enrolled in our undergraduate and graduate programs.
- Increase fiscal and other tangible supports for DEI-related research and applied DEI-related projects within the College.
- Increase substantive DEI content in curriculum.

ENSURE EQUITY

Participation | Accessibility | Retention | Protection | Promotion | Recognition

Goal Statement: Our College proactively identifies and eliminates structural barriers and ensures equitable opportunities to foster individual potential and cultivate a community in which all members can learn, grow, and advance.

Objectives

- Strive to eliminate disparities in persistence and graduation rates among underrepresented minority, Pell-Eligible, and first-generation students.
- Increase the proportion of underrepresented faculty in the rank of Professor.
- Bolster supports for the success of underrepresented and first-generation graduate students.
- Improve the accessibility of our physical and digital spaces.
- Formalize pathways for career advancement among academic and support staff.
- Support opportunities and create pathways for leadership development for underrepresented faculty.

PROMOTE INCLUSION AND BELONGING

Climate survey | Physical Environment | Education | Communications |
Accessibility/Safety

Goal Statement: Our College community intentionally embraces the authentic expression of our plurality of identities and lived experiences and strives to eliminate harms that occur as we collaborate across areas of difference.

Objectives:

- Co-create a culture of trust that addresses exclusionary behaviors (microaggressions, incivility) and encourages inclusive behaviors.
- Provide onboarding and continued DEI professional development opportunities to College and unit leadership.
- Support ongoing opportunities to develop and sustain meaningful and collaborative relationships and a sense of community across affinity groups and DEI goal areas.
- (Re)design physical and digital spaces to reflect our diversity and foster connection.
- Offer flexible methods of engagement in DEI professional development.
- Increase College community participation in regular climate assessments.
- Enhance DEI communications to internal and external audiences.

ENHANCE OUTREACH AND ENGAGEMENT

MI Community | Alumni Relations | Donor Development | Vendors/Suppliers

Goal Statement: Our College proactively partners with underserved communities and engages stakeholders from underrepresented backgrounds to reduce inequities and advance shared goals.

Objectives:

- Increase fiscal and other tangible supports for faculty engaged in research with underrepresented communities.
- Increase community-engaged learning experiences.
- Increase student engagement with alumni from underrepresented backgrounds.
- In line with university guidelines, integrate DEI into consideration of vendors and suppliers.
- Increase donor engagement in the DEI space.
- Increase the training of underrepresented faculty in donor development.

CLIMATE ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

In the Fall of 2022, the College of Social Science (herein referred to as the College) at Michigan State University (MSU) initiated a diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) strategic planning process with the College's first climate assessment. Climate assessments gather community members' attitudes, perceptions, behaviors, and expectations related to DEI, in our case by administering a survey and hosting virtual focus group sessions. Our assessment focused specifically on belonging and inclusion, voice, commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion, and experiences of workplace incivility. To utilize expert knowledge, build trust in the process of data collection and analysis, and ensure our community of the privacy of the data, the climate assessment was completed by an external partner, Strategic Diversity Initiatives (SDI). SDI worked collaboratively with two (Working and Stakeholder) groups of faculty, staff, and students that guided and provided feedback on every aspect of the process and assessment. The climate assessment was not intended to be used in a prescriptive manner, but instead to be used in combination with other data sources (e.g., Office of Planning and Budget, metrics from the College's Strategic Plan, and the Know More survey), coupled with community feedback (e.g., DEI planning retreats) to inform the College DEI Strategic Plan.

Employees who held at least a 25% appointment and graduate and undergraduate students enrolled in an on-campus primary or secondary major in the College were invited to participate. Of these 7,690 individuals, 907 answered the first (and only required) survey question about one's primary role in the College, which represents 12% of our community (or a 12% response rate). Based on this first question, survey response rates appeared to be the highest among faculty and academic staff (56%) and support staff (51%) and the lowest among graduate students (17%) and undergraduate students (5%). To provide flexibility and protect privacy, the remaining survey questions were not required (i.e., respondents could skip any question and still complete the survey), which reduced the response rates for individual survey items to between 68% and 14% of the 907 respondents. In other words, on average, 40-45% of respondents did not answer each question, including those about personal and social identities (e.g., gender identities, racial and ethnic identities). The College offered over 20 focus group sessions that could accommodate 10-12 individuals and 48 members of the College participated in total. We have not received additional information from SDI about participation and response patterns even after multiple requests. Therefore, we do not know how representative the responses are of those who reported their identities or how many responses informed SDI's estimates of the subgroup averages for each survey question. Given this limitation, we are unable to present survey responses by identity or role subgroups with any degree of confidence. Therefore, this executive summary only includes findings that were consistently reported in pooled data and for which we can describe patterns of missing data.

Our goal is to honor the voices of those who participated and also acknowledge the strengths and limitations of the data. Due to the concerns with the low response rates and high numbers of skip rates per item, we provide a qualitative summary of patterns rather than descriptive statistics. SDI asserts that this was a participatory study and not an academic one. They did not assess the representativeness of the respondents and do not claim findings are generalizable.

DEI STRENGTHS (in no specific order):

- » **Personal Commitment to DEI.** Approximately 600 of the 907 survey respondents answered the question about their own demonstrated commitment to DEI in their work or major/program; on average, it was reported as a strength. As summarized by SDI, many focus group respondents indicated that “the College is filled with...faculty, staff, and students who not only have the will to make changes but also the expertise and experience to make those changes that would drive the College forward...the College needs to tap into this rich resource.”
- » **Student Experiences.** Approximately 200 graduate and undergraduate students answered student-specific questions, of the 471 who opened the survey. On average, these 200 students reported a strength in feeling respected, valued, and supported by support staff members, other students, and academic advisors and mentors.

DEI AREAS FOR GROWTH (in no specific order):

- » **Inclusion and Belonging.** Satisfaction with the overall climate emerged as an area for growth on average (n=600). Feeling valued and respected by College leadership emerged as an area for growth on average among around 500 respondents.
- » **Voice and Mistrust.** On average, approximately 350 (of 907) respondents who answered the question about feeling they can voice a contrary opinion to College leadership without fear of consequences reported a need for improvement. Approximately 600 respondents also saw a need for growth in voicing contrary opinions without fear of consequences to those in a position of authority and feeling heard by those in a position of authority. Focus group participants speculated that participation may have been low because of distrust of leaders.
- » **Workplace Incivility and Accountability.** Forty percent of approximately 600 respondents reported witnessing or experiencing microaggressions and/or incivility in the last six months, 22% reported such experiences with bullying, and 26% with discrimination. Most of these 600 respondents (74%) have developed strategies to avoid such experiences. The 342 who answered a follow-up question perceived that people were targeted most often on the basis of race/ethnicity, sex, gender identity, or disability status. In an open-ended question about what allows these experiences to continue, most of the 285 respondents cited lack of accountability. Focus group participants also described a lack of consequences for people who do harm.
- » **DEI Education.** On average, approximately 300 (of the 907) survey respondents who answered the questions perceived a need for improvement in College and unit efforts to educate the larger community about how to minimize bias and foster an inclusive environment. Many focus group participants also noted the need for DEI professional development, including among College and unit leaders.
- » **Evaluation, Compensation, and Development.** Of the 436 who opened the survey, 340 faculty and staff respondents who answered the questions on average reported the following as areas for growth: equity in dividing up ad hoc tasks that are not job specific, equity in processes used to determine compensation and raises, equity in leadership development, equity in compensation, and transparency in opportunities and processes for promotion.
- » **Workload Issues.** On average, approximately 340 faculty and staff who answered reported a need for improvement regarding equity in ad hoc tasks and setting clear goals that allow for workload prioritization.

ADDITIONAL SOURCES OF DATA

A. INSTITUTIONAL DATA FROM OFFICE OF PLANNING AND BUDGETS

As of the Fall of 2022, the current College undergraduate student composition was 58% Women, 11% African-American or Black, 5% Asian, 7% Hispanic or Latine, 6% International, 4% Two or More Races, and 64% White. The Master's student population was 75% Women, 10% African-American or Black, 1% Asian, 8% Hispanic or Latine, 3% International, 2% Two or More Races, and 72% White. The doctoral student composition was 58% Women, 6% African-American or Black, 6% Asian, 11% Hispanic or Latine, 27% International, 3% Two or More Races, and 45% White.

Racial and ethnic diversity has increased among graduate students. Data from the 2023 College Town Hall on progress shows that the percent of underrepresented minority doctoral students increased from 14.9% to 20.5% between AY 2016/2017 and AY 2020/2021.

The 2023 College Town Hall also reported that the percent of underrepresented minority tenure-system faculty increased from 14.9% in AY 2016/2017 to 17.4% in AY 2020/2021. Fifteen of the 26 (or 58%) new tenure-system faculty hired since 2019 are underrepresented minorities. The notable increases in racial and ethnic diversity among tenure-system faculty are concentrated among Assistant Professors. The College's compositional diversity is considerably lower among Full Professors in comparison to early and mid-career tenure-system faculty. As of Fall 2022, Assistant Professors are 14% African American or Black, 25% Asian or Asian American, 14% Hispanic or Latine, and 48% White, of Assistant Professor; whereas Full Professors are 6% African American or Black, 14% Asian or Asian American, 5% Hispanic or Latine, and 74% White. Patterns are similar in relation to sex. Currently, 56% of Assistant Professors are Women, but only 36% of Full Professors identify as such. The diversity of Associate Professors falls between these ranges.

Teaching-focused or fixed-term faculty are also considerably less diverse in terms of race and ethnicity than tenure-system faculty, academic staff, and support staff. However, academic and support staff are predominantly women. In AY 2021/2022, teaching-focused or fixed-term faculty were 80% White (5% Black or African American, 4% Asian or Asian American, 4% Hispanic or Latine) and 56% women, whereas academic specialists (excluding instructors) were 10% Black or African American, 7% Asian or Asian American, 7% Hispanic or Latine, and 69% White and 72% women. Support staff were 8% Black or African American, 6% Asian or Asian American, 5% Hispanic or Latine, and 71% White and 71% women.

Currently, our Chairs and Directors are predominantly White (86%) and male (82%). College leadership (Dean, Associate Deans, FEA, Assistant Deans, Directors) are 31% Black or African-American and 54% White and 54% men.

B. RETREAT FEEDBACK

The October 26, 2022 retreat included approximately 20 breakout tables that reported feedback on the following discussion prompts. The numbers indicate the number of tables that mentioned each theme. Themes that were mentioned by at least five tables are reported.

A. What 2-3 things is the College currently doing that we need to keep doing?

1. Early Start Program (15) - College program that provides support in the summer prior to year 1 of the PhD program, research funding in two summers, as well as programming and support to facilitate the professional development of the Early Start students. Evaluation of outcomes for these students show that among the first cohorts, Early Start students show improved time-to-degree and retention.
2. Research Associate's Program (14) - College two year postdoctoral program for scholars advancing DEI across the mission with the goal of transitioning them into the tenure-system at MSU.
3. Newsletter/Diversity Champion (8)

B. What are 2-3 barriers to advancing DEI in the College?

1. Lack of resources (20) - This includes a wide range of comments related to lack of resources, including a lack of dedicated staff to recruit and support prospective undergraduate students, lack of funding for support staff and graduate students, limited money and resources to attract people to the University, and comments specific to resources for DEI (e.g., there are more DEI-related responsibilities but the work is still concentrated within a small number of faculty and staff; DEI is moving quickly but without proper supports; could fund more DEI initiatives within the College; need to have more incentives and support for grassroots initiatives).
2. Communication (10) - Some highlighted the lack of communication about available resources, others that messages come from various sources (e.g., the college, unit, programs) that need to be coordinated. Several comments were made in relation to a lack of communication, or lack of consistent communication, across the units.
3. Insufficient support/resources for students (7) - Comments described the need to increase support for international students, first-generation students, other students facing challenges, and graduate students who feel financially isolated and anxious; to reduce the high student-instructor/TA ratio students; and to increase faculty understanding of what students need.
4. Training (6) - Comments described the need for professional development for DEI for faculty, staff, and students rather than assuming faculty have DEI expertise. Others argued that some of the University training sessions are ineffective and more should be offered at the College level in a manner that is manageable. This could involve tapping into some of the more effective training sessions on campus.

C. What are the most pressing DEI-related challenges to address in the College?

1. Communication (19) - Comments described the need to highlight DEI activities and their impact on the College and units and to communicate across units.
2. Resistance (18) - Comments stated that many people do not value DEI and demonstrate resistance to this work.
3. Siloing (10) - Comments indicated that DEI initiatives are not coordinated or collaborative across units.

4. Student Support (10) - Several comments regarding student support described the need for internship coordinators and improved mentoring, as well as general advocacy for undergraduate students.
5. Power/Hierarchy (8) - Comments generally stated that power/hierarchy is limiting the success of DEI work. Examples mainly included top-down decision making and not valuing staff and faculty advice and suggestions in decision making.

D. What are your top 2-3 ideas for addressing DEI challenges in the College?

1. Communication (18) - This node explains ways in which communication can be strengthened across departments and faculty/staff/students
2. Funding (12)
3. DEI Curriculum (11) - DEI should be further integrated into the learning (e.g., experiential learning, DEI majors and minors, including readings from URM authors, refraining from using [expensive] textbooks).
4. Collaboration (10) - Comments regarding the potential for faculty, staff, and students to work together to learn about and advance DEI.



C. KNOW MORE SURVEY

The KNOW MORE survey was designed to assess the culture, perceptions, and policies associated with sexual misconduct among the entire MSU campus community. Several questions on climate were embedded within this survey. One set of items measured experiences with workplace incivility (e.g., making insulting or disrespectful remarks, interrupting, paying little attention to their statements or showing little interest in their opinions, making jokes at their expense).

Cisgender women faculty and staff and transgender and/or nonbinary faculty/staff experienced more frequent direct incivility than did cisgender men faculty and staff. Cisgender women faculty were far more likely to perceive that the incivility was gender related (43.1% felt that their experiences were because of their gender identity) than the other groups; only 2.8% of cisgender men staff felt that the incivility they experienced was gender related, and 20.9% of cisgender women staff and 37.9% of transgender and/or nonbinary faculty/staff felt this way. Respondents in all five groups felt that age was also a fairly common reason for the incivility, and race/ethnicity was perceived to be a factor in incivility for all five groups. Among Black, Indigenous, and people of color (BIPOC) faculty and staff, workplace incivility based on race or ethnicity was more prevalent than for White faculty and staff.

Additional questions assessed general perceptions of climate in four domains: general school connectedness, inclusivity, general perceptions of highest university leadership, and general perceptions of other leadership. Across all climate scales, undergraduate cisgender men, faculty cisgender men, and staff cisgender men had the most positive perceptions of climate, whereas cisgender women graduate/professional students, transgender and/or nonbinary undergraduates, cisgender women faculty, and transgender and/or nonbinary graduate/professional students provided the most negative perceptions of climate. The climate scale that appeared to have the lowest scores (relative to the scale's upper limit) was "General Perceptions of the Highest Administrative Leadership at the School," which included the President and Board of Trustees.



D. 2017-2022 COLLEGE STRATEGIC PLAN

The 2017-2022 College of Social Science Strategic Plan included Diversity and Inclusion as one goal area and embedded additional DEI-related objectives in other areas of the plan. Progress on these goals and objectives informed the development of the new DEI plan. For more detailed information on the metrics and strategies used to advance these goals, please see the [5-Year Strategic Plan Report](#).

The College met the 5-year objective of increasing the percentage of underrepresented minority (URM) PhD students from 14.9% to 20%. In year 5, 20.5% of doctoral students in the College were from URM backgrounds. To reach this goal, investments were made in the Early Start Program, which provides underrepresented students with funding for predoctoral and doctoral research and the opportunity to begin their graduate program early. The College also doubled investment in Academic Achievement Graduate Assistantships (AAGA).

The objective to increase the percentage of URM tenure-system faculty from 14.9% to 16.4% was also met. As of year 5, URM faculty comprised 17.4% of tenure-system faculty. This goal was achieved in part through the Dean's Research Associate (Postdoctoral) Program through which three cohorts of Research Associates were recruited and two (to date) successfully transitioned into the tenure-system. This program, along with the Dean's Senior Distinguished Scholars Program, aims to promote an inclusive environment for exceptional scholars who also advance DEI in the academy. We were successful in hiring one Dean's Distinguished Senior Scholar to lead one of our thematic research areas, now referred to as the Youth Equity Project. This objective was also supported by the work of the Faculty Excellence Advocate to train search committees to implement inclusive search processes.

The College reduced opportunity gaps for minority, first generation, and Pell eligible students from a difference of 7.4% to 5.1%, but fell short of the goal of a 50% reduction (i.e., decreasing opportunity gaps to 3.7%). This progress was largely the result of investments in help rooms and peer assisted learning in large and gateway courses.





OUR SCIENCE **TRANSFORMS THE HUMAN EXPERIENCE**
AND INSPIRES LEADERS



College of Social Science
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

socialscience.msu.edu



#MSUSocialScience