



Appendix Report:
**DEI In
U-M Courses
and Curricular
Engagement**



Appendix Report

DEI in U-M Curricular Engagement Efforts: Insights, Lessons Learned and Next Steps

Introduction and Goals

As the University of Michigan (U-M) Ann Arbor launched its inaugural five-year Diversity, Equity and Inclusion strategic plan (DEI 1.0) in fall 2016, its focus was on catalyzing institutional change, such that the values of DEI are infused into the very culture and fabric of the University—across all units, structures and functions. The plan’s overarching goals centered three strategic “distal” objectives relevant to culture change, that is, positively impacting DEI in “People,” “Process” and “Products”. The “People” distal objective referred to recruiting, retaining and developing a diverse community; the “Process” distal objective referred to cultivating and sustaining a more inclusive and equitable campus climate; and the “Products” distal objective referred to supporting innovative and inclusive education, scholarship, research, teaching and service.

All 50 campus units (academic, administrative, service) developed unit-specific DEI plans that addressed these distal objectives in ways that aligned with their unit missions and functions, and these were complemented by a central DEI plan focused on cross-cutting, University-wide efforts. The steps undertaken in campus unit-level and central DEI plans would reflect shorter-term, proximal objectives and action steps toward achieving the three distal objectives that could be measured and assessed over the five-year strategic plan period (2016-2021).

In this report section, the focus is on DEI curricular engagement as a distal measure of change with regard to the “Products” objective of U-M’s DEI strategic plan. This objective reflects efforts to ensure that diversity, equity and inclusion are foundational aspects of U-M’s educational programs, teaching methodologies, service and research and scholarship.

Drawing on institutional data and unit-level annual and evaluation reports, the evaluation and assessment team considered multiple indicators of campus-wide DEI curricular engagement, organized in three focus areas:

- **Focus 1:** DEI in Courses (undergraduate course description content)
- **Focus 2:** Unit-reported DEI Curricular Engagement (curricular changes, policies and practices, example spotlight on Race & Ethnicity course requirements)
- **Focus 3:** Campus-wide Inclusive Teaching and Professional Development programs (centrally supported programming for faculty and graduate instructors)

More specifically, this portion of the DEI 1.0 strategic plan evaluation was intended to assess the following:

- the extent that DEI goals of promoting innovative and inclusive education and teaching are reflected through the infusion of DEI-related concepts across academic units’ course description content; and
- whether campus academic units’ curricular engagement with DEI was enhanced during the university’s five-year DEI 1.0 strategic plan period.



Focus 1: Undergraduate Course Descriptions

The course descriptions published by U-M academic units are one important source of information about primary course content and foci and a means of signaling to students the topics and themes that are relevant to the fields, disciplines and associated learning goals within the units.

The DEI evaluation and assessment team analyzed the number and content of undergraduate course descriptions as one indicator of the extent that DEI is integrated into U-M’s undergraduate course curriculum. The team examined course descriptions over the DEI 1.0 strategic plan period, with a focus on topics/themes spotlighted in descriptions and how this varied over time or across schools, colleges and academic programs.

[The evaluation and assessment team acknowledges that course descriptions alone do not provide a full picture of how DEI issues may be taken up within courses. For instance, data from course syllabi content, course materials and other course artifacts would provide additional relevant information and insights. In the case of the current evaluation, course description data were systematically available across U-M units, while other relevant forms of data were unevenly available and accessible across units. In the future steps of U-M DEI efforts and strategic planning, the evaluation and assessment team recommends additional course related data collection (e.g., gathering relevant syllabi across all units) and analysis in order to more fully understand the infusion of DEI into units’ courses and curriculum. Such efforts will require new collaboration with units to support a shared data approach and process, one that accounts for units’ diverse practices and systems for documenting and archiving course materials.

Nevertheless, the present examination of course descriptions, coupled with other unit-reported and institutional data, provides important information and insights around the University’s DEI curricular engagement during the DEI 1.0 strategic plan period, as well as future considerations for U-M’s continued and future work of advancing DEI in its educational programs and within teaching and learning contexts.]

Data

The evaluation team used institutional data to conduct the following analyses. The available unit of analysis was course descriptions for undergraduate courses offered between Fall 2016 and Winter 2021¹. All available undergraduate course data was requested from the central Registrar’s Office (RO) and the College of Literature, Science and the Arts (LSA)². From both sources, the total number of undergraduate courses included in the data request received by the evaluation team was 4,972 unique courses.

Data cleaning was completed using Microsoft Excel and the statistical computing software R.³ Data from the RO was combined with the LSA data to find out which courses did not have a description included or lacked a meaningful description (i.e., less than 10 words). The courses were then coded by the evaluation team based on a coding scheme developed for the courses. Only courses that were

¹ For this report and analyses, only courses held in Fall and Winter terms were examined. Spring and Summer courses were not included in the analyses.

² The extensive nature of course cross-listing and the overall number of undergraduate courses offered through LSA is the primary reason data was requested from LSA, in addition to the central Registrar’s Office.

³ R Core Team (2022). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. <https://www.R-project.org/>



owned by the eight schools and colleges that directly admit first year undergraduate students were included in the report analysis⁴. For courses that did not have descriptions included, the evaluation team reached out to the respective schools and colleges in order to collect missing information. If available, additional descriptions were added to the data set before the analyses began. Course data analyzed came from courses that were offered regularly with content that did not change from semester to semester (e.g., seminar courses) and was not individualized to the students (e.g., “independent study”, “Directed Study”)⁵. Therefore, only courses that were not flagged for removal under the coding scheme were included in the analyses.

The final set of course descriptions included in this report analysis were from 3,163 unique courses offered within the timeframe of DEI 1.0. For courses offered multiple times during the five-year period of 2016-2021, our team examined only the most recent available course description for each unique course in our data. This choice was principled since the overwhelming majority of course descriptions remained static throughout the time period under study. Table 1 offers a breakdown of how many course descriptions in our dataset belonged to each of the eight schools and colleges under study.

Table 1. Data Breakdown	
School/College	# of Unique Courses to be Analyzed
College of Engineering	325
Literature, Science and the Arts	1949
Ross School of Business	137
School of Kinesiology	90
School of Music, Theatre & Dance	322
School of Nursing	203
Stamps School of Art and Design	105
Taubman College of Architecture and Urban Planning	32
Total	3163

Unique courses had the potential of being offered up to 10 times over the five year period.⁶ Table 2 provides a snapshot of the total number of course offerings across academic years⁷ for each school and college.

⁴ Courses owned by other schools and colleges were excluded from the analyses.

⁵ Independent and directed study courses are important, but due to the institutional data available, the evaluation team made the decision to exclude these types of courses from this particular analysis.

⁶ Five Fall terms (F16, F17, F18, F19, and F20) and five Winter terms (W17, W18, W19, W20, and W21).

⁷ Academic year includes the combined total for the fall and winter terms, e.g., Fall 16 and Winter 17.



Table 2. Total Number of Course Offerings Across Academic Years

School/College	16-17 AY	17-18 AY	18-19 AY	19-20 AY	20-21 AY
College of Engineering	383	394	396	401	409
Literature, Science and the Arts	1719	1744	1751	1777	1818
Ross School of Business	125	128	137	146	137
School of Kinesiology	100	101	107	106	112
School of Music, Theatre & Dance	320	340	339	342	340
School of Nursing	258	232	238	215	231
Stamps School of Art and Design	92	105	103	105	105
Taubman College of Architecture and Urban Planning	35	33	33	34	36
Grand Total	3032	3077	3104	3126	3188

Methodology

Text mining and content analysis using a DEI dictionary (i.e., categorization model) were the primary methods⁸ used to analyze the course descriptions. The evaluation team used Wordstat 9⁹, a text mining and qualitative analysis software, to complete the analysis of examining and extracting DEI related items (i.e., words) found in the course descriptions.

More specifically, the team referenced and adapted from Halualani et al.’s (2010)¹⁰ Diversity Mapping and definition of a *diversity-related course*: a class that “focuses on issues and topics related to various cultural groups, backgrounds, identities, and experiences, and/or promotes the larger importance of diversity, difference or cultural sharing for the public.”

DEI Dictionary Development.

In order to conduct this analysis, the evaluation and assessment team developed a “DEI dictionary” – a bank of words and phrases associated with a variety of DEI-related categories and items – for the purpose of quantifying the pervasiveness of DEI engagement in courses across time and school/college.

⁸ Deng, Q., Hine, M.J., Shaobo, J., Sujit. S. Inside the black box of dictionary building for text analytics: A design science approach. *Journal of International Technology and Information Management*: 2019; 27(3): 7, <https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/jitim/vol27/iss3/7>

⁹ Wordstat 9. (2021). *Content analysis and text mining software* (Version 9.0.6). Provalis Research, Montreal, QC. <https://provalisresearch.com/products/content-analysis-software/>

¹⁰ Halualani, R. T., Haiker, H., & Lancaster, C. (2010). Mapping diversity efforts as inquiry. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 32,2, 127-136, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13600800903575439>



A team of six DEI evaluation staff and students developed the DEI dictionary through an iterative process for both the course data analysis included in this report, as well as the budget document analysis¹¹. The team met regularly over several months to discuss and reach shared agreement on the structure of the dictionary. Common words and phrases used to define diversity, equity and inclusion were compiled from various sources to develop an initial list of words and phrases^{12,13}. Each team member independently reviewed the list of dictionary items and categorized them under the developed subcategories. Team members met weekly to refine the dictionary and finalize the structure. Shared understanding and agreement across the two projects and team members was critical to ensure a comprehensive DEI dictionary and a systematic approach to the analyses.

The final dictionary structure included 3 main categories: DEI Domains, Identity Characteristics and DEI Mechanisms. For the purposes of this course description analysis, the report will only focus on the category of Identity Characteristics. This category included 11 subcategories:

- Ability or Disability Status; Age;
- Citizenship, Immigration Status, National Origin;
- Culture;
- Gender, Gender Identity & Sexual Orientation;
- General Identity;
- Political Perspective;
- Race and Ethnicity;
- Religion and Spirituality;
- Social Class and Socioeconomic Diversity;
- Veterans

Category descriptions and inclusion examples for each category can be found in Table 3.

The finalized DEI dictionary was imported into Wordstat for validation. An automated dictionary created by Wordstat reviewing the content of the 3163 course descriptions was used to augment and validate the dictionary. The Wordstat generated dictionary was applied to the course description data set and key topics were extracted. The evaluation team compared the Wordstat-generated topics to the structure and content of our DEI dictionary model. Additional words/phrases that were determined to be DEI related but not already included in our dictionary were added to produce an augmented dictionary that closely reflected concepts of DEI within the course descriptions. The augmented dictionary was applied to the course descriptions dataset to generate DEI-specific topics or phrases. Wordstat-suggested synonyms and antonyms were reviewed, and words or phrases determined to be appropriate for the DEI dictionary were added. Wordstat features were also used to determine which words or phrases should be included or excluded from the analyses. A senior evaluation staff member with knowledge of the DEI strategic plan reviewed the augmented dictionary and discussed changes with the larger dictionary group. The final augmented dictionary was applied to the course descriptions data set and validated using Wordstat’s keywords in context (KWIC) feature. KWIC allowed the evaluation team to determine whether dictionary items were being used in a DEI context.

¹¹ To learn more about the budget documents analysis and result, please see the [DEI in Budgets report appendix](#) of the [DEI 1.0 Evaluation Report](#).

¹² Examples of categories outlined by Halualani et al. (2015) include: gender, socioeconomic class, political perspective, age, race, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, disability and nationality, among others.

¹³ Halualani, R. T., Haiker, H. L., Lancaster, C., & Morrison, J. H. T. A. (2015). *Diversity mapping data portrait: California State University Monterey Bay (CSUMB)*. Halualani & Associates. <https://edit.csumb.edu/sites/default/files/images/st-block-19-1435260309719-raw-csumbdiversitymappingdataportrait.pdf>



Words/phrases that were found to be used in a non-DEI related context were excluded from the analysis.

Table 3. DEI Dictionary			
DEI Dictionary Category		Category Description	Inclusion Examples
1	Identity Characteristics	This category encompasses various social identities with which U-M constituents may identify	
1.1	Ability Or Disability Status	This subcategory encompasses words or phrases that describe or are related to ability and/or disability status. This includes mental, emotional and physical abilities/disabilities.	Ableism, adaptive technology, barriers to accessibility, cognitive disability, hearing impaired, learning accommodations, screen reader
1.2	Age	This subcategory includes words and phrases that are related to the length of time individuals have lived, growing older, age diversity and generations.	Adolescents, adult, aging, infant, elderly, young adult
1.3	Citizenship, Immigration Status, National Origin	This subcategory includes words and phrases that express individuals' legal status or allegiance to a state or nation as inhabitants, natives or naturalized persons, including the legal protections to which they may be entitled under law due to that status.	African, Alaskan native, ancestor, British, Chinese, citizen, DACA, decolonizing, Immigration status, indigenous people
1.4	Culture	This subcategory includes words and phrases that express the way of life of groups with which U-M constituents identify, general customs and beliefs, attitudes, behavior and opinions.	Acculturation, assimilation, culture, ethnocentrism, multicultural, transculturation, shared cultural experiences, bicultural
1.5	Gender, Gender Identity, Sex & Sexual Orientation	This subcategory includes words and phrases that describe the characteristics of all genders as they relate to social or cultural differences. It includes words that express an individual's internal sense of self and their gender, gender expression and sexual orientation.	Bisexual, Cisgender, Gay, Gender diversity, Gender identity, Gender expression, Sexism, Homophobia, transgender, genderqueer
1.6	General Identity	This subcategory encompasses words that did not fit into any of the above identity characteristics and/or represented concepts that can be associated with multiple social identities.	Minority, first-generation, ally, passing privilege, privileged group, intersection, impostor syndrome
1.7	Political Perspective	This subcategory includes words or phrases used to describe social attitudes or ideologies of or relating to the state, government, the body politic, public administration and policy-making.	Activism, apolitical, civil rights, democracy, partisan, Ideology, Internationalism
1.8	Race And Ethnicity	This subcategory includes words and phrases that describe human identity or diversity based on physical traits, such as skin color, and groups of people/concepts based on common nationality, language, religion, cultural traditions or family ancestry.	Alaskan native, BIPOC, colorblind, faculty of color, Hispanic, Latinx, White, multiethnic, people of color, African American



Table 3. DEI Dictionary			
DEI Dictionary Category		Category Description	Inclusion Examples
1.9	Religion And Spirituality	This subcategory includes words or phrases that describe peoples' beliefs and practices related to religion and spirituality, and how they make meaning of life.	Agnostic, Antisemitism, Buddhism Catholic, Islam, nonreligious, spiritual, religion, Jewish
1.10	Social Class And Socioeconomic Diversity	This subcategory captures words that describe how people are grouped into hierarchical categories based on socioeconomic status.	Classism, elitism, Financial aid, low income, middle class, poverty, gentrification, social class, social status, wealth gap
1.11	Veteran	This subcategory includes words used to describe military experience or persons who have served in the military.	Veteran

Wordstat Extraction

The DEI dictionary was used to identify the relative presence of DEI related concepts in the course descriptions over the five years of the strategic plan implementation. To ensure a comprehensive analysis, the evaluation team applied stems to the dictionary (e.g., "ACCESSIB*" to capture items including "Accessible", "Accessibility", etc). The Wordstat default English exclusion list was also applied. This feature excluded items such as articles, conjunctions and preposition that occur frequently (e.g., "and," "before," "after," "maybe," "the," "are," etc.) but may not necessarily be informative. Items were included in the extraction counts if they were present at least once in a course description. Duplicate paragraphs and URLs were ignored. No weighting was applied, but the automatic spelling correction feature in Wordstat was used.

In the course data, only the "Identity Characteristics" category of the DEI dictionary was relevant. In fact, nearly all courses that were flagged with the other overarching category tags were also flagged with the Identity Characteristics tag (see Table 4). As a result, only the Identity Characteristics tag and its subcategories were included in the final analysis.

Results from Course Description Analysis

As shown in Table 4, nearly half of the undergraduate course descriptions included in this analysis were flagged as having DEI content (46.89% of unique courses). Topics relevant to citizenship, immigration status, national origin, race and ethnicity and culture are most frequently mentioned in the course descriptions – each subcategory appears in more than half of the unique courses flagged as engaging DEI-related content (see Table 4). Nearly one fifth of the DEI-related course descriptions mentioned topics related to gender, gender identity, sex and sexual orientation, religion and spirituality or political perspective. Topics related to age, social class, and ability/disability status were mentioned less frequently in the course descriptions, with less than 8% of all course descriptions with DEI-related content engaging any of these individual subcategories. Additionally, many of the course descriptions that engaged DEI concepts often focused on more than one content area (e.g., race, gender and culture), given that the total number of subcategory flags (3668) is more than double the total number of unique courses flagged (1483).

The vast majority of undergraduate course descriptions with DEI-related content were those for courses housed within the College of Literature, Science, and the Arts (LSA). As indicated in Table 5,



over 60% of the unique LSA undergraduate course descriptions in this analysis included DEI-related content. Among the seven other schools or colleges included in this analysis, the percent of undergraduate courses descriptions with DEI-related content ranged from 4% to 20% (as shown in Table 5).

That said, over the five years of the DEI 1.0 strategic plan period, small increases were observed in the number of course descriptions with DEI-related content, specifically in LSA, the School of Kinesiology and the Stamps School of Art and Design. Overall, the number and percentage of undergraduate course descriptions with DEI-related content remained fairly stable across the five-year period of DEI 1.0 strategic plan implementation.

The evaluation and assessment team raise several considerations around the course description analysis findings. First, the stability of DEI-related content in the undergraduate course descriptions across the five years of the DEI 1.0 strategic plan can be viewed in itself a noteworthy, positive finding in the context of the societal events that impacted the campus (and world) during the latter 2-½ years of the DEI 1.0 strategic plan period. The patterns suggest that, at the very least, units maintained course offerings focused on DEI topics and showed small increases in offerings in a few units.

Second, the stability pattern could also be an artifact of the nature of course description data rather than an complete indicator of the progress schools and colleges have made to infuse DEI in their undergraduate courses. While course descriptions can provide an overview of what students can expect to learn from a course, the descriptions vary in their elaboration and thus may vary or be limited in the amount of information provided about a particular course. Additionally, course descriptions may be updated less frequently than other course materials, such as course syllabi. These analyses illustrate a limitation of course description information alone and the need to capture additional course materials and forms of data in order to best understand the myriad of ways DEI may be infused into a unit's courses and curricular efforts.

To this point, subsequent sections of this report highlight other data sources reviewed in the DEI 1.0 evaluation process that demonstrate a diversity of unit efforts to infuse DEI in curriculum and teaching and learning contexts. The following sections detail this information.



Table 4. Count (Percent) of Undergrad Courses with DEI-related Content in Course Descriptions (Out of 3163 Unique Courses)¹⁴		
	Percent of unique courses	Count of unique courses
IDENTITY CHARACTERISTICS	46.89%	1483
CITIZENSHIP, IMMIGRATION STATUS, NATIONAL ORIGIN	31.77%	1005
RACE AND ETHNICITY	24.22%	766
CULTURE	25.10%	794
GENDER, GENDER IDENTITY, SEX & SEXUAL ORIENTATION	9.04%	286
RELIGION AND SPIRITUALITY	8.22%	260
POLITICAL PERSPECTIVE	7.94%	251
AGE	3.35%	106
GENERAL IDENTITY	2.94%	93
SOCIAL CLASS AND SOCIOECONOMIC DIVERSITY	2.28%	72
ABILITY OR DISABILITY STATUS	1.11%	35

¹⁴ There were no courses flagged with items from the Veteran category.



Table 5. Count (Percent) of Undergrad Courses with DEI-related Content in Course Descriptions Over Time

School/College	16-17 AY		17-18 AY		18-19 AY		19-20 AY		20-21 AY	
College of Engineering	18	4.70%	17	4.31%	19	4.80%	17	4.24%	18	4.40%
Literature, Science and the Arts	1058	61.55%	1073	61.53%	1073	61.28%	1077	60.61%	1115	61.33%
Ross School of Business	25	20.00%	24	18.75%	22	16.06%	25	17.12%	24	17.52%
School of Kinesiology	10	10.00%	11	10.89%	10	9.35%	12	11.32%	15	13.39%
School of Music, Theatre & Dance	63	19.69%	59	17.35%	60	17.70%	62	18.13%	57	16.76%
School of Nursing	38	14.73%	33	14.22%	33	13.87%	35	16.28%	39	16.88%
Stamps School of Art and Design	7	7.61%	5	4.76%	6	5.83%	10	9.52%	10	9.52%
Taubman College of Architecture and Urban Planning	4	11.43%	4	12.12%	3	9.09%	4	11.76%	4	11.11%
Grand Total	1223		1226		1226		1242		1282	



Focus 2: Unit-Reported Curricular Engagement

Beyond course descriptions, units’ own DEI plan reports indicate changes in engagement related to DEI in course curriculum and teaching and learning related efforts. For instance, as part of units’ self-evaluations of their DEI strategic plans, units described their DEI efforts to promote innovative and inclusive education, scholarship, research and teaching. Across the DEI 1.0 strategic plan period, each of the academic units¹⁵ described efforts to integrate DEI concepts into course content and curriculum, and in various ways.

Some of these unit-reported efforts reflected the initial goals they outlined at the outset of the DEI plan period (2016), while in other cases, units reported new efforts responsive to critical emergent societal events, such as the renewed racial justice movement sparked by the 2020 murder of Mr. George Floyd and other publicized incidents of police violence against Black and Indigenous communities and communities of color, increased xenophobic and anti-Asian hate acts, and increased acts of anti-semitism. The COVID-19 pandemic impacts (locally, nationally and globally)—including social inequalities illuminated and exacerbated by the pandemic—also related to units’ subsequent efforts related to curriculum, teaching and learning. Examples include taking steps to provide additional academic and social support to students and other unit members disproportionately impacted by societal events, and initiating new community conversations and curricular engagement in their unit communities around topics related to racial justice and social inequality, among other examples.

[Note: Given the gravity of the noted societal events and conditions for the 2020 reporting year, the DEI strategic plan evaluation team added questions to units’ DEI annual report protocols asking about ways that units were impacted by and responded to these events. This allowed units to share ways that they may have had to adjust, pivot and/or revise their DEI efforts to be responsive to these events and the subsequent needs and concerns of their unit communities.]

Following is a summary of units’ reported efforts.

Curriculum Change from Unit Evaluation Reporting

As reported in units’ DEI 1.0 strategic plan self-evaluations completed in 2021-2022 (the academic year following the five-year plan period), ninety percent (90%) of academic units engaged in some form of curriculum change or made progress regarding the infusion of DEI into their unit courses. Moreover, 100% of the units that teach courses directly highlighted work related to these efforts. How units specifically engaged with changes in curriculum and/or inclusive teaching varied.

Some units highlighted initiatives and related work focusing on anti-racism and decolonizing the curriculum (with decolonizing defined in multiple ways related to addressing concerns of anti-Blackness, Indigenous invisibility, among other approaches). Moreover, in order to further realize their unit efforts, community teams were created to identify proposed new recommendations for curriculum, continued education or professional development with a focus on DEI and anti-racism.

¹⁵ Academic units include the following 21 schools and colleges: College of Engineering, College of Literature, Science and the Arts, College of Pharmacy, Ford School of Public Policy, Institute for Social Research, Law School, Life Sciences Institute, Michigan Medicine, Rackham Graduate School, Ross School of Business, School for Environment and Sustainability, School of Dentistry, School of Education, School of Information, School of Kinesiology, School of Music, Theatre, and Dance, School of Nursing, School of Public Health, School of Social Work, Stamps School of Art & Design and Taubman College of Architecture and Urban Planning.



Units also noted the importance of engaging multiple constituencies, including faculty, staff and students, to participate and inform the working groups and discussions.

In addition to engaging their existing curricula, units also reported discussing, for example, developing new required courses to examine historical contexts and societal impacts related to DEI issues. Similarly, a few units engaged reviews of their curricula, including course syllabi, among other metrics. Additionally, units reported efforts in updating course materials, such as the inclusion of DEI-related statements in unit course syllabi. Collaborating with other units across campus, both academic and non-academic, was also discussed as a need and a way to encourage inclusive teaching, training and development for relevant constituencies in their units.

Unit-level Policies, Practices and Reflections

The DEI 1.0 strategic plan unit self-evaluation process was organized into three phases. Each phase was designed to assist units in engaging in their self-evaluation throughout the evaluation year (fall 2021- summer 2022). As part of Phase 1, units were asked to review their checklist of institutionalized DEI policies, practices and standard operating procedures. Several policy and practice categories were related to courses, including Critical Lens or Decolonizing Framework, Curricular Change and Inclusive Teaching/Pedagogy. Academic units reported high engagement with these practices. Specifically:

- 90% of academic units engaged inclusive teaching and pedagogy practices
- 76% of academic units institutionalized policies/practices related to curricular change
- 43% of academic units engaged a critical lens or decolonizing framework in their education, teaching, research and scholarship

Another phase of the unit self-evaluation process also highlighted efforts to infuse DEI into courses. In Phase 3, the final phase of the DEI 1.0 evaluation process, units were asked to reflect on what they reported in Phases 1 and 2 and to think holistically about their DEI 1.0 plan efforts and progress toward each distal objective (i.e, People, Process, Products). For each distal objective, units were asked to identify any lessons learned, best practices that emerged and possible pitfalls to avoid in the future. Based on these reflections, units were then asked to describe their initial thoughts about their unit’s priorities for the next steps in U-M’s DEI efforts (the next strategic plan period, or DEI 2.0) for each distal objective. Both academic and non-academic units discussed aspects of curricular change, critical lens or decolonizing framework and inclusive teaching and pedagogy in their Phase 3 reflections. For instance,

- 67% of academic units called for concrete curricular change in order to promote inclusive and equitable pedagogy
- 86% of academic units discussed inclusive teaching and pedagogy within their reflections

The introduction of inclusive pedagogy training and changes to curricula have often aimed to incorporate anti-racism into teaching practices and acknowledge racist structures both in American society and potentially within the University of Michigan itself. Establishing inclusive teaching practices and training faculty in them has been a critical objective during the DEI 1.0 strategic plan period. Critical lens or decolonizing frameworks were discussed as part of initiatives taken up by units when reviewing curriculum, as well as having involvement and feedback from relevant constituencies (i.e., faculty, students, staff).



[To learn more about the Phase 1 and Phase 3 findings relevant to the infusion of DEI in courses and other policies, practices and reflections, please see also the [Unit-level Evaluation and Reflections report appendix](#) of the [DEI 1.0 Evaluation Report](#).]

Unit Spotlight: The LSA Race and Ethnicity (R&E) Requirement

In addition to information from unit self-evaluations highlighting different forms of DEI curricular engagement, the evaluation and assessment team spotlights a unit example with additional available institutional data, specifically the Race and Ethnicity (R&E) requirement for the College of Literature, Science and the Arts (LSA)¹⁶. Before graduating with an undergraduate degree from LSA, students must fulfill this course requirement, and LSA offers several courses that meet this requirement.

LSA is held as a spotlight example in this report, as it is one of the largest colleges on the U-M Ann Arbor campus, serving the largest number of undergraduate students. Its R&E requirement has been established since 1990 and has been evaluated and re-examined by unit leadership prior to and during the DEI 1.0 strategic plan period. As such, the LSA R&E requirement supports education around race and racism (at national and global levels) for a substantial proportion of the U-M undergraduate campus community, and engages a substantial proportion of U-M faculty and graduate students with scholarly and teaching expertise on these topics. In addition, as noted in the prior section, other campus academic units have reported efforts to plan and establish Race & Ethnicity and/or related DEI course requirements in their curricula as a part of their DEI strategic plans. LSA's requirement is a model and example that could help inform and support those efforts.

As shown in Table 6, the total number of course offerings that met the LSA R&E requirement increased during the time of DEI 1.0¹⁷. The number of R&E course offerings increased by 35.7% from the 2016-17 academic year to the 2020-21 academic year.

Academic Year	LSA R&E Course Offerings
AY 16-17	230
AY 17-18	236
AY 18-19	288
AY 19-20	298
AY 20-21	312

Focus 3: Inclusive Teaching Professional Development Programs

The establishment of the Inclusive Teaching Professional Development Programs (now referred to as Equity-focused Teaching) is a centrally supported action within U-M's DEI 1.0 strategic plan. The programs are offered through the Center for Research on Learning and Teaching (CRLT). CRLT will both (1) continue to offer campus-wide programs about inclusive and equity-focused teaching for instructors in multiple disciplines and (2) work with schools and colleges to create faculty professional development programs that reflect their particular pedagogical needs and make learning more

¹⁶ Information about R&E course requirements in LSA can be found [here](https://lsa.umich.edu/lsa/academics/lsa-requirements/race-and-ethnicity--r-e--requirement.html). [URL: <https://lsa.umich.edu/lsa/academics/lsa-requirements/race-and-ethnicity--r-e--requirement.html>]

¹⁷ Data was collected from the [LSA Online Course Guide](http://www.lsa.umich.edu/cg/default.aspx). [URL: <http://www.lsa.umich.edu/cg/default.aspx>]



inclusive and equitable across a diverse student body. In addition, CRLT will continue to offer equity-focused teaching workshops for new and experienced graduate student instructors. During the five years of the DEI 1.0 strategic plan period, CRLT worked in various ways to meet the goals set forth in this action item. Among key accomplishments, the unit:

- Offered 135+ DEI-focused seminars in its fall and winter seminar series, and through its Inclusive Teaching @ Michigan Series
- Delivered 240+ customized workshops to departments across campus
- Arranged for the CRLT Players to present—or provide follow-up for—185+ performances on topics that included promoting a climate resistant to sexual harassment
- Facilitated programs for 210+ instructors teaching LSA Race & Ethnicity courses
- Presented modules on inclusive teaching to 6,200+ GSIs and undergraduate instructional aides
- Provided 40 programs on anti-racist pedagogy for 12 schools/colleges during Year Five
- Developed and arranged for the CRLT Players to perform new sketches on departmental climate issues faced by minoritized students and a new sketch on the history of racial inequality at U-M
- Created a video with the CRLT Players, titled “Act for Equity,” which was shown at instructor orientations and workshops

Conclusions and Recommendations

As these multiple data sources show, there has been significant effort and progress to infuse and engage DEI in curricular and pedagogical areas at U-M over the DEI 1.0 strategic plan period. Findings showed that nearly half of the undergraduate course descriptions included in the data analysis engaged with DEI content of some kind. The results from examining the course descriptions also suggest relative stability of course descriptions with DEI content over the five years of the DEI 1.0 plan period. But, several units showed small increases in course descriptions with DEI content, and showing stability in available courses with DEI related course descriptions in the context of the last 2.5 years of the DEI plan period (with the noted pandemic impacts and concurrent racial and social inequality challenges) can be viewed as noteworthy and a signal of U-M units’ DEI commitment.

That said, the findings are not necessarily reflective of the full scope of work being done within different units and courses offered. Additional course information data (syllabi, undergraduate and graduate courses) and analysis are needed to more fully understand U-M’s DEI curricular engagement and progress over time. Course descriptions were appropriate to use as one important source of course information that was available across all units (for undergraduate courses). But, it is strongly recommended that future DEI strategic planning efforts engage units more collaboratively in the beginning of the planning process to address vast unit variation in archiving and storage of course and curricular information and records, and at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. The support of and collaboration with the schools and colleges will be critical, including respective unit leadership and departments, to advancing these important efforts effectively.

The data from unit-level evaluation reports and institutional data for the LSA Race & Ethnicity requirement spotlight also provide additional indicators of U-M units’ active and enhanced engagement around curriculum and pedagogy during the DEI plan period. Units were able to describe and reflect on their efforts to infuse DEI into curriculum and learning contexts. This included efforts that were responsive to the COVID-19 pandemic and subsequent justice/equity movements occurring in the latter years of the DEI plan period. In a number of instances, these societal events prompted



units to engage in new actions within their DEI plans – including conversations, programs and other action planning with their unit community, e.g., around addressing anti-Blackness, anti-Asian hate, decolonizing curricula, addressing health disparities, among other areas. As such, some important and impactful areas of DEI curricular engagement and accomplishment are likely still yet to come, beyond the DEI 1.0 strategic plan period.

In addition, the centrally supported work of the Inclusive Teaching Professional Development Programs (now referred to as Equity-focused Teaching programs) has yielded high campus-wide participation of faculty and graduate instructors. The uptake of this programming suggests that this set of professional education products has supported capacity building in the U-M campus community for creating inclusive classrooms and teaching and learning environments. As a number of these programming efforts provided introductory foundations, it is recommended that U-M's future DEI efforts build on these educational and training offerings by supporting continued education and skill building for U-M community members. It will also be critical to begin to develop ways to evaluate the impacts of this type of education/training and capacity building on student outcomes as well as classroom-level, unit-level and campus-level climates.

Finally, it will be essential that units continue their DEI curricular engagement efforts beyond the current 1.0 DEI plan period in order to yield the positive impacts of their planning and community engagement work and to create culture change. Just as critical is providing campus units with continued and ongoing support for DEI education and professional development around teaching, learning and pedagogy to support high quality preparation in DEI curricular planning and implementation.

