



TO: Senate Agenda Committee
FROM: The Inclusion and Diversity Committee (IDC)
DATE: March 19, 2025
SUBJECT: Final report for 2024-2025

The IDC committee had 12 meetings during the academic year. The committee carried out the specific charges assigned by SAC. The charges were addressed as follows with recommendations and/or resolutions:

Charge 1: Follow up on the IDC proposal from 2022 (Integrating Diversity Recommendations into Policy-Making Processes) with the Policy Oversight Committee and report on its implementation.

The IDC submitted a proposal, "Integrating Diversity Recommendations into Policy-Making Processes," to the Policy Oversight Committee (POC) at policy_oversight@northeastern.edu on February 2, 2024. Towards the goal of fulfilling Charge 1, the following activities were conducted during the 2024-2025 academic year:

- Initial Response to Proposal Submission: On April 4, 2024, Stacey Hamilton, Global AVP for Compliance, acknowledged receipt and indicated that the proposal was under review with relevant internal parties. She provided a new contact email, policies@northeastern.edu, for future correspondence.
- Follow-Up Attempt via Email: On October 18, 2024, the IDC sent a follow-up email to policies@northeastern.edu requesting an update on the proposal's progress. No email response has been received.
- Follow-Up via Teams Meeting: The IDC met with POC member, Dr. Deb Franko, on March 13, 2025, to discuss the proposal's status.
- Follow-Up Attempt via Email: On March 17, 2025, the IDC sent a follow-up email to policies@northeastern.edu requesting an update on the proposal's progress. The IDC received an auto-response that the POC chair would be out of the office until March 21, 2025.

At the meeting with Dr. Franko on March 13, 2025, the IDC inquired about the university's stance on DEI and the current political landscape. Of note, external political pressures have caused the university to alter its public DEI language. University-wide language changes have occurred, reflecting a shift from "DEI" to "Office of Belonging" and updated terminology across Northeastern websites. However, Dr. Franko assured the IDC that NU is committed to the core values of DEI. The IDC also learned that the POC's current policy development processes incorporate many of the core principles outlined in the IDC proposal, albeit with updated language. The university has made significant strides in ensuring policies are inclusive, accessible, and clearly written.

- Northeastern policies are currently developed with neutral, gender-inclusive language (e.g., "they/them").
- Policies are written in clear, factual language at a 7th-grade reading level, with defined abbreviations; accessibility is a mandatory component of all policies.
- Policies are reviewed on a 3-year basis.
- The POC follows a rigorous review and approval process for all policies, including:
 - Drafting by a point person
 - POC review and editing
 - Senior Leadership Team (SLT) sponsor review
 - Development of a communication plan
 - Final approval by the full SLT

Recommendation

While the original IDC proposal aimed to guide NU policy development with more inclusive language, the university's current policy-making processes have evolved to address many of the proposal's core principles through updated language, accessibility requirements, and a structured review process. Given the current evolving political climate, the underlying spirit of inclusion remains, even though the language has changed. The IDC recommends that the administration send a university-wide email to faculty and staff when significant changes have been made to the FAQ "Navigating a New Political Landscape"

(<https://news.northeastern.edu/new-political-landscape-faq/>).

Resolution

Be it resolved that the administration be tasked with sending an email to all faculty members and staff when significant changes are made to the FAQ.

Charge 2: Review the guidelines for creating unit DEI action plans and provide standard definitions for DEI terminology so future surveys can evaluate and compare plans. For example, in the IDC report from 2023, the committee reports that the "terms 'belonging' and 'inclusion' are used differently by different groups" (p. 15) and therefore recommends developing standard university-wide definitions of key DEI terms.

In response to Charge 2, the IDC developed the 'Key Terms for Action Plans,' which provides standard university-wide definitions for key DEI terms. This document addresses the issue of varied interpretations of terms like 'belonging' and 'inclusion' as highlighted in the 2023 IDC report.

The rationale for developing standard university-wide definitions of key DEI terms is to: Facilitate clear communication among faculty, staff, and students; Ensure consistency in the development and implementation of DEI initiatives; Facilitate the collection and analysis of data to measure progress and inform future strategies; Promote collaboration and partnership among different departments and units.

Definitions were compiled from Northeastern's Office of Belonging glossary, the University of Washington School of Public Health, and other reputable sources. For a complete list of references, please refer to the 'Key Terms for Action Plans,' located in Appendix C.

Recommendation

The IDC should develop a plan for university-wide dissemination of the ‘Key Terms for Action Plans.’ Towards this goal, the IDC should collaborate with the Office of Belonging to ensure the ‘Key Terms for Action Plans’ is readily accessible university wide, such as the Office of Belonging website. The IDC should work with the Calypso newsletter to help amplify awareness of the ‘Key Terms for Action Plans’ across the university network.

Resolution

Be it resolved that the DEI terminology standardization document, ‘Key Terms for Action Plans,’ be shared across the Northeastern network via the Office of Belonging website.

Charge 3: Survey faculty about their current DEI priorities and concerns regarding DEI policies and programs offered at Northeastern.

Fall Faculty Survey

The committee developed a list of questions for the Fall Faculty Survey designed to determine how faculty would prioritize different DEIB concerns, how they would rate the effectiveness of current DEIB initiatives on campus, and the level of support they would like to see for various DEIB practices (Appendix A). The responses were analyzed numerically except for the open-ended questions analyzed using ChatGPT.

Numerical results

Table 1 below shows the average responses for the items listed in Question 1 on the Fall Survey. The color scale has the highest values shaded in green. These results indicate that pay, raises, promotions, and retention of faculty and students are the highest concerns. Campus climate and student recruitment and admissions were also deemed important. The open responses, discussed below, support the idea that equity in terms of compensation and promotion are high priorities for faculty members. Equity in Awards was at the bottom of the list of priorities. This was interesting as multiple charges for the 2023-2024 IDC committee concerned equity as it applied to awards. Creating inclusive experiences for co-op students was also low on the priority list. Some respondents did not answer every item, and their answers are not included in Table 1 as the averages that included their responses were generally similar. However, when responses from those who did not answer all the DEI questions were averaged in, supports like mentoring and affinity groups seemed to be lower priority. This could have resulted from some individuals skipping DEIB questions in favor of questions related to advancement or benefits. In addition, when answers from incomplete surveys were excluded, review processes for administrators were a lower priority. It should be noted that a few respondents expressed elsewhere that they were confused by the wording of this first question. Also of note, all the items were rated as ‘low priority’ on Average.

How would you prioritize the following according to your level of concern in terms of Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Belonging (DEIB) at Northeastern (1=not a priority, 2=low priority, 3=medium priority, 4=high priority)	Average score for complete surveys
Student Recruitment/Admissions	2.95
Diverse and Inclusive Curriculum	2.94
Administrators review process	2.92
Campus climate in terms of Diversity, Equity, Inclusion and Belonging	2.89
Retention	2.84
Pay	2.79
Inclusion/Accommodation	2.75
Raises/Promotions	2.70
Hiring Process	2.56
Awards	2.52
Creating inclusive and supportive experiences for Co-op students	2.44
Supports (e.g., mentoring and affinity groups)	2.21

Table 1: Results from Question 1, Fall Survey

Question 2 asks respondents to rank each item based on the effectiveness of each initiative. The results (shown in Table 2) indicate that faculty value CATLR courses and workshops, affinity groups, unit-level action plans, and school/college level action plans. Conversely, the calculations showed the least amount of support for the Calypso newsletter from the Office of Belonging (formerly ODEI). Mandatory DEI training had an average of 1.88, indicating a low level of enthusiasm for this type of training. Optional workshops from the ODEI/Provost's Office received more support, with an average of 2.02, and CATLR courses/workshops were tied with affinity groups as being the most effective, with an average of 2.33. Having a newsletter to communicate awards and a designated person to oversee awards were both seen as ineffective.

Table 2: Results from Question 2, Fall Survey

Please rate the effectiveness of the following Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Belonging (DEIB) initiatives at Northeastern University (1=not effective, 2=somewhat effective, 3=effective, 4=very effective)	Average score for complete surveys
CATLR courses/workshops	2.33
Affinity Groups	2.33
Unit-level Action Plans	2.21
School/College-level Action Plans	2.14
Optional Workshops from ODEI/Provost Office	2.02
Designated person in the Provost's Office to oversee awards	1.95
Creation of a newsletter to communicate awards information to the university	1.95
Mandatory Diversity Equity and Inclusion (DEI) training	1.88

Question 3 asks what faculty would like to see going forward. As in Question 1, the results in Table 3 show that factors surrounding compensation and promotion are high on the list of what should be supported. For this question, the highest scores were centered around transparency with respect to the tenure and promotion process, the merit review process, and on pay gaps across demographic groups. This call for transparency is notable since last year's charges uncovered a large well of concern about pay equity. This prompted a Faculty Salary Survey that showed evidence of some gender-based pay gaps. Information from the administration has, so far, been difficult to obtain. Besides transparency, faculty also showed support for expanding accessibility for disabled faculty/staff/students and having a wide pool of applicants for hires.

Table 3: Results from Question 3, Fall Survey

Please rank the following according to the level of support you would like to see the university provide for the following DEIB practices going forward (1=no support, 2=low support, 3=medium support, 4=high support)	Average score for complete surveys
Transparency around the tenure and promotion review process	3.60
Transparency around the merit review process	3.59
Transparent reporting on gaps in pay across demographic groups	3.52
Pay equity data collection and analysis by demographic groups	3.51
Expanding accessibility for disabled faculty/staff/students	3.47
Consistent process for merit raises across the university	3.39
Consistent process for promotions across the university	3.37
Wide applicant pools for hiring	3.33
Clarity and transparency around the administrator review process	3.23
Increased faculty and staff input in the administrator review process	3.22
Inclusive language in job ads	3.2
Measures to increase and support the diversity of the student body	3.18
Mentoring	3.17
Demographic data collection and analysis for departing employees	2.97
Exit interviews	2.92
Expanded work benefits (Please describe in the next question)	2.81
Data collection and analysis on awards, by demographic groups	2.80
Data analysis of climate survey results by demographic groups	2.77
Creation of a Guide for Accessing DEI Data across the University	2.71
Climate Assessment (climate survey, focus groups)	2.66
Centralized posting of DEI Action Plans, easily accessible to all	2.65
Expanded affinity groups	2.61
Additional guidance on writing Action Plans (including standardized definitions of DEI terminology)	2.50
Optional Workshops and Training	2.44
Mandatory Training	2.16
Appointment of a new Vice Provost for Faculty Diversity	2.07

The least supported idea was the idea of hiring a new Vice Provost for Faculty Diversity. Comments in the open-ended questions conveyed the opinion that the administration is already too large of a group. Other ideas with low support were mandatory training and optional workshops and training. This is rather disappointing and may point to a need for redesigned training or different professional development formats. The low support for optional workshops seems at odds with our results for Question 2 that indicate that faculty believe these to be highly effective. It may be that those who attend find them effective, and those who have not attended don't see the benefits and therefore have little interest in supporting this area.

Open-response analysis

The open responses for each of the questions were summarized using ChatGPT and the prompt, "Provide the most prominent themes in these open responses to the question..." followed by the question text. The themes were verified by examining the text for key words. These themes are presented in Table 4. As seen in the numerical answers, pay equity and equal opportunities in hiring and retention are common across the questions.

Table 4: Main themes from open-ended questions on Fall Survey.

Question 1: Please describe any other concerns you have around Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Belonging (DEIB), and/or elaborate on the options that were listed above.	Question 2: Please elaborate on any comments or concerns about any Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Belonging (DEIB) initiatives the university has undertaken.	Question 3: Please describe any other Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Belonging (DEIB) practices you would like to see on campus, and/or elaborate on the options that were listed above.
Perception of Performative Efforts	Perceived Lack of Impact	Administrative Concerns
Campus Climate and Leadership	Focus and Scope of DEIB Initiatives	Funding and Resources
Concerns About Implementation	Communication and Awareness	Pay Equity
Cultural and Political Challenges	Faculty Hiring and Retention	Recruitment and Retention
Equity in Pay and Opportunities	Mandatory Training Criticism	Mentorship and Training
Faculty Feedback and Concerns	Administrative Challenges	Academic and Structural Suggestions
Inadequate Support and Representation	Student-Related Concerns	Student-Focused Suggestions
Intersectionality and Broader Inclusion	Broader Cultural Issues	General Frustrations and Recommendations
Student-Related Issues		

The quotes below show a range of reactions to the questions. One person had specific wants in addition to asking questions about pay equity:

“Restore benefits (ie: Care.com benefits) and review parking to make it more affordable to travel to campus, and equalize pay (if this is a primarily teaching institution, why are teaching professors paid significantly less than their TT peers?)”

Other respondents were very clear that pay should start equal and change based on experience and support of students:

“I would like to see equal starting pay across the university according to years of experience in the field of study coupled with years of instructional experience in higher education. Many well-paid employees of this university are not supporting student learning. Many poorly paid employees of this university are student facing and engaged but not recognized.”

Others were much more concise about their concerns:

“I am concerned about gender and race pay equity.”

In general, complaints about pay inequities are concerned with gender, race, and role-based gaps. Role-based pay disparities are particularly noticed between NTT and TT faculty, with NTT faculty being perceived as second-class citizens and provided with less support. The perception of pay inequity is also coupled with a desire for thoughtfully handled increases in transparency in pay and benefits. Faculty are also frustrated with centralized hiring processes which are perceived as undermining department autonomy. Many comments decried the persistent underrepresentation of faculty and students from marginalized backgrounds, particularly in the wake of the Supreme Court decision on affirmative action. Faculty would like to go beyond surface-level initiatives and move toward mentorship programs and other retention efforts.

A theme that overlapped with several other themes was that DEIB work was seen as performative and lacked real impact. There was strong resistance to creating additional DEIB-related administrative roles, with respondents recommending direct investments in people and programs that promote belonging. Direct support for faculty, staff, and students could be paid for by reallocating funds from administrative hires. These administrative roles were seen as symbolic, bureaucratic, and lacking in accountability. A repeated theme was that the existing initiatives lack tangible impact on deeper systemic problems. The efforts are seen as surface-level only which can lead to backlash against programs, workshops, and the ideas they are attempting to put forward. Three representative quotes are given here:

“Nothing is bad, but a lot of these initiatives end up "preaching to the choir" or addressing DEI at a very superficial level (which has been shown to not work, and sometimes even backfire)”

“Please no more VPs or VCs. We are drowning in heavy titles. We need doers. We need to educate and empower doers. Top-down monitoring with a VP for diversity will not work.”

“DEIB can seem like an asymmetrical or performative gesture that is not an holistic institutional praxis, it emerges when it is convenient.”

Spring Faculty Survey

Based on the results of the Fall survey, the committee developed additional questions for the Spring survey to probe more deeply into what faculty members wanted to see in terms of DEIB activities. The questions are listed in Appendix B. These questions were more open-ended, asking faculty members what a more transparent and diverse campus looks like and what initiatives or activities they would like to see. Additionally, they were asked how the recent prohibitions on DEI work and research affected them.

After the demographic questions, the survey asked respondents to rate the Northeastern administration's response to recent executive orders. This was rated on a five-point scale where 1 = very unsatisfactory and 5 = very satisfactory. The average numerical response was 2.22, which is categorized as unsatisfactory. Two open-ended follow-up questions probed additional comments on the administration's response and what respondents would have liked the response to be. The main themes of the responses to these questions are shown side by side in Table 5 below. The open-ended responses to the first of these questions were generally negative. The response from the administration was seen as weak and poorly communicated. The sudden DEI rebranding led to poor morale and a lack of trust in the leadership. While some people did feel that the university had to act strategically, others now worry about whether the university will continue to support underrepresented groups. Based on the answers to the second question, respondents wanted the university to stand up to the administration in collaboration with other universities. They wanted the university to reject premature compliance with the executive orders and to be more transparent about the changes they were making. They want more visible support for the most vulnerable of the campus community. The sense is that the university needs to do more than just say they will continue to support DEI – they also need to find a way to demonstrate it. The faculty also wants the university to come out with a strong statement of support for academic freedom and to renew its commitment to shared governance. Finally, another five-point scale question asked, "How would you rate your department/unit's response to recent executive orders?" The average for this question was 3.25 - slightly higher than neutral. Overall, there was more satisfaction with the response of the individual units than with the response of the university.

Table 5: Main themes from follow-up questions to Question 1 on Spring Survey.
(Themes are listed in order of prevalence.)

How would you rate the Northeastern administration's response to recent executive orders?	
Do you have any additional comments about the administration's response?	What would you like the administration's response to be?
1. Perceived Weakness and Preemptive Compliance	1. Stronger, More Defiant Response
2. Concerns About Transparency and Communication	2. Transparency and Communication
3. Frustration Over DEI Retraction and Rebranding	3. Support for Faculty, Staff, and Students
4. Divided Opinions on Strategy	4. Opposition to Preemptive Compliance
5. Negative Impact on Morale and Institutional Trust	5. Collaboration and Advocacy

6. Desire for Stronger Leadership and Advocacy	6. Balancing Strategy and Resistance
7. Uncertainty About Future Actions and Implications	7. Institutional Values and Integrity
	8. Academic Freedom and Governance

The next two questions sought faculty input on the effect of recent executive orders on their personal research and teaching. The first question asked, “To what extent have you been affected by the recent executive orders?” This was also a Likert scale where 5 equals ‘extensively’. 4 equals ‘very much’, 3 equals ‘somewhat’, 2 equals ‘a little’, and 1 equals ‘not at all’. The average score was 2.99, which is close to ‘somewhat’. Although the average was in the center, there was a range of effects. The next question was an open-response question which asked, “If you have been affected by these orders, explain how.” The main themes included:

1. Research and Grant Funding Disruptions
2. Budget Cuts and Hiring Freezes
3. Low Morale and Mental Health Impact
4. Impacts on Teaching and Curriculum
5. Co-op and Career Disruptions
6. Administrative Challenges and Institutional Response
7. Concerns for Student and Faculty Safety
8. International and Immigration-Related Issues

Many respondents report delays or cancellations of NSF, NIH, and DOE grants and some researchers have had grants placed on hold or withdrawn. There is fear that any future funding related to inclusive STEM education, DEI, social justice, and other related topics will be difficult to get funding for. Concerns about the loss of postdoctoral positions and research assistantships are also voiced. Faculty and staff are experiencing hiring freezes which leads to increasing workloads – this also affects co-op programs. Many respondents are in emotional distress and are feeling discouraged, alienated, and uncertain about their future employment. Marginalized groups such as LGBTQ+, BIPOC, and immigrants in the campus community are afraid and need support. There is already a ‘chilling effect’ in the classroom and people are afraid of repercussions for teaching and discussing social justice and DEI topics. Employers are not offering as many co-op opportunities leading to students struggling to find co-ops and post-graduation jobs. There seems to be more frustration and less transparency – some of which stems from the initial response of the administration.

The next question asked respondents, “What is your biggest concern about the interaction between higher education and the current executive orders?” This was an open-ended response with the following themes identified:

1. Financial Instability and Funding Cuts
2. Loss of Academic Freedom and Censorship
3. University Compliance and Leadership Response
4. Impact on International and Marginalized Students
5. Erosion of Higher Education’s Role in Society
6. Chilling Effect on Research and Teaching
7. Lack of Collective Action and Resistance

Many of these themes were like those noted in questions about the desired response from the administration. Financial instability in higher education in general is under threat and specific grant-funded research is being disrupted. Concerns about the safety of students and faculty, particularly international students and faculty, are noted in multiple responses. Several responses called for collective action, which would be key in protecting the safety of the community members, defending academic freedom and free speech, guarding against the chilling effects on teaching and research, and preventing the erosion of higher education's role in society. In the fall survey, many faculty members expressed a high level of support for pay equity data collection and analysis by demographic groups. Before that, the 2023-2024 IDC committee also found that pay equity across genders/races/roles was a very high priority. The previous committee also found there were many roadblocks to getting the appropriate data. To gauge faculty sentiment the next question asked, "Do you have any specific suggestions on how this could be accomplished in the current climate?" The ideas gathered had the following themes:

1. Transparency and Access to Existing Data
2. Strategic Framing and Compliance
3. Data Collection Methods
4. Resistance to Compliance with Federal Orders
5. Equity Beyond Salary: Addressing Faculty Disparities
6. University Budget Priorities
7. Concerns About Political and Institutional Resistance

One quote expresses some key sentiments:

"No, but I'd love to hear more discussion about this INCLUDING most importantly: if we can't make progress, then we need to say that and talk about why. We should not obscure the "we don't know" or "we can't do anything" because it feels like the university as an employer is trying to protect someone or something that IS NOT the employees and the students here (Eg. political standing)"

Another representative quote is:

"Northeastern has less transparency about average faculty salaries even compared to other local private universities. Publicly available information about average salaries would help keep NU competitive, which would in turn help current faculty feel secure and attract new hires."

The ideas produced by this survey could be the basis for a rich discussion about these matters. Based on the fall survey, the next two questions asked respondents for their ideas about increasing transparency around the promotion and tenure process and the merit review process. The main themes of these two questions are compared in Table 6. The top theme in both cases was the need for clarity, standardization, and guidelines. Although the question asked for ideas to increase transparency, that concept appeared in six of the themes. Data collection, data sharing, and communication in general were important to many for creating a more transparent process. Faculty also want consistency across departments and alignment between merit and workload/effort. Additionally, faculty want to be involved in all aspects of designing and repairing the current process.

Table 6: Main themes about increasing transparency in the promotion, tenure, and merit review processes.

What are your suggestions for increasing transparency about...	
...the promotion and tenure process?	...the merit review process?
Clear and Accessible Guidelines	Clear and Standardized Evaluation Criteria
Open Communication and Regular Feedback	Transparency in Merit Outcomes and Pay Adjustments
Standardized and Consistent Evaluation Criteria	Separating Cost-of-Living Adjustments from Merit Raises
Transparency in Decision-Making and Outcomes	Consistency Across Colleges and Departments
Faculty Involvement in the Process	Workload and Merit Alignment
Data Collection and Public Sharing	Faculty Input and Oversight
Streamlining and Simplifying the Process	Time and Effort vs. Small Merit Increases
Protection Against Bias and Inequity	Need for Individualized and Written Feedback
Transparency in Post-Tenure Expectations	Addressing Bias and Fairness Concerns
	Administrative Transparency and Communication
	Calls for Full Salary Transparency

The final question built on the fall survey where the faculty expressed a high level of support for having wide applicant pools for hiring. The Spring survey asked, “Do you have any suggestions for expanding the applicant pools for Northeastern University hiring?” The main themes in the responses were:

1. Broader and More Strategic Job Advertising
2. More Inclusive and Flexible Hiring Practices
3. Competitive Salaries and Benefits
4. Proactive Recruitment Efforts
5. Streamlining the Hiring Process
6. Retention and Faculty Support
7. Strengthening Diversity and Inclusion Efforts
8. Institutional Marketing and Outreach

Many good suggestions came from this question, as illustrated by the following quotes. The third quote below was a comprehensive, well-described plan to widen the searches.

“Recruit from extremely varied professional associations, cultural groups, job boards, social media, publications and institutions. Track what types of candidates come from different sources.”

“I think we need to lower the barriers to entry. Streamline the process and make decisions over the course of weeks and not months or many months. If the ease and competence of the NEU hiring process becomes well known then the applicant pool will follow.”

“Expanding applicant pools for hiring at Northeastern University requires intentional outreach, broader advertising strategies, and clear communication about the university’s commitment to attracting a wide range of talent. One effective approach involves actively advertising open positions beyond the traditional academic job boards, reaching professional associations, affinity groups, and networks that specifically serve underrepresented scholars and professionals. Partnering with doctoral programs at a diverse set of institutions, including Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), Hispanic-Serving Institutions (HSIs), and tribal colleges, could also expand the pipeline of potential applicants. Faculty search committees should be trained on strategies for proactive recruitment, encouraging them to personally invite qualified candidates from their professional networks to apply. Additionally, refining position descriptions to emphasize Northeastern’s interest in diverse perspectives, interdisciplinary work, and innovative research could attract applicants who might not otherwise consider the university. Finally, developing a database of promising candidates from previous searches, conference networking, and internal recommendations would allow the university to cultivate long-term relationships with potential applicants, rather than relying solely on reactive recruitment during active searches.”

The ideas collected from the faculty could be the basis for a strong and effective solution.

Recommendations

Based on the Fall and Spring Survey data, these recommendations are presented:

1. The administration should present concrete ideas and plans to support and advocate for BIPOC and LGBTQ+ individuals, international faculty/staff/students, DEI research, and research funding in general. This should be done soon, and as publicly as possible, to demonstrate commitment to the campus community.
2. Recent discussions on academic freedom should continue, and the chilling effect that the current Federal administration is having on teaching and research should be addressed.
3. Faculty should be informed via email whenever a major change has been made to the FAQ on “Navigating a New Political Landscape.”
4. The Senate ad hoc committee devoted to addressing equity issues in pay should consider ways to document, standardize, and communicate promotion and merit processes. Merit processes should connect raises to workload and effort.
5. The Office of Belonging, together with CATLR and ADVANCE, should develop inclusive mentoring programs for underrepresented faculty – TT and NTT – to promote retention and build community.
6. Workshops and training sessions in inclusive teaching and other DEI topics should be practical and interactive, to allow faculty to fully engage in the material rather than completing an online training in a superficial manner.

7. The administration should increase resources for recruitment, retention, and support of diverse populations, by promoting wide applicant pools, mentoring, affinity groups, and accessibility for disabled faculty, staff, and students.

Resolution

Be it resolved that the administration follows the proposed recommendations.

Respectfully submitted,

Bridget M. Smyser, Chair
Veronica Godoy-Carter, co-Chair
Lorien Rice
Jennifer Cassano
A C Goldberg
Ted Landsmark-SAC Liaison

APPENDIX A: FALL FACULTY SURVEY QUESTIONS

1. How would you prioritize the following according to your level of concern in terms of Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Belonging (DEIB) at Northeastern (1=not a priority, 2=low priority, 3=medium priority, 4=high priority):
 - a. Hiring Process
 - b. Pay
 - c. Raises/Promotions
 - d. Inclusion/Accommodation
 - e. Awards
 - f. Retention
 - g. Supports (e.g., mentoring and affinity groups)
 - h. Student Recruitment/Admissions
 - i. Diverse and Inclusive Curriculum
 - j. Campus Climate
 - k. Administrator's review process
 - l. Community Engagement
 - m. Other (please describe in the next question)
2. Please describe any other concerns you have around Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Belonging, and/or elaborate on the options that were listed above.
3. Please rank the following according to the level of success/usefulness of the following Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Belonging initiatives that have been implemented (1=not useful, 2=low usefulness, 3=medium usefulness, 4=high usefulness):
 - a. Designated person in the Provost's Office to oversee awards
 - b. Creation of a newsletter to communicate awards information to the university
 - c. Mandatory ODEI training
 - d. Optional Workshops from ODEI/Provost Office
 - e. CATLR courses/workshops
 - f. Calypso newsletter from ODEI
 - g. School-level Action Plans
 - h. Unit-level Action Plans
 - i. Affinity Groups
4. Please elaborate on any comments or concerns about any Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Belonging (DEIB) initiatives the university has undertaken.
5. Please rank the following according to the level of support you would like to see the university provide for the following DEIB practices going forward (1=no support, 2=low support, 3=medium support, 4=high support):
 - a. Expanding accessibility for disabled faculty/staff/students
 - b. Wide applicant pools for hiring
 - c. Inclusive language in job ads
 - d. Pay equity data collection and analysis by demographic groups
 - e. Transparent reporting on gaps in pay across demographic groups
 - f. Transparency around the merit review process
 - g. Consistent process for merit raises across the university

- h. Transparency around the tenure and promotion review process
- i. Consistent process for promotions across the university
- j. Data collection and analysis on awards, by demographic groups
- k. Expanded work benefits (Please describe in the next question)
- l. Exit interviews
- m. Demographic data collection and analysis for departing employees
- n. Mentoring
- o. Expanded affinity groups
- p. Mandatory Training
- q. Optional Workshops and Training
- r. Climate Assessment (climate survey, focus groups)
- s. Data analysis of climate survey results by demographic groups
- t. Clarity and transparency around the administrator review process
- u. Increased faculty and staff input in the administrator review process
- v. Measures to increase and support the diversity of the student body
- w. Additional guidance on writing Action Plans (including standardized definitions of Diversity Equity and Inclusion (DEI) terminology)
- x. Centralized posting of DEI Action Plans, easily accessible to all
- y. Guide for accessing DEI Data across the University
- z. Appointment of a new Vice Provost for Faculty Diversity
- aa. Other (please describe in the next question)

Q6) Please describe any other Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Belonging practices you would like to see on campus, and/or elaborate on the options that were listed above.

APPENDIX B: SPRING SURVEY QUESTIONS

Spring Survey questions from the Inclusion and Diversity Committee.

1. How would you rate the Northeastern administration's response to recent executive orders. **(Likert scale: 5 equals very satisfactory. 1 equals very unsatisfactory)**
2. Do you have any additional comments about the administration's response? **(Open Response)**
3. What would you like the administration's response to be? **(Open Response)**
4. How would you rate your department/unit's response to recent executive orders? **(Likert scale: 5 equals very satisfactory. 1 equals very unsatisfactory)**
5. To what extent have you been affected by the recent executive orders? **(Likert scale: 5 equals 'extensively'. 4 equals 'very much', 3 equals 'somewhat', 2 equals 'a little', 1 equals 'not at all'.)**
6. If you have been affected by these orders, explain how. **(Open Response)**
7. What is your biggest concern about the interaction between higher education and the current executive orders? **(Open Response)**
8. In the fall survey, many faculty members expressed a high level of support for pay equity data collection and analysis by demographic groups. Do you have any specific suggestions on how this could be accomplished in the current climate? **(Open Response)**
9. In the fall survey, many faculty members also expressed a high level of support for transparency around the promotion and tenure process. What are your suggestions for increasing transparency about this process? **(Open Response)**
10. In the fall survey, the faculty also indicated a high level of support for transparency around merit review process. What are your suggestions for increasing transparency with respect to merit reviews? **(Open Response)**
11. In the fall survey, the faculty expressed a high level of support for having wide applicant pools for hiring. Do you have any suggestions for expanding the applicant pools for Northeastern University hiring? **(Open Response)**

APPENDIX C: Key Terms for Action Plans

Introduction

Diversity, Equity, Inclusion are central to creating an equitable and inclusive campus community. However, the interpretation and use of these terms can vary across different individuals, groups, and campuses. To foster a shared understanding and promote effective initiatives, it is crucial to establish clear and consistent definitions for key terms.

Rationale

The rationale for creating this document is as follows:

- Clear Communication:
 - o Standardized definitions may help to facilitate clear communication among faculty, staff, and students.
- Consistent Implementation:
 - o A shared understanding of key DEI terms ensures consistency in the development and implementation of DEI initiatives.
- Impact on Data-Driven Decisions:
 - o Standardized definitions may help to enable the collection and analysis of data to measure progress and inform future strategies.
- Potential for Enhanced Collaboration:
 - o Standardized language may help to promote collaboration and partnership among different departments and units.

Key Terms

Accessibility:

The “ability to access” the functionality of a system or entity and gain the related benefits; the degree to which a product, service, or environment is accessible by as many people as possible [1, 2].

Affinity groups:

Groups of people who share common identities, backgrounds, or interests within an organization, and meet regularly to engage in activities or discussions; affinity groups aim to foster a sense of belonging, provide support, and promote inclusivity [3].

Ally:

Someone who supports a group other than one’s own (in terms of multiple identities such as race, gender, age, ethnicity, sexual orientation, religion, etc.); an ally acknowledges oppression and actively commits to reducing their own complicity, investing in strengthening their own knowledge and awareness of oppression [1, 4].

Anti-Racism:

Any idea that suggests that racial groups are equals in all their apparent differences – that there is nothing right or wrong with any racial group [1, 5].

Belonging:

Everyone is treated and feels like a full member of the larger community, and can thrive [1, 2].

Bias:

Prejudice in favor of or against one thing, person, or group compared with another, usually in an unfair or negative way [1, 2].

BIPOC

Black, Indigenous, [and] People of Color; this term is used to center the experiences of Black, Indigenous, and communities of color [1, 5].

Cisgender

A person whose gender identity corresponds with the sex the person had or was identified as having at birth. For example, a person identified as female at birth who identifies as a woman can be said to be a cisgender woman [1, 2].

Cultural literacy

The ability to understand and appreciate the customs, values, and beliefs of different cultures, as well as the ability to effectively communicate and interact with people from diverse backgrounds [6].

D.A.C.A.

Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals; an American immigration policy that allows some individuals who were brought to the United States without inspection as children to receive a renewable two-year period of deferred action from deportation and become eligible for a work permit in the U.S. [1, 9].

Deaf

Used to describe a person with total or profound hearing loss.

Note: Many only have mild or partial loss of hearing. Use person with hearing loss, partially deaf, or hearing impaired for individuals with partial loss of hearing [1, 9].

Diversity

The wide range of identities people possess. It broadly includes race, ethnicity, gender, age, national origin, religion, disability, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, education, marital status, language, veteran status, physical appearance, etc.; different ideas, perspectives and values [1, 4].

Discrimination

The unequal treatment of members of various groups, based on conscious or unconscious prejudice, which favors one group over others on differences of race, gender, economic class, sexual orientation, physical ability, religion, language, age, national identity, religion and other categories [1, 4].

Equality

Equality is the condition under which every individual is treated in the same way, and is granted same rights and responsibilities, regardless of their individual differences [6, 7].

Equity

- i) The fair treatment, access, opportunity and advancement for all people, while at the same time striving to identify and eliminate barriers that prevent the full participation of some groups [4].
- ii) Resources are distributed based on the tailored needs of a specific audience. Equity recognizes that some communities will need more—or different—access compared to other communities [1].

Ethnicity

A socially or politically constructed group based on cultural criteria, such as language, customs, and shared history [1, 8].

Gender Identity

A person's internal understanding and perception of their gender; this understanding can be aligned with the social conditioning around their assigned sex at birth — what's known as being cisgender — or it can be different from the social conditioning around their assigned sex at birth, which can encompass identities that are considered nonbinary, transgender, trans, gender nonconforming, or others [1, 5].

Gender-Neutral or Gender-Inclusive

Inclusive language to describe relationships (spouse and partner instead of husband/boyfriend and wife/girlfriend), spaces (gender-neutral/inclusive restrooms are for use by all genders), pronouns (they and ze are gender neutral/inclusive pronouns) among other things [1, 9].

Gender Nonconforming or Gender Non-binary

A way of identifying and/or expressing oneself outside the binary gender categories of male/masculine and female/feminine [1, 2].

Implicit Bias (or Unconscious Bias)

Attitudes and stereotypes that influence judgment, decision-making, and behavior in ways that are outside of conscious awareness and/or control [1, 2].

Inclusion

The act or practice of behaviors and social norms that ensure people feel welcome. In the workplace, inclusion is the achievement of a work environment in which all individuals are treated fairly and respectfully, have equal access to opportunities and resources, and can contribute fully to the organization's success [1].

Inclusive Language

Refers to non-sexist language or language that "includes" all persons in its references. For example, "a writer needs to proofread his work" excludes females due to the masculine reference of the pronoun. Likewise, "a nurse must disinfect her hands" is exclusive of males and stereotypes nurses as females [1, 9].

Intersectionality

The complex, cumulative way in which the effects of multiple forms of discrimination (such as racism, sexism, and classism) combine, overlap, or intersect, and their multiple effects on the same individuals or groups; also refers to the view that overlapping and interdependent systems of discrimination and inequality can more effectively be addressed together [1, 2].

Land Acknowledgment

Recognizing the traditional indigenous inhabitants of the land, a practice important in respecting historical truths and indigenous cultures [6].

Microaffirmation

A microaffirmation is a small gesture of inclusion, caring or kindness. They include listening, providing comfort and support, being an ally and explicitly valuing the contributions and presence of all. It is particularly helpful for those with greater power or seniority to "model" affirming behavior [1, 2].

Microaggression

A comment or action that unconsciously or unintentionally expresses or reveals a prejudiced attitude toward a member of a marginalized group, such as a racial minority. These small, common occurrences include insults, slights, stereotyping, undermining, devaluing,

delegitimizing, overlooking or excluding someone. Over time, microaggressions can isolate and alienate those on the receiving end, and affect their health and wellbeing [1, 2].

Neurodiversity

The awareness that every person's brain operates differently. Neurodiversity encourages people to recognize that everyone may have different methods of learning or remembering information, as well as different ways of processing information and socially interacting with others.

Examples of neurodiverse identities include, but are not limited to, people who identify as experiencing autism, ADHD, ADD, dyspraxia, dyslexia, sensory-processing sensitivity, and Tourette's Syndrome [1, 5].

Pronouns

Words to refer to a person after initially using their name. Because many personal pronouns have gender (e.g., she, her), people generally like others to use pronouns that match their gender. In addition to "she/her," personal pronouns include "he/him" and gender-neutral pronouns, such as "ze/hir" or "they/them." Some people use specific pronouns, any pronouns, or none at all. Some people state their pronoun preferences as a form of allyship [1, 2].

Racism

An umbrella term for individual, institutional, and systemic forms of racial prejudice. Any idea that suggests one racial group is inferior or superior to another racial group in any way. Other definitions include the idea that racism is the result of racial prejudice plus institutional power [1, 5].

Social Justice

A form of activism, based on principles of equity and inclusion that encompasses a vision of society in which the distribution of resources is equitable and all members are physically and psychologically safe and secure; social justice involves social actors who have a sense of their own agency as well as a sense of social responsibility toward and with others [1, 4].

Structural Inequality

Systemic disadvantage(s) of one social group compared to other groups, rooted and perpetuated through discriminatory practices (conscious or unconscious) that are reinforced through institutions, ideologies, representations, policies/laws and practices. When this kind of inequality is related to racial/ethnic discrimination, it is referred to as systemic or structural racism [1, 4].

Undocumented

A foreign-born person living in a country without legal citizenship status [1].

Undocumented Student

School-aged immigrants who entered the United States without inspection/overstayed their visas and are present in the United States with or without their parents. They face unique legal uncertainties and limitations within the United States educational system [1, 9].

Universal Design

Ensures that an environment can be accessed, understood, and used to the greatest extent possible by all people [1, 2].

White Privilege

The unfair societal advantages that white people have over non-white people. It is something that is pervasive throughout society and exists in all of the major systems and institutions that operate in society, as well as on an interpersonal level [1, 8].

Ze

Gender neutral pronouns that can be used instead of he/she [1, 9].

Zir

Gender neutral pronouns that can be used instead of his/her [1, 9].

References

1. Northeastern University - Belonging Glossary & Allyship Resources: <https://nuplace.northeastern.edu/services/belonging-glossary-allyship-resources/>
2. Harvard University - Glossary of Diversity, Inclusion and Belonging (DIB) Terms: https://edib.harvard.edu/files/dib/files/dib_glossary.pdf
3. Princeton University - The Proven Impact of Affinity Spaces: <https://rrapp.spia.princeton.edu/how-to-guide/the-proven-impact-of-affinity-spaces/>
4. University of Washington (College of the Environment) - Glossary of Terms: <https://environment.uw.edu/about/inclusive-excellence-office/inclusion-resources/glossary-of-terms/>
5. Cornell University - DEI Glossary: <https://hr.cornell.edu/culture/inclusion-belonging/learning-and-development/dei-glossary>
6. Oxford Review DEI (Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion) Dictionary: <https://oxford-review.com/the-oxford-review-dei-diversity-equity-and-inclusion-dictionary/#1-b>
7. University of Washington (School of Public Health) - Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Glossary of Terms: https://epi.washington.edu/sites/default/files/website_documents/DEI%20Glossary_Formatted_20190711.pdf

8. University of Washington (Foster School of Business) - Inclusion and Belonging Glossary <https://foster.uw.edu/about-foster-school/fostering-diversity/dei-glossary/>
9. University of Pittsburgh - Glossary of Terms:
<https://www.diversity.pitt.edu/education/glossary-terms>