



University Council on Equity, Inclusion and Intercultural Awareness

Annual Report
Academic Year 2017-2018

Contents

Introduction

Council EIIA Membership 2017-2018

Council EIIA Advocacy & Accomplishments

- Student Involvement
- Strategic Planning Committee
- Campus Climate Committee
- Recruitment & Retention Committee
- Global Awareness & Connections
- Collaborative Work Groups:
 - BIAS Team
 - Undocumented Community Support Coalition
 - Communications

Summary of Recommendations

- Campus Climate Committee
- Intercultural Intelligence, Pedagogies & Curriculum

Addendums

- Committee Reports
- Fair Chance Hiring Notice

Introduction

Diversity is a core value at Gonzaga University. The values of inclusion, equity, and intercultural awareness deepens and enriches our academic goals for educational excellence in the Jesuit intellectual tradition that animates Catholic social teaching. Gonzaga University aspires to create and sustain an inclusive learning, living and working environment that invites our students, staff, and faculty to learn and grow from one another's cultural experiences. Our learning community recognizes the challenges and opportunities inherent in the complexity of similarities and differences among individuals or between groups that encompass, but are not limited to race, color, ethnicity, national origin, gender identity and expression, sex, age, religious belief, language, sexual orientation, political ideology, veteran status, and physical and mental ability. In order to optimize these challenges and opportunities as strategic pathways for systemic improvement we must be intentional, communicative and accountable. The following report represents an annual review of the Council on Equity, Inclusion and Intercultural Awareness work addressing the areas of advocacy, accomplishments and recommendations.

In accordance with the Council's By-Laws as stipulated under Article VI: Frequency of Meetings and Procedural Protocols, Section 4, the Council shall issue an annual progress report. At the end of academic year 2017-2018, the Council Co-Chairs collected annual reports from each committee summarizing their advocacy issues, accomplishments and recommendations into this report. This is an executive summary of the 2017-2018 Annual Progress Report for the Council on Equity, Inclusion and Intercultural Awareness and is organized in two parts: (1) Council Advocacy and Accomplishments and (2) Summary of Recommendations. For additional information, following the main body of this report, each full committee report is provided in the Addendum.

2017-2018 ACADEMIC YEAR COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP

Laurie Arnold	Sean Joy	Daniel Rosales
Carla Bonilla	Carlo Juntilla	Janeen Steer
Rajah Bose	Joe Kinsella	Michael Tanaka
Amanda Braley	Ron Large	Julie Tibbs
Kari Elgee-Sanders	Molly Pepper	Jane Tiedt
Joan Iva Fawcett	Stephanie Plowman	Analuz Torres
Kem Gambrell	Chris Purviance	Marvin Tut
Jason Gilmer	Lacy Reyes	Jason Varnado
Heather Gores	Raymond Reyes	Linda Wilson
Tianna Helm	Rickel Karen	Hikaru Yamaguchi
Jose Hernandez		Yanping Zhang

2017-2018 COUNCIL COLLABORATIVE PARTNERS

Abbie Altamirano	Jordan Cotton	Ricardo Ortega
Trish, Alvaro	Monica Elenes	Gutierrez Salvador
Jeffrey Brogan	Victoria Elleby	Athena Sok
Loren Carrillo	Ronnie Estoque	Nhan Ta
Rafael Castellanos-Welch	Salvador Gutierrez	Lashantay Walls
Amarani Chavez	Jaylun Hutchison	Zaria Winkfield
August Corpetts	Simeon Menso	Jaden Zwick

2017-2018 ACADEMIC YEAR COUNCIL CO-CHAIRS

Christine Purviance, Assistant Director Equity and Inclusion, Human Resources
Raymond Reyes, Associate Academic Vice President and Chief Diversity Officer

Advocacy & Accomplishments

STUDENT INVOLVEMENT

The Council membership consists of approximately one-third undergraduate and graduate student members. After a Students of Concern group actively engaged with campus leadership over the summer 2017, they were referred to the Council of Equity, Inclusion and Intercultural Awareness. This group of students became active and engaged with the Council as “Collaborative Partners,” throughout the 2017-2018 academic year, participating in monthly Council meetings and joining the standing committees and working groups. The Council finished its’ school year work by convening a consultation meeting with key student leaders from this group to assure ongoing student engagement and activism for next year. A perceived outcome from this Council consultation resulted in several returning students expressing an interest to continue working on institutional diversity issues in collaboration with the Council for AY 2018-2019.

STRATEGIC PLANNING, EVALUATION, & ACCOUNTABILITY COMMITTEE

The Strategic Planning, Evaluation, & Accountability Committee dedicated the 2017-2018 academic year to selecting and adopting an institutional diversity planning and assessment model, to more effectively inform the work of the Council for Equity, Inclusion, & Intercultural Awareness (EIIA) with a greater level of institutional accountability. As a result of this year-long evaluation and testing, the committee brought the following two recommendations to the Council EIIA for review and approval. These recommendations were approved and adopted by the Council EIIA and are ready to move to the next phase of customization and finalization before moving to the President and Cabinet.

Recommendation 1: To strategically guide the Council’s work, formally adopt and customize the New England Resource Center for Higher Education (NERCHE) Self-Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion in Higher Education developed by the College of Education and Human Development at the University of Massachusetts Boston.

- The Council adopted this model as a framework for planning and assessment of diversity and inclusion work at GU. The next steps will include evaluating the structure of the Council against this model and customizing the model for the Gonzaga University context, strategies and priorities.
- Once the NERCHE model has undergone the necessary editing in adaptive alignment to the university’s culture and way of proceeding, the Strategic Planning Committee will offer an orientation to the full Council for a clearer and consensus understanding of how we will operationalize the planning and assessment of institutional diversity work for the university community.

Recommendation 2: Create and adopt a common language with key terms for the Gonzaga community to cultivate a culture of healthy dialogue across human difference and improve intercultural communication. The Strategic Planning Committee identified, critically reviewed and defined the following key terms – diversity, inclusion, equity, and cultural fluency. Once reviewed, revised if necessary, and adopted by the Council, these key terms foundational for creating a common vocabulary for diversity will be finalized in a series of consultations with key campus stakeholders and constituency groups such as the Staff Assembly, Faculty Senate, GSBA, and Cabinet, for university-wide adoption and use within the community’s patterns of communication and discourse. See addendum for drafted definitions.

CAMPUS CLIMATE COMMITTEE

The Campus Climate Committee worked with Rankin & Associates and the President through the early fall semester to prepare for a series of presentations to various constituency groups designed to offer the entire university community an overview of the survey findings, conclusions and recommendations. These sessions were conducted on October 17-18, 2018 and the results were posted on the Gonzaga campus climate committee website for internal community members. Rankin & Associates provided survey debrief presentations to the campus climate committee, the President’s Cabinet and Council of Academic Deans, and two open community forums. After these initial community briefings, the committee organized and convened numerous consultation “listening” sessions to invite students, staff and faculty to offer their interpretative analysis and “meaning making” of the survey data as a step toward transforming the survey data results into recommendations for next action steps with accountability measures. These facilitated focus groups and discussion sessions were conducted from late October 23, 2017 to January 12, 2018.

From February 2018 through May 2018, the committee translated the feedback from the community consultation sessions into a list of recommendations. It is noteworthy to point out that throughout this process, the committee continued to engage in several open Q & A discussions and presentations with students, staff, faculty, and senior leadership for additional input and further refinement of the recommendations.

This full committee report delineates the final list of recommended action steps into two categories:

- 1) Recommendations approved by the Council to move forward to the President and Cabinet for review and consideration that may require the adoption of new policies, procedures, budget resources and/or other executive leadership authorization for referral to the appropriate department(s) for implementation.
- 2) Recommendations not requiring executive-level approval, and/or work that has already been initiated by programs and departments that address issues or needs identified as a result of the campus climate project. These recommendations may continue to need Council advocacy to monitor and assure complete implementation.

For more for information, please refer to the full Campus Climate Committee report that offers more details on the recommendations in the addendum section at the end of this report.

RECRUITMENT & RETENTION COMMITTEE

The Recruitment and Retention Committee focused their work on two areas for the academic year 2017-2018. First, the committee continued to support the approval and implementation of the Fair Chance Hiring initiative that was recommended in the 2016-2017 Council Annual Report. The initiative implementation plan was presented to the President's Cabinet for final approval in the Spring 2018 Semester with a May 1, 2018 implementation date. The committee members hosted two open information sessions for community members to learn more about this initiative and how the implementation will impact the university's recruiting and hiring process.

In their second major area of focus, the Recruitment and Retention Committee began researching and critically examining examples on the use of diversity statements and other advertising language for inclusion in all job postings. Several options designed to create a more culturally diverse applicant pool are currently under review, and the committee anticipates putting forward a final proposal during fall semester 2018.

GLOBAL AWARENESS & CONNECTIONS

The members of this committee evaluated why and how they may re-define their scope of work and its intended purpose. One theme did emerge from the discernment work of this committee, i.e., the need to focus on determining successful measures of best practices either internal or external to the university in the area of global awareness and engagement. A second theme identified by this committee is the need and benefits of recognizing and celebrating successful examples of departments and individuals building global awareness and connections at Gonzaga. For Academic Year 2018-2019, committee work will devote its attention to developing a plan to raise awareness about what is already in practice in this area.

COLLABORATIVE WORK GROUPS:

- ***BIAS Team***

The Bias Incident Assessment & Support (BIAS) Team was formed in the Fall Semester, 2017, with an informal linkage to the Council EIA as a collaborative partner.

The team consisted of 14 faculty and staff who accepted invitations to participate from Dr. Elisabeth Mermann-Jozwiak, Interim Academic Vice President, and Dr. Judi Biggs Garbuio, Vice President for Student Development with appointments for the 2017-2018 Academic Year with an opportunity to re-commit to serve for the 2018-2019 Academic Year. The BIAS Team is charged with:

- Supporting individuals and communities impacted by bias incidents and hate crimes
- Assessing and making recommendations on the impact of bias incidents and hate crimes to Gonzaga's overall campus climate.

The BIAS Team met bi-monthly during the academic year with one monthly meeting focused on setting group norms, reviewing bias reports, and training. The other meeting was dedicated to committee work with two committees under the BIAS team:

- (1) Campus Communication and Education Committee chaired by Joan Iva Fawcett
- (2) Bias Incident Policies and Procedures Committee chaired by Matt Lamsma.

The primary project for the Council's Campus Communication workgroup was developing a BIAS Team website, which will go live during the summer of 2018. The Policies and Procedures team worked on writing guidelines and a response process for submitted bias reports.

In addition to committee work, BIAS Team members responded to numerous reports received, actively supporting students, staff, and faculty, and educating the community on the impact of bias. Finally, the BIAS Team co-chairs met regularly with the co-chairs of the Council on Equity, Inclusion, and Intercultural Awareness and two representatives from the AVP Council of Deans, for consultative guidance on the implementation of BIAS reporting and response protocols in the academic division, and to keep academic leadership aware of the work of the BIAS team. Information related to the committee membership and reports received is included in the full report in the addendum.

- ***Undocumented Community Support Coalition (UCSC)***

Since its formation, the UCSC has focused efforts around the development of a contingency plan and the identification of resources for the possible expiration of DACA. In February 2018, the UCSC organized a campus call to action in support of the DREAM Act, creating opportunities for members of the community to contact their senators and congressional representative. The UCSC continues to explore how the Gonzaga community can best support those vulnerable in light of ongoing legal and political uncertainty in our national immigration policies. In collaboration with GSBA, the UCSC is studying the feasibility of establishing an endowed tuition scholarship for undocumented students.

- ***Communications***

The Communications Work Group was identified as a need early in fall 2017 semester by the Council EIIA to focus on the development of a Council EIIA website, and regular forms of communication from the Council EIIA to the community. A small workgroup of 5-6 staff, faculty, and students, met with a Marketing & Communications representative to first focus on and develop a Council EIIA website. The first draft of the website was ready by March 2018.

In the middle of March 2018, President McCulloh asked for consideration of a broader scope of a University diversity website. Dr. Reyes called together a broader group of individuals with staff from Marketing & Communications to create a new vision, under which the Council EIIA website would reside, as would other diversity related sites already in existence or under development (such as BIAS).

All three websites referenced in this annual report for the University, Council EIIA, and the BIAS team are under final revision with an anticipated launch by the time students and faculty return to campus in August 2018.

- New Diversity Website: www.gonzaga.edu/about/diversity-equity-inclusion
- Council Website: www.gonzaga.edu/about/diversity-equity-inclusion/ceia
- Bias Team Website www.gonzaga.edu/about/diversity-equity-inclusion/bias-team

Recommendations from the Council

CAMPUS CLIMATE COMMITTEE

These recommendations are items that members of the Council of Equity, Inclusion and Intercultural Awareness felt were too important to reduce and/or consolidate. Therefore, the Council elected to include the entire list of recommendations in this annual report as well as advocate for the implementation of the action steps articulated in the recommendations. The Council is suggesting approximate timeframes, which will need to be affirmed or modified by the department or program, charged with the responsibility to implement the recommendation. Additional items that were on the recommendations list from this body of work, but have already moved into the action stages are in the full Campus Climate Committee report in the addendums.

- 1) Recommend mandatory workforce development in intercultural communication skill development. There is an identified need for mandatory, comprehensive intercultural competency development opportunities for the entire GU workforce (staff and faculty). During fall 2018, the Council EIIA, in collaborative consultation with HR, CTA, and DICE, will research & recommend existing training programs to bring to campus with pilot testing workshops in spring 2019. By June 2019, select a program to bring to campus and work toward full implementation in 2019-2020. Responsible service provider and collaborators: HR, DICE, CTA, Institute for Hate Studies.
- 2) Recommend an expansion of employee appreciation/recognition in the area of inclusion & equity. Highlight and further develop staff & faculty appreciation efforts (Staff Kudos, Faculty Recognition, Innovation Awards, divisional and departmental recognition) by March 2019. An important first step will be to identify existing recognition award programs (e.g. title, purpose, sponsoring program, department, or division, intended constituency group, application/nomination process, monetary honorarium, etc.). The Council recommends the Campus Climate Committee consult with Staff Assembly, Faculty Senate, division and departmental leaders in early fall 2018 to create a list of prospective recognition programs.
- 3) Recommend establishing a comprehensive, inter-dependent system that links three primary change drivers for inclusive excellence in the workforce: professional development; performance evaluation that includes practices addressing inclusion, equity and intercultural fluency, and reappointment, tenure, rank and promotion for faculty; and promotion and recognition of exemplary accomplishments for staff. This recommendation involves changing existing processes like course evaluations, RPT factors, and staff evaluations by fall 2019. Beyond defined consideration of equity issues in these processes, training will be required. Implementing such a recommendation and sustaining the commitment to inclusive performance evaluation systems will also require a leadership mandate that staff performance reviews and post-tenure faculty reviews are completed on currently defined timeframes. Potential responsible entities: HR; Provost and Deans; University, Schools & College committees on RPT.
- 4) Recommend the development and availability of a disciplined-based diversity related theme Core Freshman Seminar. Identify departments and/or academic programs and faculty to pilot equity, inclusion, and/or intercultural awareness based first-year seminars integrated into their discipline

and/or from an interdisciplinary perspective. The footsteps to implementing this recommendation reside in moving a proposal through the Core Curriculum Committee review and approval process. Need to identify faculty/discipline interested for pilots. After pilots in 2019-2020, adapt and evaluate diversity-inclusive first-year seminars for implementation in each undergraduate school / college within the following two years. Potential authority entities: First Year Seminar Core Curriculum Committee, Academic Council.

- 5) Recommend adopting an anti-bullying university policy. Develop an anti-bullying policy for the University during 2018-2019 academic year through PCAC process, applicable to faculty, staff and students. Once approved, move through awareness campaign in the 2019-2020 academic year. Enforced through OCS, HR, and faculty processes. Potential co-sponsors: Provost and Vice President of Administration. Potential Responsible Entities and Collaborators: HR and Council of Deans.
- 6) Recommend encouraging advisor registration meetings be utilized to assess a student's sense of belonging, campus-based involvement and/or experience of inclusion on campus, and overall well-being. Guided questions will need to be developed and provided, as well as a way to connect students to existing processes. Recommended responsible entities and subject matter experts: CTA, faculty and representatives from key student development offices. Development in 2018-2019 with implementation in fall 2019.
- 7) Recommend all course syllabi have a brief informational item regarding the BIAS Team contact information and link to submit a Bias incident report. Faculty inclusion of information on BIAS reporting system to students to increase awareness of reporting and support. Training and language provided by BIAS team. Create workgroup consisting of faculty and the BIAS Team to recommend a variety of communication options to faculty, who will then work through Faculty Senate, faculty conferences, Provost communications, CTA, etc.
- 8) Recommend that DICE (UMEC & LGBTQ+ Centers) is included in all Admissions Tours & New Employee Experience Tours by October 2018. What we invest time in demonstrates what we value on these tours. This is an early opportunity for potential students and new employees to physically see and hear that we value diversity and inclusion. Identified Authority Entities: Admissions; HR.
- 9) Recommend systemic communication and consultation between students and Academic Deans. Create a process for regular communication between Deans and students to share concerns and engage in consultative conversations. Recommend a discussion with the Provost Council of Deans with Council EIIA representative involvement to identify various pathways for this engagement by February 2019.
- 10) Several other action themes resulting from the campus climate process will likely take two or more years to critically evaluate feasibility, develop a way of proceeding, and an implementation plan with evaluation elements and any budget implications. The Council recommends consideration of the following items by responsible campus entities with authority and responsibility for the applicable area and any evaluation and/or development of the recommendation:

- a) Develop student learning outcome-based criteria to evaluate all diversity-related courses under the Social Justice and Global Studies designations for the university core curriculum to suggest revisions to the course offering listing. Responsible Entities: University Core Directory and Core Curriculum Committees in consultation with the Council EIIA.
- b) Develop and implement social justice and inclusivity requirements into the promotion and tenure process for faculty. The Council recognizes this does have faculty handbook implications.
- c) Research campus safe ride programs for students beyond the current rides given by CSPS. Evaluate for program expansion at Gonzaga.
- d) Conduct revisions to student course evaluations to include questions on how the course and/or professor creates and manages an inclusive environment and practices culturally inclusive teaching.

INTERCULTURAL INTELLIGENCE, PEDAGOGIES & CURRICULUM

All recommendations were approved by Council for referral to the President and Cabinet for consideration.

Recommendation 1:

Revise the student course evaluation form. Have several questions that will help the Provost and university assess if faculty are practicing inclusive teaching or contextualizing academic content with intercultural, equity or inclusive social justice themes. If we value the integration of intercultural communication skill development and the Jesuit Charism pertaining to the intercultural encounter into the student classroom experience, then we need to determine ways to evaluate faculty in this area of our university mission. The student evaluation form offers an opportunity to begin a conversation regarding the student course evaluations.

Recommendation 2:

Work with CTA on organizing a Stop the Hate Training as well as other workshops. One of our team members attended this training for staff and it was a great resource. Stop the Hate training would offer faculty a chance to develop pedagogical skills in this area.

Recommendation 3:

Recommend the Faculty Senate President consider introducing the Stop the Hate training program at "Spring 2019" Faculty Conference. Have CTA make announcements regarding all of their related trainings during the faculty conference so faculty can schedule around these opportunities.

Recommendation 4:

It is recommended that the Faculty Handbook have evaluative criteria addressing instructional performance related to inclusive instruction and equity education as part of the university discernment for the Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure process.

Addendums

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Strategic Planning, Evaluation, & Accountability Committee Annual Report

Submitted by Joan Iva C. Fawcett, Committee Chair, on April 24, 2018

The Strategic Planning, Evaluation, & Accountability Committee dedicated most of the 2018-2019 academic year to selecting an institutional diversity model that could effectively guide the work of the Council for Equity, Inclusion, & Intercultural Awareness (EIIA). We researched and vetted four different models:

1. The Organizational Development Model of Inclusion (ODMI) developed by Moises Baron and Reuben Mitchell
2. The Culturally Engaging Campus Environments (CECE) Model administered by the National Institute for Transformation & Equity
3. The Multicultural Organizational Development (MCOD) Model developed by Kathy Obear, and
4. The Self-Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion in Higher Education developed by the New England Resource Center for Higher Education (NERCHE) Multicultural Affairs Think Tank

After weighing the pros and cons of each model, our committee decided to move forward with the NERCHE Self-Assessment Rubric. We then spent several months analyzing the rubric, critiquing its shortcomings, discussing ways it could be customized to Gonzaga University, and workshopping its six dimensions and respective components.

On April 16, 2018, I introduced and facilitated a workshop on the NERCHE Rubric with the Council for EIIA with the intention that it be formally adopted and customized to guide the Council's work moving forward. Based on the NERCHE Rubric, the Strategic Planning Committee also drafted formal definitions for key terms: (1) diversity, (2) inclusion, (3) equity, and (4) cultural fluency. These definitions were presented at the April 16th Council meeting in an effort to start the revision and vetting process to formally adopt and communicate these key terms University-wide. Formal adoption of the NERCHE rubric and key terms will likely have major implications on the Council's name, membership, committee structure, and goals.

Recommendations

1. In order to strategically guide the Council's work for next year and beyond, formally adopt and customize the Self-Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion in Higher Education developed by the New England Resource Center for Higher Education (NERCHE) Multicultural Affairs Think Tank.
2. As a Council, review and revise the key terms -- diversity, inclusion, equity, and cultural fluency -- that were defined and proposed by the Strategic Planning Committee. Then vet through all the appropriate channels -- the President's Cabinet, Faculty Senate, the Gonzaga Student Body Association, and the Staff Assembly -- for University-wide adoption and communication.

Members

- Laurie Arnold – Native American Studies
- Victoria Elleby – Law Student
- Joan Iva C. Fawcett – Diversity, Inclusion, Community, & Equity (DICE)
- Jason Gilmer – Center for Civil & Human Rights / School of Law
- Sean Joy – Center for Cura Personalis
- Molly Pepper – School of Business Administration
- Raymond Reyes – Associate Academic Vice President & Chief Diversity Officer
- Hikaru Yamaguchi – Office of Admission

Note: Several attempts were made throughout the academic year to secure an undergraduate representative to no avail.

Committee Meetings

- September 25, 2017
- October 16, 2017
- November 14, 2017
- December 12, 2017
- January 23, 2018
- February 20, 2018
- March 20, 2018
- April 10, 2018
- May 1, 2018

Note: All meeting agendas, minutes, and related documents have been uploaded to SharePoint in the “EIIA Strategic Planning Committee” folder.

STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE DEFINITIONS (Approved by Council for next level of vetting at GU.)

Diversity & Inclusion Proposed Definition:

- The promotion, integration, and celebration of varying individual and group/social differences which advance the value placed on the dignity of the human person through holistic living, learning, and working environments.
- The activity practice of creating a sense of belonging for all individuals with respect to each person’s values and traditions, beliefs, backgrounds, and ways of being.
- The intentional and ongoing engagement with diversity in people in the (co-)curriculum, and in communities to serve the common good.

Equity Proposed Definition:

- The recognition that diversity and equality may not exist institutionally.
- The commitment to implement strategies and policies that create equal opportunity for power, ability, achievement, and excellence for all community members, in three main areas:
 - Representational Equity: Proportional participation at all levels of the institution.
 - Resource Equity: Distribution of educational resources in order to close equity gaps.
 - Equity consciousness: The awareness, willingness, and demonstration to address equity issues regarding historically underrepresented and/or traditionally marginalized communities.

Cultural Fluency Proposed Definition:

- The infinite capability to understand and adapt behavior to cultural difference and commonality. It involves three components:
 - Cultural Self-Awareness (Knowledge): Deep understanding of your values, beliefs, perceptions, behavior, and practices.
 - Cultural Other-Awareness (Attitudes): Empathy towards the experience of others from different cultural communities.
 - Adaptations (Skills and Behaviors): Behavioral shifting to accompany across various cultural differences.

Recruitment & Retention Committee Annual Report

Submitted by Kari Elgee-Sanders on Month xx, 2018.

Committee Members:

- Heather Gores – Athletics
- Carla Bonilla –
- Rajah Bose – University Advancement
- Yanping Zhang – School of Engineering & Applied Sciences
- Chris Purviance – Human Resources
- Kari-Elgee Sanders – Human Resources, Committee Chair
- Daniel Rosales – student
- Jordan Cotton – student
- Tianna Helm – student

Annual Activities and Recommendations:

1. Presented Fair Chance hiring to the Cabinet and moved forward with implementation: Two 30 minute open sessions, removed the Criminal question from online application as well as all written applications including those for adjuncts. The Fair Chance Hiring Flier is attached at the end of the addendums.
2. Requesting Diversity statement on all online applications. Also recommending follow-up questions for interviews to address what was provided in the diversity statement. The committee is working into early next academic year to recommend Diversity Statement language to be added to applications.

Curriculum and Pedagogy's Committee Annual Report

Revise the student course evaluation form. Have several questions that will help the community assess if faculty are modeling, and when appropriate, teaching intercultural unity and inclusion. If we value the integration on inclusion and mission into the classroom then we need to determine a way in which to evaluate faculty in these areas. The student evaluation form offers an opportunity to begin a conversation regarding the student course evaluations.

Work with CTA on organizing a Stop The Hate Training as well as other workshops. Work with Faculty Development. One of our team members attended this training for staff and it was a great resource Stop the Hate training would offer faculty a chance to develop pedagogical skills in this area.

Recommend to Tom McKenzie, faculty president, the Stop the Hate training @ faculty conference. Have CTA make announcements regarding all of their related trainings during the faculty conference so faculty can schedule around these opportunities.

As they are continuing to rewrite the faculty handbook, add section on diversity and inclusion. We suggest placing it somewhere under the criteria for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure. Having an evaluative dimension of diversity and inclusion as part of the criteria for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure process would elevate the value we attach to diversity and inclusion.

Summary report of our work for the year.

Along with the Campus Climate survey results, our committee took time to read two articles, "Advancing diversity and Inclusivity through Strategic Multilevel Leadership" and "Using Dialogue to Create Inclusive classrooms". We used these as a springboard for thinking about recommendations we wanted to make. A few of our members met with some of our minority students for coffee and listened to their experience on campus regarding their race and their experience in the classroom and campus life. We then came together and compiled our recommendations for the council.

Campus Climate Committee Annual Report

Committee on Campus Climate | CEIIA Sub-Committee:

Matthew Barcus	Carlo Juntilla	Brian Steverson
Noel Bormann	Richard Menard	Daniel Stewart
Amanda Braley	Molly Pepper	Julie Ullrich
Rani Chavez-Godinez	Bethany Prince	Jason Varnado
August Corppetts	Chris Purviance	Michelle Wheatley
Heather Gores	Raymond Reyes	Stephanie Whaley
Sean Joy	Joanne Shiosaki	Linda Wilson

Summary of Activities, Community Actions, and Recommendations:

The following list contains recommendations from the Campus Climate Committee based on the community-wide engagement after the spring 2017 survey results were delivered on October 18, 2017. Prior to October 2017, the committee was actively engaged in preparing for Rankin and Associates to visit campus to deliver and share the survey results with the community. The committee helped prepare messaging, advertise and staff the October 18th sessions, and then draft the process for community engagement to move the findings into actionable items.

These recommendations have not only been informed by the survey results, but also by issues raised from student groups, reported incidents, and other on-going work on campus. Nearly forty (40) potential actions rose from themes out of these data sources, and the many community conversation held between November 2017 and February 2018 on this topic.

The recommendations are listed below in two categories:

- 1) recommendations are already in process as they did not require executive-level approval, and/or Gonzaga community members were empowered in their respective areas to begin taking action based on the community engagement and vetting of these recommendations through various groups and the Council; and
- 2) recommendations approved by the Council to move forward to the President and Cabinet for consideration to implement.

The first group defined here are recommendations out of the campus climate community engagement that are already well-underway by functional areas across campus. The Council of Equity, Inclusion and Intercultural Awareness affirms these recommendations and on-going work by staff and will continue to advocate for and support the efforts. As progress is made on these items, the Council will help communicate out that progress to the University community.

- The community directly and indirectly asked for greater transparency around diversity related statistics, reporting, activities and offices. As such, work began around multiple websites.
 - A comprehensive Gonzaga University website focused on diversity, equity and inclusion, is under development since April 2018. It will include a historical timeline of activities on campus, related statistics, stories, and resources among other things and will be formally launched by 8/25/2018.

- Dedicated websites for the Council of Equity, Inclusion and Intercultural Awareness and the BIAS team also began development in late fall 2017 for launch during the summer 2018. These websites will be linked through the comprehensive University website.
- In addition to the websites above, the Council is actively working on a regular communication plan to keep the community informed of its activities and the activities of the University, including progress on these recommendations. More information will be forthcoming on these communication avenues in fall 2018, with a plan communicated by October 31, 2018.
- The campus community also asked for greater clarity and ease of access of University policies. A centralized policy website has been created under the Vice President of Administration. This site is published effective May 2017 and will continue to be built out and enhanced so community members can easily access policies. Policies can either be physically housed on one website, or linked out to department sites. It is the goal that Student Code of Conduct, Faculty Handbook, Policies and Procedures Manual, and other University-wide policies, will all be connected through this site eventually. The new internet/intranet allows for one policy in database with multiple links to it throughout both sites, which will minimize confusion and multiple versions.
- The Recruitment & Retention Committee of the Council EIIA is currently researching a diversity statement to place in all job postings no later than December 2018. This effort will directly impact recruitment efforts for faculty and staff as was identified as an important need by the survey and emphasized by the community engagement. The Recruitment & Retention committee will bring back options for the Council's input and then make recommendations.
- The community desires the development of definitions around inclusive language for use and understanding by all faculty, staff, students, and administrators. The Strategic Planning Committee drafted an initial set of definitions which was approved by the Council in May 2018. The next phase of this definitional work will be vetting out the terms and definitions with the GU community by the Council EIIA during the 2018-2019 academic year.
- As identified above, a strong outcome of the survey was reporting & transparency of employment & student diversity metrics. This work got underway when the website work was launched in April 2018. An initial set of metrics will be reported on the website when launched. Other metrics are being identified and reporting mechanisms developed by Institutional Research, HR, CDO, and other pertinent data owners on campus. A status update on the progress of this work will be delivered by mid-January 2019.
- In addition to diversity metrics, enhanced & comprehensive employee turnover and current employment reports including diversity categories (race/ethnicity, gender, disability, vets) is under development. Human Resources will be working with Institutional Research and other data experts on campus to draft reports and dashboards for use by leadership. Early drafts of employee turnover reports were developed, and other key metrics are being identified. After finalization, the report generation development will be undertaken. A status update on the progress of this work will be delivered by mid-January 2019, with a goal of full implementation no later than July 2019.
- Implicit bias / diversity programming was consistently identified as a need for implementation at Gonzaga in forms directly connected to recruiting and hiring processes and as overall programming. The Council Recruitment & Retention Committee proposed research and adoption of a program connected to the recruiting & hiring processes over the 2018-2019

academic year, as part of the approved and implemented Fair Chance Hiring Process which went into effect on May 1, 2018. The Council looks forward to reporting out the progress on this work in conjunction with Human Resources by mid-January 2019, with a goal for University adoption by summer 2019.

- An on-going process to review diversity of candidate pools during open recruitments was also identified as a need to ensure we are getting qualified candidates from a broad experience and background (before postings close). This review can then inform changes to recruiting strategies/actions before postings close. Recruiting processes are already under review by HR Recruiting Partners and the new Associate Director of Organizational Development. The Council looks forward to reporting out the progress on this work in conjunction with Human Resources by mid-January 2019.
- The campus community strongly advocated for the Council to continue to ensure the Staff Total Compensation Project would stay on track with deliverables in September 2018, including market adjustments for staff who fall below identified ranges. This work is well under way, with further communication delivered in May 2018 to Staff Assembly. The Campus Climate Committee recommended continued advocacy and support of this project for staff. The Council supported this recommendation.
- Advocacy and support of the Critical Race & Ethnic Studies Program. Identified Owners: WGST Department and the Arts and Sciences Committee; Academic Council; Dean Mermann-Jozwiak; Provost. Recommendation is to advocate for this proposal to move through Academic Council in 2018-2019 for implementation in fall semester 2020. Further demonstration of our commitment to this minor would be hiring a dedicated FT faculty member and a diverse group of existing faculty supporting through involved teaching and courses.
- A final campus climate theme was also advocated for by departments and individuals outside of the Campus Climate Committee and Council which resulted in approval to move office locations this summer of key diversity centers in Hemmingson. The offices of UMEC and LGBTQ+ underneath DICE will move from the 3rd floor of the Hemmingson Center to the 2nd floor, while GUEST will move up to the 3rd floor spaces. Additionally, the TVRAS office for transfer, veteran, and returning adult students will also move to the 2nd floor adjacent to the DICE offices. The Council supported these recommendations when they came out of the engagement process, and are happy to report that functional areas took steps to advocate for these moves directly. The construction for the moves will occur during the summer 2018, with an anticipated grand re-opening of all offices at the start of the academic year in late August or early September 2018.

This second group of recommendations are items that members of the Council of Equity, Inclusion and Intercultural Awareness felt were too important to narrow to only a few recommendations. Therefore, the Council chose to move forward the entire list of recommendations. We have identified approximate timeframes which will need to be affirmed or updated by the responsible owners.

- Recommend an Expansion of Employee Appreciation/Recognition in the Area of Inclusion & Equity. Highlight and further develop staff & faculty appreciation efforts (Staff Kudos, Faculty Recognition, Innovation Awards, divisional and departmental recognition) by March 2019. An important first step will be to identify existing recognition award programs (e.g. title, purpose, sponsoring program, department, or division, intended constituency group,

application/nomination process, monetary honorarium, time of year issuance, etc...). The Council recommends the Campus Climate Committee consult with Staff Assembly, Faculty Senate, division & departmental leaders in early fall 2018 to create a list of potential other recognition programs currently not being done.

- Recommend Mandatory Workforce Development in Intercultural Communication Capacity-Building. There is an identified need for mandatory, comprehensive diversity and inclusion skill development opportunities for the entire GU workforce, i.e., staff and faculty. During fall 2018, Council EIIA, in collaborative consultation with HR, CTA, and DICE, will research & recommend existing training programs to bring to campus with pilot testing workshops in spring 2019. By June 2019, select a program to bring to campus and work toward full implementation in 2019-2020. Responsible Service Provider and collaborators: HR, DICE, CTA, Institute for Hate Studies.
- Recommend establishing a comprehensive, inter-dependent system that links three primary change drivers for inclusive excellence in the workforce: professional development; performance evaluation that includes practices addressing inclusion, equity and intercultural fluency and reappointment, tenure, rank and promotion for faculty; and promotion and recognition of exemplary accomplishments for staff. This recommendation involves changing existing processes like course evaluations, RPT factors, and staff evaluations by fall 2019. Beyond defined consideration of equity issues in these processes, training will be required. Implementing such a recommendation and sustain the commitment to inclusive performance evaluation systems will also require a leadership mandate that staff performance reviews and post-tenure faculty reviews are completed on currently defined timeframes. Potential Responsible Agency: HR; Provost and Deans; University, Schools & College committees on RPT.
- Recommend the Development and Availability of a disciplined-based diversity related theme Core Freshman Seminar. Identify departments and/or academic programs and faculty to pilot diversity & inclusion-centered first-year seminars integrated into their discipline and/or from an interdisciplinary perspective. The footsteps to implementing this recommendation reside in moving a proposal through the Core Curriculum Committee review and approval process. Academic Council approval process for new courses for implementation in fall 2019. Need to identify faculty/discipline interested for pilots. After pilots in 2019-2020, adapt and evaluate diversity-inclusive first-year seminars for implementation in each undergraduate school / college within the following two years. Potential Authority Agent(s): Core Curriculum Committee, Academic Council.
- Recommend Adopting an Anti-Bullying University Policy. Develop an anti-bullying policy for the University during 2018-2019 academic year through PCAC process, applicable to faculty, staff and students. Once approved, move through awareness campaign in the 2019-2020 academic year. Enforced through OCS, HR, and faculty processes. Potential co-sponsors: Provost and Vice President of Administration. Potential Responsible Entities and Collaborators: HR and Council of Deans.
- Recommend Encouraging Advisor Registration meetings are also utilized to assess a student's sense of belonging, campus-based involvement and/or experience of inclusion on campus, and overall well-being. Guided questions will need to be developed and provided, as well as a way to connect students into existing processes. Recommended Responsible Entities and Subject Matter Experts: CTA, faculty and representatives from key student development offices. Development in 2018-2019 with implementation in fall 2019.

- Recommend All Course Syllabi have a brief informational item regarding the BIAS Team contact information and link to submit a Bias incident report. Faculty inclusion of information on BIAS reporting system to students to increase awareness of reporting & support. Training and language provided by BIAS team. Create workgroup of faculty and the BIAS Team to recommend variety of communication options to faculty, who will then work through Faculty Senate, faculty conferences, Provost communications, etc.
- Recommend that DICE (UMEC & LGBTQ+ Centers) is included in all Admissions Tours & New Employee Experience Tours by October 2018. What we invest time in demonstrates what we value on these tours. This is an early opportunity for potential students and new employees to physically see and hear that we value diversity and inclusion. Identified Authority Agent(s): Admissions; HR.
- Recommend Systemic Communication & Consultation between students and Academic Deans. Create a process for regular communication between Deans and students to share concerns and engage in consultative conversations. Recommend discernment through the Provost Council of Deans with Council EIIA representative involvement to identify various pathways for this engagement by February 2019.
- Several other action themes resulting from the campus climate process will likely take two or more years to critically evaluate feasibility, develop a way of proceeding, and an implementation plan with evaluation elements and any budget implications. The Council recommends consideration of these items by responsible campus entities with authority and responsibility for the applicable area and any evaluation and/or development of the recommendation:
 - Update the criteria and develop a rubric to review courses count for credit under the diversity and inclusion course requirement. This rubric will then be used to examine and update identification of courses fitting this designation and removing courses that no longer meet the requirement. Responsible Agent: Provost Office to develop work groups inclusive of Council representation, students and faculty.
 - Develop and implement social justice and inclusivity requirements into the promotion and tenure process for faculty. The Council recognizes this may have faculty handbook implications, which is why it is falling into this two or more category.
 - Research campus safe ride programs for students beyond the current rides given by CSPS. Evaluate for program expansion at Gonzaga.
 - Conduct revisions to student course evaluations to include questions on how the course and/or professor creates and manages an inclusive environment and culturally-inclusive content.

The Campus Climate Committee will identify and implement tracking and reporting mechanisms in 2018-2019 year and begin to monitor the progress of these items. They will also develop periodic updates to the University community on the status of these items.

Global Engagement

Regarding: Year-end Recommendations - Global Awareness and Connections Committee

The sub-committee on Global Awareness and Connections, of the Council on Equity, Inclusion and Intercultural Awareness met sporadically throughout the year. In addition to Jose Hernandez and Joe Kinsella, the members of this committee included:

- Jane Tiedt
- Analee Sun Hee Scott
- Ronnie Estoque
- Nhan Nt Ta
- Jennifer Phan

In our most significant meeting, on 13 February 2018, we discussed the broad mandate of this sub-committee, and reached consensus on the disposition of this group. As unofficial co-chairs, Hernandez and Kinsella feel fairly strongly that the mandate of this sub-committee needs to move away from 'programming,' and embrace more of a 'best practices' approach, serving the University Community as a body that a) articulates and makes public criteria that advance the cause of "global awareness," and b) identifies individuals or groups that exemplify these criteria. We envision this to be an annual recognition that ultimately not only celebrates global awareness in general among our communities, but highlights for our communities what we determine to be the best of what Gonzaga has to offer in terms of global awareness-raising.

While some of the student participants expressed concern that this recognition not turn into a kind of 'tokenism' singling out under-represented groups for the sole purpose of assuaging concerns about inclusiveness or diversity on campus, the majority agreed that the work of managing programming that addresses global awareness needs to be left to the numerous offices that, in their own way, work every day to raise "global awareness and [build] connections," from respective areas of the institution. From the Rudolf Fitness Center to the Center for Community Engagement, Diversity, Inclusion, Community and Equity, SODEXO, the Center for Global Engagement, the numerous student groups doing good work to raise global awareness, as well as the faculty who teach and advocate for global awareness in the classroom, we assert that this subcommittee should not even appear to be taking on that programming and classroom work.

Consequently, our recommendation for next year is to re-focus the work of this subcommittee, calling for us to develop the criteria by which we – as a Council – are able to measure successful examples of departments and individuals building global awareness and connections at Gonzaga, and subsequently (by December), call for nominations and recognize the best examples of on campus work toward these goals. We would recommend that some sort of public event or award ceremony be developed (or built into already-existing year-end celebrations) to highlight and celebrate these examples of how individuals and groups raise global awareness and build global connections as part of their everyday work at Gonzaga.

BIAS Team Annual Report

Submitted by Matt Lamsma & Joan Iva Fawcett, BIAS Team Co-Chairs, on April 24, 2018

The Bias Incident Assessment & Support (BIAS) Team was formed in the fall semester, 2017. The team consists of 14 faculty and staff who accepted invitations to participate from Dr. Elisabeth Mermann-Jozwiak, Interim Academic Vice President, and Dr. Judi Biggs Garbuio, Vice President for Student Development. Members accepted appointments for the 2017-2018 academic year. The BIAS Team is charged with:

- Supporting individuals and communities impacted by bias incidents and hate crimes
- Assessing and making recommendations on the impact of bias incidents and hate crimes to Gonzaga's overall campus climate.

The BIAS Team met twice a month during the academic year. One of these was an all-team meeting focused on setting group norms, reviewing bias reports, and training. The other meeting was a committee. Half of the BIAS Team was a part of the Campus Communication and Education Committee chaired by Joan Iva Fawcett and the other half was part of the Bias Incident Policies and Procedures Committee chaired by Matt Lamsma. The primary project for the Campus Communication group was the development of a BIAS Team website which will go live during the summer of 2018. The Policies and Procedures team worked on writing guidelines and a response process for when a bias report is received.

In addition to committee work, BIAS Team members responded in pairs to numerous reports received, actively supporting students, staff, and faculty and educating the community on the impact of bias. Finally, the BIAS Team co-chairs met regularly with the co-chairs for the Council for Equity, Inclusion, and Intercultural Awareness and representatives from the Deans Council for guidance and to keep academic leadership aware of the work of the team. Information related to the committee membership and reports received, to date, is included below.

BIAS Team Membership

1. Joan Iva Fawcett (Diversity, Inclusion, Community, & Equity) – Co-Chair
2. Matt Lamsma (Student Development) – Co-Chair
3. Chris Purviance (Human Resources) – Advisor
4. Raymond Reyes (AAVP & Chief Diversity Officer) – Advisor

Committees:

- Campus Communication & Education (chaired by Joan Iva Fawcett)
 - Summary of Fall 2017 Reports
 - Website
 - Campus presentations / trainings targeting specific groups
 - General PR and marketing campaign
 - Bias Incident Policies and Procedures (chaired by Matt Lamsma)
 - Guidelines on institutional messaging (e.g. campus-wide vs college specific email/statements)
 - Reporting software & report sharing practices
 - Report response workflow

- Guidelines for addressing classroom conduct

Reports to Date for 2017-2018 (www.gonzaga.edu/reportbias) – 32 reports as of April 24, 2018

Reports by Month

- Oct = 9 (~28%)
- Nov = 2 (~6%)
- Dec = 3 (~9%)
- Jan = 1 (~3%)
- Feb = 8 (25%)
- March = 1 (~3%)
- April = 8 (25%)

Reports submitted by

- Students = 17 (6 RAs) (~53%)
- Staff = 13 (5 RDs) (~41%)
- Faculty = 1 (~3%)
- Anonymous = 1 (~3%)

Notification Only / Response Requested

- Notification Only = 16 (50%)
- Response Requested = 16 (50%)

Incident Location

- Residence hall = 14 (~44%)
- Classroom = 9 (~28%)
- Campus Buildings = 4 (~13%)
- Outside = 2 (~6%)
- Off-Campus = 2 (~6%)
- Other (snail mail) = 1 (~3%)

Social Identity/ies Targeted

- Race = 10 (~31%)
- Other (multiple) = 9 (~28%)
- Sexual Orientation = 3 (~9%)
- Gender = 3 (~9%)
- Disability = 2 (~6%)
- National Origin (Language) = 2 (6%)
- No Bias = 2 (~6%)
- Religion = 1 (~3%)

Each report was received electronically and reviewed by co-chairs of the BIAS team, Joan Iva Fawcett & Matt Lamsma, as well as co-chairs of the Council for Equity, Inclusion, and Intercultural Awareness. Each report was followed up on by BIAS Team Members, Human Resources, Student Conduct, Residence Life Staff, Campus Security & Public Safety (CSPS), and/or the Chief Diversity Officer as appropriate. Follow-up actions included investigation by CSPS, removal of graffiti by Plant Services staff, offering support to targeted individuals, residence hall meetings / communication, and educational conversations.

Gonzaga University February 1, 2018

Fair Chance Hiring Initiative

Background Information and Implementation Strategy

Attention: Gonzaga University Cabinet

I. Introduction

This Fair Chance Hiring initiative came to the attention of Gonzaga administration in a number of ways. A faculty member began asking Human Resources about criminal history in employment. Individuals brought it to the Council on Equity, Inclusion, and Intercultural Awareness (Council) about the time that HR was bringing it to the Council. Once the Council began discussing the issue, student members quickly got involved to support the initiative due to the social justice and Gonzaga University Mission connection.

The Council committee on recruitment and retention evaluated the issue and proposed that Gonzaga University adopt the Fair Chance Hiring practice of banning the criminal history question from our employment application. The Council accepted the committee proposal and forwarded the recommendation to the Cabinet as part of the 2016-2017 annual report.

Implementing Fair Chance hiring at Gonzaga does not change our hiring standards. It is a change of when information is presented to hiring managers and search committees, and an opportunity to allow applicants to select into our candidate pools without fear of being rejected outright because of a "yes" answer to the criminal history question. It aligns directly with our mission recognition of and work in social justice issues.

This document and the resulting implementation plan is based on the Cabinet's request for more information in order to fully consider the issue and the recently adopted City of Spokane ordinance.

II. Background Information

Overview of Fair Chance Hiring initiative across the country

Criminal history questions on employment applications vary from broad to specific at organizations who still ask for this information. Several samples of criminal history employment application questions include:

- Have you ever been convicted of a crime (felony or misdemeanor) other than a minor traffic violation? Please explain. (Gonzaga's phrasing)
- Have you been convicted of a felony in the last seven years?
- Have you been convicted of a violent crime?

Impera tive , a background screening company explains the impact of these questions succinctly:

"...a 1975 federal case, *Green vs. Missouri Pacific Railroad* , determined that an employer who eliminates all applicants with a criminal history, regardless of age or severity, from consideration will likely violate Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

The court's reasoning was that minorities (in this case, blacks) are arrested, prosecuted, and convicted at a higher rate than whites. Therefore, by eliminating all applicants with any criminal history from consideration, minorities would be excluded at a higher rate than the white population.

Because some criminal offenses would be so minor, so unrelated to the risks of the position, or so old as to be inconsequential to the individual's effectiveness or safety in the job, such a broad exclusion would create a "disparate impact."

In recent years, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission has increasingly focused on this issue. In 2012, they published a 50+ page guidance document on employer's use of criminal history."

Per the EEOC website:

"Federal law does not prohibit employers from asking about your criminal history. But, federal EEO laws do prohibit employers from discriminating when they use criminal history information. Using criminal history information to make employment decisions may violate Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended (Title VII).

1. Title VII prohibits employers from treating people with similar criminal records differently because of their race, national origin, or another Title VII-protected characteristic (which includes color, sex, and religion).
2. Title VII prohibits employers from using policies or practices that screen individuals based on criminal history information if:
 - They significantly disadvantage Title VII-protected individuals such as African Americans and Hispanics;
 - AND
 - They do not help the employer accurately decide if the person is likely to be a responsible, reliable, or safe employee."

The criminal history question "exacerbates the 'media-driven perception that if we committed a crime, then we are a criminal' and violates 'the promise that we paid our dues and can begin to rebuild our lives and become productive members of society.'"

Across the nation, many states and municipalities have been passing regulations in favor of fair chance hiring, by eliminating the criminal history question. Over 150 cities & counties have banned the criminal history question from employment applications. Twenty-nine states & Washington DC have now banned this question from employment applications at organizations within their states. In Washington State, the cities of Seattle and Spokane, and Spokane & Pierce Counties have banned criminal history questions from employment applications. Washington State has considered this legislation but it failed to pass with a majority vote. The City of Spokane passed its ordinance on November 27, 2017 effective for all employers within the city limits. The regulation goes into effect on May 27, 2018 with the City using all of 2018 as an opportunity to educate and assist employers with compliance.

What are other Jesuit institutions doing? Several Jesuit institutions have banned the criminal question from applications when their states or local municipalities implemented fair chance hiring regulations. None of the institutions sought exemption under working with minors. When Seattle adopted the regulation, Seattle University removed the criminal question from their employment applications. They have not seen an increase failed searches or offers being rescinded due to convictions. University of San Francisco (2014), St. Josephs (several years), and Fairfield (Jan 2017) have also implemented Fair Chance Hiring practices.

Research related to Fair Chance Hiring Initiatives

Research completed by scholars from Princeton University and the University of Michigan suggest discrimination increases after elimination of this question, in some cases, because people begin to make judgments based on perception of the ethnicity of applicant's names. Since people of color are incarcerated in higher numbers than white people, ethnic sounding names were screened out at a higher rate. This research was conducted solely in New Jersey and New York City. This research also cited "employers that ask about criminal records are 62% more likely to call back an applicant if he does not have a record...an effect that BTB [Ban the Box] compliance necessarily eliminates." The NY Times article regarding this research identifies that removal of the box does not fix the discrimination, it must be accompanied by other efforts. The available research is limited but can be helpful in determining appropriate implementation strategies. We concur with the researchers that an implementation must include strategies to support unbiased (non-discriminatory) hiring decisions. Our proposal outlines efforts we need to implement in conjunction with eliminating the criminal history question.

Facts for consideration during implementation of Fair Chance Hiring

- Eliminating the criminal history question does not affect gathering and evaluating criminal history on applicants.
- One in four adults have criminal records, eliminating the question eliminates seeds of doubt about an applicant's candidacy too early in the process.
- Felonies never fall off a person's record. So even convictions over a certain time period will appear on background checks, and can be evaluated for relevancy to position.
- Criminal conduct that does not result in a conviction should still be considered when evaluating risk as reported in background checks. Outcomes from criminal behavior that do not register as a conviction (i.e.: vacated cases, or probationary agreements) will still show up on background checks. These situations may be pertinent for consideration in a hiring decision. However, our current question asks for "convictions", so individuals with other outcomes could argue that we can't use that information because we only asked for "convictions." Being silent on the employment application, outside of the background check disclosure gives us broader ability to address anything that comes as the result of a background check.
- Eliminating this question may bring a perception of adding complexity to the hiring process if a criminal record comes forward in background check. It does not add complexity, but could add a few days before a staff member can start in some cases. This is not likely to impact faculty hiring, as they are typically weeks and months ahead of a start date. Currently faculty contracts are not issued without a completed background check.

Gonzaga Existing Hiring Processes

Steps in GU existing hiring process:

1. Post vacant positions on www.gonzaga.edu/jobs and other recruiting locations
2. Individuals apply for jobs online.
 - a. Question on our application: "have you ever been convicted of a crime (felony or misdemeanor) other than a minor traffic violation". However, minor is not defined and is in the eyes of the applicant and they answer across the spectrum. Below that yes/no is a secondary box asking "please explain" which is not required for completion and most people do not fill this out if they answer yes.
 - b. The application currently informs applicants that a background check will be done. Before they certify the accuracy of their application, applicants are notified that a background check will be completed on final candidates. The application also provides the full notice of what a background check involves and their rights to

disclosure of background verification information. These statements authorize Gonzaga to administer a background verification pre-employment and at any time during employment. It also informs candidates the offer is contingent upon successful passage of this background verification.

3. Position closes & screened applicants are moved to Hiring Manager / Search Committee for review (represented as two steps on the enclosed graphic).
 - a. At this point, anyone reviewing applications can see a positive or negative answer to the criminal history question. This information is in the top ¼ of the application page.
 - b. Every hiring manager and search committee member can see whether or not the applicant answered affirmatively to the criminal history question. There is no way to hide this question from the search committee. Once they see that answer, they can't unsee or unknow it for a true unbiased review of their application, skills and employment history.
 - c. Hiring managers and search committee members are supposed to ignore the information at this time. They do not. We have a history of search chairs calling HR and/or searching the internet to find this information rather than screening them on their qualifications at this early stage. Even when they call HR, it becomes a bigger issue and discussion point on the committee even though they should not yet be considering this information.
4. Round one interviews
5. Round two interviews
6. Checking of professional references: this step occurs either between the two stages of interviews above, or after the second round, depending on the position and preference of the hiring manager/ search committee.
7. Once references have been received and reviewed, the hiring managers can move to making a recommendation for hire. The verbal offer usually occurs at this stage with a verbal indication of acceptance.
8. Human Resources creates an offer letter which states the offer is contingent upon successful completion of background check (see attached sample).
9. HR initiates background check process.
 - a. Background checks take an average of one week to be returned. On occasion, it can take up to two weeks.
 - b. Background checks cover the topics listed in the appendix of this proposal.
10. Background check received and reviewed by HR.
 - a. GU only asks the vendor for the background checks to pull seven years of employment history. Criminal history and most other items are reported regardless of timeframe.

- b. Any concerns (criminal, financial, education, employment verification information, other) from the background check are reviewed in the following order by Gonzaga representatives:
 - i. Recruiting Specialist, (then if issues it proceeds to)
 - ii. AVP HR,
 - iii. Division leadership, generally just below cabinet level,
 - iv. Depending on facts of situation, with cabinet level leadership of division,
 - v. Depending on facts of situation, with Assistant Director, Equity & Inclusion
 - vi. In most situations, with General Counsel (expectation being truly minor traffic violations when the job has no driving requirement).
- c. After review, there is a yes/no decision to go forward with employment offer. A yes decision is usually affirmed by Hiring Manager/leadership with candidate. A no decision is usually communicated by HR.
- d. On rare occasions where the candidate has already started work and a negative decision is made, the individual is removed from employment. While we have not had to take this action, it is routine that candidates begin work before background checks are received by HR.

11. New employee begins work or position is re-opened.

HR does provide search committee training. It is offered once a month for staff as a general session. We also conduct "on-demand" training for faculty and staff search committee who request it. However, we see repeat attendees to these sessions and have likely reached only about 40% of the search committee participants with this training. This is not mandatory for staff. And the updated faculty hiring policies now identify a mandatory training but those have only recently been implemented and are still under review and updating processes.

Currently, all cases of criminal background are evaluated on a case-by-case basis in accordance with regulations. We must consider the full explanation, the type of crime, when it occurred, job functions, and whether the crime related to the job.

III. Implementation Plan

The following items are recommended for successful implementation of the Fair Chance Hiring initiative in alignment with recommendations from the Council last spring, and now in compliance with City of Spokane regulations. This implementation plan will be discussed at the cabinet meeting on February 21, 2018.

- Open Forums to introduce/explain the initiative and changes to GU community in April 2018.
- Remove criminal history question from the employment application on May 1, 2018.
- Implement mandatory search committee training for staff every two years (if they are on a search committee), and move forward with the same requirement as it is listed in the newly revised (and under review) faculty recruiting guidelines.
 - Training is already developed and may need minor updates to support this initiative.
- Research and implement Implicit Bias Training and/or diversity expert recruiting programs. A number of models exist at other Universities for evaluation. Council's Recruitment and Retention committee will conduct this evaluation and make a recommendation on the final program for implementation.
- Successful candidates' first day will be after receipt and/or approval of a cleared background check. Any exceptions to this practice will require prior approval from the AVP HR and area VP.

"When we try to end discrimination without addressing the underlying causes of discriminatory behavior, our efforts may accomplish little - and may even backfire." NY Times 8/19/2016

IV. Request for Cabinet Consideration

Human Resources and General Council have evaluated the new regulation in the City of Spokane. Human Resource has evaluated the options for successful implementation of the Fair Chance Hiring initiative and reviewed these with General Counsel support. We are requesting the President's Cabinet approve this implementation plan for the Fair Chance Hiring initiative at Gonzaga University. A final decision by March 9, 2018 will allow time to finalize implementation details and actions prior to implementation on May 1, 2018. The City of Spokane ordinance becomes effective June 14, 2018 with fines suspended through 2018.

V. Impact

This is not a change in our hiring standards. It is a change of when information is presented to hiring managers and search committees, and an opportunity to allow applicants to select into our candidate pools without fear of being rejected outright because of a "yes" answer to the criminal history question.