
A Design for the Inclusive History Project

July 12, 2023

Anishinaabeg gaa bi dinokiivaad temigad manda Michigan Kichi Kinoomaagegamig. Mdaaswi nshwaaswaak shi mdaaswi shi niizhawaaswi gii-sababoonagak, Ojibweg, Odawaag, minwaa Bodwe'aadamiig wiiba gii-miigwena'aa maamoonjiniibina Kichi Kinoomaagegamigoong wi piigaa aanjibiigaadeg Kichi-Naakonigewinning, debendang manda aki, mampii Niisaajwan, gewiinwaa niijaansiwaan ji kinoomaagaazinid. Daapanaming ninda kidwinan, megwaa minwaa gaa bi aankoosejig zhinda akiing minwaa gii-miigwewaad Kichi-Kinoomaagegamigoong aanjidaapinanigaade minwaa mshkowenjigaade.

The University of Michigan is located on the traditional territory of the Anishinaabe people. In 1817, the Ojibwe, Odawa, and Bodewadami Nations made the largest single land transfer to the University of Michigan. This was offered ceremonially as a gift through the Treaty at the Foot of the Rapids so that their children could be educated. Through these words of acknowledgment, their contemporary and ancestral ties to the land and their contributions to the university are renewed and reaffirmed.*

**While this is the university's official statement on the Anishinaabe land transfer, many other land acknowledgments circulate through the University of Michigan. One goal of the Inclusive History Project is to bring the university to a deeper understanding of both the history surrounding this land transfer and the many contributions of Indigenous people to the university.*

Table of Contents

I.	Framing & Design Committee Members	4
II.	Executive Summary	7
III.	Introduction and Overview of the Committee Charge	8
IV.	Contextualization	9
V.	Activities	13
VI.	Recommendations for the Inclusive History Project	16
	A. Research Plan and Priorities	19
	B. Research Project Sites and Related Activities	24
	C. Products	27
	D. Processes	29
VII.	Recommendations for the University	33
VIII.	Vision for the Inclusive History Project	36
IX.	Acknowledgments	38
X.	Appendix: Framing & Design Committee Charge	39
XI.	List of References	41

I. Framing & Design Committee Members

Co-chairs:

Elizabeth Cole, University Diversity and Social Transformation Professor of Psychology, Women's and Gender Studies, and Afroamerican and African Studies and Director, National Center for Institutional Diversity, College of Literature, Science, and the Arts, University of Michigan-Ann Arbor

Earl Lewis, Thomas C. Holt Distinguished University Professor of History, Afroamerican and African Studies, and Public Policy and Director, Center for Social Solutions, College of Literature, Science, and the Arts and Gerald R. Ford School of Public Policy, University of Michigan-Ann Arbor

Members:

Keisha Blevins, Chief of Staff and Senior Advisor to the Chancellor and Chief Diversity and Inclusion Officer, University of Michigan-Dearborn

Jay Cook, Professor of American Culture and Professor of History, College of Literature, Science, and the Arts, University of Michigan-Ann Arbor

Luis deBaca, Lecturer I and Visiting Professor of Law, Law School, University of Michigan-Ann Arbor

Manan Desai, Associate Professor of American Culture and Director of the Asian/Pacific Islander American Studies Program, College of Literature, Science, and the Arts, University of Michigan-Ann Arbor

Angela Dillard, Richard A. Meisler Collegiate Professor of Afroamerican and African Studies and in the Residential College and Professor of History, College of Literature, Science, and the Arts, University of Michigan-Ann Arbor

Paul Erickson, Randolph G. Adams Director of the William L. Clements Library, University of Michigan-Ann Arbor

Fatma Müge Göçek, Professor of Sociology, College of Literature, Science, and the Arts, University of Michigan-Ann Arbor

Thomas Henthorn, Dorothea E. Wyatt Professor of United States History and Associate Professor of History, College of Arts and Sciences, University of Michigan-Flint

Morela Hernandez, Ligia Ramirez de Reynolds Collegiate Professor of Public Policy, Gerald R. Ford School of Public Policy, and Professor of Management and Organizations, Stephen M. Ross School of Business, University of Michigan-Ann Arbor

Georgina Hickey, Professor of History, College of Arts, Sciences, and Letters, University of Michigan-Dearborn

Joel Howell, Elizabeth Farrand Collegiate Professor of Medical History and Professor of Internal Medicine, Medical School; Professor of History, College of Literature, Science, and the Arts; and Professor of Health Management and Policy, School of Public Health, University of Michigan-Ann Arbor

Vincent Hutchings, University Diversity and Social Transformation Professor; Hanes Walton, Jr. Collegiate Professor of Political Science and Afroamerican and African Studies, College of Literature, Science, and the Arts; and Research Professor, Center for Political Studies, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan-Ann Arbor

Nancy Love, Borchardt and Glysson Collegiate Professor, JoAnn Silverstein Distinguished University Professor of Environmental Engineering, and Professor of Civil and Environmental Engineering, College of Engineering, University of Michigan-Ann Arbor

David Luke, Chief Diversity Officer, University of Michigan-Flint

David Porter, Professor of English Language and Literature and Professor of Comparative Literature, College of Literature, Science, and the Arts, University of Michigan-Ann Arbor

Emily Prifogle, Assistant Professor of Law, Law School, and Assistant Professor of History, College of Literature, Science, and the Arts, University of Michigan-Ann Arbor

Denise Sekaquaptewa, University Diversity and Social Transformation Professor of Psychology, College of Literature, Science, and the Arts, and Faculty Associate, Research Center for Group Dynamics, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan-Ann Arbor

Trina Shanks, Harold R. Johnson Collegiate Professor of Social Work, School of Social Work, University of Michigan-Ann Arbor

Marie Ting, Assistant Vice Provost, Office of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion, University of Michigan-Ann Arbor

Sydney Tunstall, PhD Candidate in English and Women's and Gender Studies, College of Literature, Science, and the Arts, University of Michigan-Ann Arbor

Bennett Walling, Undergraduate Student, College of Literature, Science, and the Arts, University of Michigan-Ann Arbor

Stephen Ward, Arthur F. Thurnau Professor and Associate Professor of Afroamerican and African Studies and in the Residential College, College of Literature, Science, and the Arts, University of Michigan-Ann Arbor

Administrative Leads:

Jennifer Brady, Senior Project Manager, Inclusive History Project, National Center for Institutional Diversity, University of Michigan-Ann Arbor

Graham Grubb, Administrative Assistant, National Center for Institutional Diversity, University of Michigan-Ann Arbor

Research Support:

Judah Doty, Master's Research Opportunity Program, Center for the Study of Higher and Postsecondary Education, Marsal Family School of Education, University of Michigan-Ann Arbor

Wynter Douglas, Master's Research Opportunity Program, Center for the Study of Higher and Postsecondary Education, Marsal Family School of Education, University of Michigan-Ann Arbor

II. Executive Summary

The Inclusive History Project (IHP) is a multifaceted, multi-year endeavor designed to study and document a comprehensive history of the University of Michigan that is attentive to diversity, equity, and inclusion. First charged by President Mary Sue Coleman and then by President Santa J. Ono in 2022, the Inclusive History Project aims to provide a critical reexamination of the university's history that stretches across its three campuses and Michigan Medicine. In doing so, it will engage the entire university and neighboring communities to better understand the full history of the institution, including its record of inclusion and exclusion, and to consider what actions that history demands in the present.

The IHP emerged in response to contexts that include the broad movement of other colleges and universities to reckon with their histories, historical name reviews that have taken place on the Ann Arbor campus over the last several years, and the rich histories of campus activism and institutional support for diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts here at the university. It also builds on wide-ranging efforts to study and reckon with U-M's history that are already underway on our campuses.

The academic year 2022–23 was designated as a planning year for the project. This work was led by a Framing & Design Committee, co-chaired by Elizabeth Cole and Earl Lewis and with 22 faculty, staff, and students from across the university's campuses. This document presents the product of this year: a design and five-year plan for the IHP's next stage of work, which includes recommendations that lay out a research plan and priorities and outline additional research activities, products, and processes (these are summarized in Table 1 on page 18). Also included are several key recommendations related to funding and policy that indicate broader institutional conditions required for an honest and wide-ranging reckoning with the university's history. In addition, this document articulates the central priorities and values that must govern the Inclusive History Project's work, with those values driving the concrete recommendations included. This plan outlines the IHP's work over the next five years, with the acknowledgment that as the project unfolds, it may build out in new directions.

III. Introduction and Overview of the Committee Charge

In June 2022, the Inclusive History Project (IHP) was announced as a presidential initiative. The project is charged with studying and documenting a comprehensive history of the University of Michigan that is attentive to diversity, equity, and inclusion and stretches across the university's three campuses, including Michigan Medicine. This history should focus not only on the momentous achievements and causes for celebration and pride that prominently feature in how the university's history is remembered and told, but also on the histories of discrimination and exclusion, promises made and not kept, and resistance against and progress despite institutional barriers. Such histories are equally part of the university's past and should be widely known and shared. The overarching goal of the IHP is to produce this full history, to engage the U-M community in a deeper understanding of it, and to consider and recommend what reparative actions it demands in the present and for the future. As the charge powerfully states, "U-M's Inclusive History Project is a journey of institutional self-discovery committed to challenging our conception of the past and taking action that enables the university to build a truly inclusive present and future."¹

A Framing & Design Committee was appointed in fall 2022 and charged with formulating a design for this multi-year project. The committee was tasked with charting the scope and phasing of the project, planning for how various stakeholders will be engaged throughout its duration, and identifying leadership and an organizational structure that will advance the project's goals and mission. Another objective was to commission historical and benchmarking analyses, working in partnership with the Bentley Historical Library. The committee's charge also laid out many potential, far-reaching outcomes for the IHP, stretching from new scholarship, research, and courses to reimagined institutional policies and programs that seek to remedy the effects of the histories of discrimination and exclusion that the project will document.

The Inclusive History Project was charged first by President Mary Sue Coleman and then by President Santa J. Ono, and is funded by the Office of the President with a commitment to providing resources that match the scope and scale of this far-reaching and ambitious effort. However, the IHP is independent of that office, and President Ono has both pledged his support for the IHP and guaranteed its independence. In line with this pledge and guarantee, this design for the IHP has been shared with President Ono in advance of its publication, so that he might be prepared to answer questions about it.

¹ For the committee's charge, see the Appendix.

As the charge indicates, the IHP is a comprehensive project; as such, it will require multiple phases of work lasting several years. The academic year 2022–23 was designated as a planning year for the work to come, and that planning was led by the Framing & Design Committee, co-chaired by Elizabeth Cole and Earl Lewis and with 22 faculty, staff, and students drawn from across the university’s campuses. What follows is the product of this year: a design and five-year plan for the IHP’s next stage of work, including a research plan and priorities as well as a series of recommendations for additional project activities, products, and processes. Also included is an articulation of the priorities and values that must govern the Inclusive History Project’s work, and those values thread through the recommendations. This plan is meant to serve as scaffolding for the work to come, with the acknowledgment that as the work progresses, it may build out in new directions.

IV. Contextualization

Over the past 20 years, more than 100 colleges and universities have committed themselves to uncovering and reckoning with abhorrent aspects of their institutional histories. These efforts began when Brown University formed their Steering Committee on Slavery and Justice in 2003, which specifically looked at their institution’s ties to slavery and the transatlantic trade in enslaved people. The committee published a landmark report in 2006 that not only provided historical findings related to those ties and a lengthy consideration of reparations, but also offered a model—and, it should be said, a spur—to other institutions to pursue similar lines of inquiry.² Since 2006, many more institutions have launched projects that examine their institutions’ historical entanglements with slavery. Notably, as part of its President’s Commission on Slavery and the University (2013–18), the University of Virginia began and continues to lead the Universities Studying Slavery consortium, which has a long and growing list of members drawn from the United States and beyond.³ Since Brown’s foundational efforts, and with the leadership and participation of many other institutions, the move of universities to take a critical turn back to their pasts has become a movement.

More recently, colleges and universities have begun to expand past slavery and its legacies in the critical reexamination of their histories. Such projects take many forms, but a few recent examples indicate the various directions this work is taking. In 2022, Stanford

² *Report of the Brown University Steering Committee on Slavery and Justice*, 2006, <https://slaveryandjustice.brown.edu/sites/default/files/reports/SlaveryAndJustice2006.pdf>.

³ “Universities Studying Slavery,” President’s Commission on Slavery and the University, University of Virginia, accessed May 31, 2023, <https://slavery.virginia.edu/universities-studying-slavery/>.

University's Advisory Task Force on the History of Jewish Admissions and Experience found that Stanford's admissions policies in the 1950s purposefully limited the enrollment of Jewish students, and the task force offered recommendations on actions to improve the current experiences of Jewish students at Stanford.⁴ The Public History Project at the University of Wisconsin-Madison (2019–23) has reckoned with its university's history of discrimination and resistance, from its founding on land seized from Indigenous people through topics like housing discrimination, disability and racism in their classrooms, and a wide range of campus activism, right up to the present. With the Public History Project set to conclude, the university has announced that its work will continue in the newly established Rebecca M. Blank Center for Campus History.⁵ Finally, the Towards Recognition and University-Tribal Healing (TRUTH) Project is a collaborative, pathbreaking effort among the University of Minnesota, the Minnesota Indian Affairs Council, and the 11 recognized Tribal Governments of Minnesota that is devoted to researching the long relationship between the university and Indigenous peoples, and doing so in a way that is Tribally led and centers Indigenous voices. After three years of work, the project published a report in March 2023 cataloging many forms of harm, neglect, and injustice perpetrated by the university against Indigenous communities since its founding in 1851. The report also makes substantive and comprehensive recommendations on material remedies for these historical and ongoing harms, including reparations, policy changes, and more.⁶ Such projects mark a critical new turn toward examining and reckoning with the full complexity of institutional histories.

Thoroughly tracing this movement is beyond the scope of this document, not least because it continues to grow and is marked by substantial variation. With that being said, the efforts of other institutions have many lessons, both practical and conceptual, to offer the IHP. A symposium co-presented by the IHP and the Eisenberg Institute for Historical Studies (EIHS) on February 10, 2023, offered the opportunity to hear those lessons directly from representatives from Brown University, Harvard University, the University of Virginia, and the University of Wisconsin-Madison.⁷ Speakers from these universities articulated the need to

⁴ "A Matter Requiring the Utmost Discretion": A Report from the Advisory Task Force on the History of Jewish Admissions and Experience at Stanford University, September 2022, <https://news.stanford.edu/report/wp-content/uploads/sites/3/2022/10/TASK-FORCE-REPORT.pdf>.

⁵ Public History Project, University of Wisconsin-Madison, accessed May 31, 2023, <https://publichistoryproject.wisc.edu/>.

⁶ The Towards Recognition and University-Tribal Healing (TRUTH) Project, *Oshkigin Noojimo'iwe, Naḡi Waḡ Pətu Uḡ Iḡduwaś'ake He Oyate Kiḡ Zaniwiçaye Kte*, March 2023, https://mn.gov/indian-affairs/assets/full-report_tcm1193-572488.pdf.

⁷ Speakers included Kacie Lucchini Butcher (Public History Project Director, University of Wisconsin-Madison), James Campbell (Edgar E. Robinson Professor in United States History, Stanford University), Evelyn Hammonds (Barbara Gutmann Rosenkrantz Professor of the History of Science and Professor of

meaningfully involve students in the historical research being conducted and to partner with members of local communities; discussed the production and dissemination of heavily researched scholarly reports; spoke of efforts to fold the new histories into the institution's self-understanding through walking tours, curricula, and exhibits; discussed changes to the built landscape that resulted from their work, including the placement of new historical markers and the construction of memorials; and highlighted additional reparative actions that have resulted or may follow from their work. All emphasized that their efforts were lengthy and intensive, required the investment of substantial resources, and would be ongoing. The speakers also echoed a common stance that these projects take: that, as James Campbell put it, "[D]oing this kind of work is in the finest tradition of what a university is."⁸

Surveying institutional history projects clearly shows that the particular circumstances, character, and history of the institution shape its approach. This is undoubtedly true of the Inclusive History Project. Two origin points for the project are particularly noteworthy.

Over the last several years, the university has been called on to review historical names in and on buildings on the Ann Arbor campus, and accordingly established a review process to respond to requests originating from members of the university community. The review process is led by the President's Advisory Committee on University History (PACOUH).⁹ As a result of these reviews, in March 2018 the Board of Regents approved two requests to rescind and remove names from the Alexander Winchell House in the West Quadrangle Residence Hall and the Clarence Cook Little Science Building. A subsequent request related to the naming of the Yost Ice Arena for Fielding H. Yost resulted in PACOUH's preliminary recommendation to remove the name and a call for feedback from U-M community members. After reflection, the administration decided that, rather than removing a single name, a more systematic investigation of the university's history of inclusion and exclusion was necessary. Indeed, this approach to reviewing historical names demonstrated the difficulties and limited effectiveness of reckoning with the institution's complex and centuries-long past through inquiries about individual historical figures and discrete periods of time. In early 2022, President Mark Schlissel began the process of establishing a project that would undertake the systematic and comprehensive study of the university's history and offer opportunities for ongoing

African and African American Studies; Professor in the Department of Social and Behavioral Sciences, T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Harvard University; Audre Lorde Visiting Professor of Queer Studies, Spelman College), and Kirt von Daacke (Assistant Dean and Professor of History, University of Virginia).

⁸ "Confronting an Institution's Pasts," Inclusive History Project and Eisenberg Institute for Historical Studies, Feb. 10, 2023, University of Michigan, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=im8tMBbJEjs>.

⁹ More information about the university's process for historical name reviews, as well as materials related to the reviews outlined above, can be found on PACOUH's website. See "Historical Name Reviews," President's Advisory Committee on University History, University of Michigan, accessed May 31, 2023, <https://pacouh.umich.edu/historical-name-reviews/>.

engagement with diverse groups of stakeholders. The Inclusive History Project was announced in June 2022 during President Mary Sue Coleman’s interim tenure.¹⁰

A second origin point is more diffuse, but even more critical to the IHP’s beginnings and its future. The antecedents already named—the broad movement of other universities and the review of a handful of historical names on the Ann Arbor campus—certainly informed and precipitated the launch of the IHP. However, the project has a deeper and wider foundation that stretches across our campuses: an ongoing tradition of trying to more fully understand our institution’s past; of institutionalized support for and advancement of diversity, equity, and inclusion; and of holding the university accountable. For decades, campus activists at the University of Michigan have shown the need for change and worked to advance it. The IHP both acknowledges the long traditions of activism and protest at U-M and aims for its efforts to echo and amplify their calls on the university to better serve the people at the heart of its mission. The IHP is also committed to building on the university’s work toward DEI goals. Most recently, those efforts include but are not limited to U-M’s DEI Strategic Planning and Implementation Process, including both DEI 1.0 and the upcoming DEI 2.0, and a variety of anti-racism initiatives.

Even more directly, we are conscious that this project is entering a landscape where much work has been done on the topic of U-M’s history, and more particularly on its *inclusive* history. Indeed, many such projects led by students, faculty, and staff have been completed or are in progress across our campuses: in and through the Bentley Historical Library; in courses and projects led by members of the faculty, and especially in our campuses’ History departments; in the exhibits, courses, and lectures that attended the Bicentennial and programming related to the 50th anniversaries of the Dearborn and Flint campuses; in departments and schools that have also celebrated momentous anniversaries; and in partnerships with our local communities.

The IHP is entering an already populated landscape, but one that stretches across our decentralized and sprawling university. In our view, that landscape first needs to be mapped. Our ambition is to identify, collect, and catalog these existing efforts and then to partner with them, when that is appropriate and welcomed, to support their work. In finding ways to

¹⁰ A fourth request is also relevant to this history. That request was initiated by the Central Student Government in November 2021 following their passing of Assembly Resolution 11-048, “A Declarative Resolution to Remove James B. Angell’s Name from Angell Hall and the Angell Scholar Award.” The request was initially reviewed by PACOUH and, based on their findings, not recommended for full-scale review. In her letter to CSG in fall 2022 communicating this decision, President Coleman noted the launch of the Inclusive History Project as one effort to better understand the university’s history, including that related to Angell and his era. See “Angell Name Review,” President’s Advisory Committee on University History, University of Michigan, accessed May 31, 2023, <https://pacouh.umich.edu/historical-name-reviews/angell-name-review/>.

network this existing work and to bring its findings and insights to new audiences, the IHP can help to make sure that the knowledge it has created and the lessons it offers are broadly known and that this work continues across our campuses. While much work has been done, much more remains.

V. Activities

The Framing & Design Committee was fully appointed and announced in November 2022. The committee began monthly meetings in November 2022 that continued through May 2023. In January 2023, six subcommittees were formed in the main areas of planning, and began holding separate meetings to advance their areas of work. The Archives & Collections Subcommittee surveyed existing primary sources crucial to the study of the university's inclusive history in institutional and local repositories; began to identify gaps in institutional collections; and engaged with archivists, curators, librarians, and leadership in discussions of existing resources, collection development, and future collaborations. The Conceptualizing the Project Subcommittee worked to develop a structure for the IHP's research, including identifying the broad topics the IHP will study, devising a methodological approach, and suggesting a sequencing of topics. The Outreach Subcommittee supported the work of the other subcommittees by connecting their work to broader communities through planning four open forums in April 2023 and coordinating additional forms of central and targeted outreach. They also worked to devise a strategy for the IHP's future outreach activities. The Planning for Curriculum and Pedagogy Subcommittee initiated a range of efforts to identify what exists in the area of curriculum related to the IHP and engaged with units on campus to understand their work to develop and provide resources for teaching related to the university's history. The Planning for Memorialization Subcommittee began to assess current conditions regarding memorialization practices at the university in order to consider future memorialization efforts that may result from the IHP. The Reviewing Resources Subcommittee identified research and scholarship on U-M's inclusive history that already existed, began a survey of the historical landscape of DEI efforts at the university, and considered what principles and methods from these projects and efforts should be adopted for the work of the IHP moving forward.

While each subcommittee pursued its particular areas of work, they did so through common strategies and with shared goals. They helped to build a vision for the IHP by identifying touchstone principles and desired long-term impacts, collecting information, initiating literature reviews, surveying a variety of existing work across the campuses, engaging with partners both on and off our campuses through meetings and other communications, and

soliciting input and advice. In their areas of planning, subcommittees focused on formulating concrete plans and building working models for the next phase of the IHP and making a start on projects they viewed as essential to its work. The activities of several subcommittees were supported by Judah Doty and Wynter Douglas, two researchers from the Master's Research Opportunity Program (MROP) in the Center for the Study of Higher and Postsecondary Education at the Marsal Family School of Education. They identified and cataloged published scholarship, syllabi, and a range of existing projects at the university related to the IHP's work as well as materials from institutional history projects at other colleges and universities. Monthly meetings of the full committee throughout the winter term were used to coordinate among the subcommittees and seek feedback, so that each subcommittee's area of work was shared with and informed by the full committee. Subcommittees prepared final reports describing their activities, providing findings, and making recommendations for the future of the project in their planning areas.

Through these activities, the committee worked toward meeting its primary objectives of commissioning historical and benchmarking analyses and making a plan for the scope and phasing of the IHP. With regard to the first objective, and as outlined, the committee made substantial progress on gathering and synthesizing a wide variety of materials to begin these analyses. However, the committee recognized this as a particularly intensive task that could not be completed on this committee's timeline. The volume and decentralized nature of the materials needed to complete the analysis and the project's comprehensive ambitions mean that continuing to understand this landscape and how the IHP enters it will be necessary work for the next phase of the IHP. The IHP also looks forward to further developing a number of partnerships with units across the university who serve as stewards of its history, including the Bentley Historical Library.

To share information about the developing project and invite more voices into the planning process, the Framing & Design Committee conducted outreach across the university through communications and programming. The co-chairs and senior project manager held many meetings with university leadership, committees, and stakeholders to inform them of the IHP's work and plans, gather feedback, and begin forming partnerships. Likewise, Framing & Design Committee members also met with people across the university's campuses to provide updates on the project and solicit ideas and advice as they pursued the work of their subcommittees. As noted above, the project co-hosted a symposium in February 2023 with the Eisenberg Institute for Historical Studies, with a post-event survey inviting feedback on the event and the project itself. The IHP also hosted four community forums in April 2023, with in-person forums held on the UM-Ann Arbor, UM-Dearborn, and UM-Flint campuses and a virtual forum for members of all campuses. An open feedback form on the project webpage has been in place since November 2022, and many people have used it to contribute suggestions and

ideas. The IHP also issued calls on each campus to share relevant research and curricular materials, and received many helpful responses. Across these audiences, participants, and respondents, the IHP has engaged over 600 members of the U-M community this year. More work in this vein remains to be done, and outreach and engagement will be central and ongoing priorities of the project.

The thoughts and ideas about the IHP gathered through these methods deeply inform the recommendations that follow. Throughout the feedback the project received this year, there was significant interest in and support for the IHP and a desire to get involved. Of particular note was the enthusiasm regarding the inclusion of all the university's campuses in the project, which was voiced at all the forums but especially those held at UM-Dearborn and UM-Flint. We also heard from many people who said the IHP must foreground the continuing impact of the university's history on its present and embraced the reparative ambitions of the project. Dozens of people also contributed ideas for research topics for the project to pursue, which signals both the need for this project and the scope and scale of the work it must accomplish. Many emphasized the necessity of representing the history of land dispossession and the university's historical and ongoing relationships with Indigenous communities. Indeed, a consistent theme of the feedback gathered was the need for deep and meaningful engagement with neighboring communities beyond the three campuses, particularly populations who had been harmed or excluded by the historical or current policies and practices of the institution. Questions that arose often had to do with implementation: how the IHP would fund and support research, how reparative justice would be pursued, how the historical research would be sequenced, and how the IHP would accomplish all its ambitions. The plan that follows aims to provide as much clarity on these questions as is feasible at this stage.

VI. Recommendations for the Inclusive History Project

This section presents the committee's plans and recommendations for the next phase of the IHP. Each subcommittee was charged with making concrete recommendations for how the IHP's work should be undertaken with regard to their area of work. Recommendations were developed by subcommittees through their activities, which are summarized earlier in this document, and reflect the feedback the IHP received over the course of the year.

At the committee's May 11 meeting, each subcommittee presented and explained its recommendations, and the full committee discussed them. The project co-chairs then gathered the recommendations to include them here, including synthesizing recommendations that stretched across multiple areas of planning. We have noted the one instance when there was some disagreement over a recommendation.

In the Framing & Design Committee's first meeting, we began naming the principles and values that should guide our work and the project more broadly. While practical, detailed, and specific, the recommendations seek to embody and illustrate those foundational principles and values. Before turning to the recommendations, we will outline several of them:

Independence: Both the guarantee and exercise of intellectual independence are critical to the IHP's paired goals to tell a full history of the university that includes histories of discrimination and exclusion and to reckon with how such histories continue to inform our present. The IHP will pursue the full scope of this work and articulate its ideas and findings independent from central administration.

Collaboration: We see the IHP's efforts as building on existing and ongoing "inclusive history" work here at the university, and we plan for the IHP to credit and support those efforts in numerous ways. To do so, we will continue to consult with the leaders of those projects on what forms the IHP's support should take, with the recognition that projects may wish to maintain autonomy from the centralized functions of the IHP.

Broad engagement: From the beginning, the committee has been committed to building a project that covers the whole university and engages broadly across campuses, institutions, constituencies, and stakeholders. Inclusion is, of course, a key principle, with the project aiming to include faculty, staff, students, alumni, patients, and neighbors, both in the histories it will tell and the partnerships it will create. While the IHP is a centralized project that can provide leadership and visibility, the contributions of people across our campuses are vital to the project of telling an

inclusive history of the university. The IHP must build multiple ways into the project to honor this principle of inclusivity.

Community relationships: Building better relationships with a range of community members and community organizations at each of our campuses will be an important overall goal of the IHP. We recognize that the IHP enters a landscape where those relations have not always been strong or beneficial to our neighbors, and will seek ways to improve relationships and build trust.

Three campuses and Michigan Medicine: A major challenge of the IHP is its ambition to include all of the university's campuses, given that each campus is a distinct community with its own priorities, challenges, and history. To be frank, there are many people on each campus who do not think of themselves in terms of one university, which is a consequence of policies and decisions that have been made over time. The IHP must honor the investments and particularities of each campus while coordinating across them to make progress on its charge, and it can do so only by listening to a range of stakeholders on each campus and making sure each campus has the needed resources and the autonomy to pursue its work. The IHP will not center the Ann Arbor campus in its efforts, and will elevate the histories of UM-Dearborn and UM-Flint and support the efforts of members of those campuses to pursue them.

Material change: Finally, while the IHP will do rigorous scholarly work to study and document the university's history, its outcomes only begin with the production of knowledge. The project aims to engage the university's many communities in deep, meaningful reflection on that history; to bring them together to think about its implications for the university's present and future; and to produce tangible change. We must keep our focus on what knowing and engaging with a full, inclusive history of the university will produce. In other words, what can and should be different in 5–10 years because of the IHP?

The co-chairs and committee make the following recommendations in line with these stated commitments and in pursuit of the committee's charge to develop a structure for the project, map its scope and scale, and outline its future activities. The recommendations begin with a detailed plan for the historical research that the IHP will undertake. The recommendations that follow are numbered and divided into the following categories: Research Project Sites and Related Activities, Products, and Processes. Section VII presents recommendations for the university. There are a total of 20 recommendations, and the table below provides the categories and thumbnail sketches of the recommendations in them.

Table 1. Recommendation Categories and Short Descriptions			
Recommendations for the Inclusive History Project			Recommendations for the University
Research Project Sites and Related Activities	Products	Processes	
1. Include and emphasize individual stories.			
2. Establish protocols for Project Sites.	6. Produce a range of research products.	10. Create an IHP Fund to support research and teaching related to the project.	15. Guarantee insulation from a changing political climate.
3. Establish selection criteria for Project Sites.	7. Develop central repositories.	11. Provide numerous opportunities for students to engage with and contribute to the IHP.	16. Increase funding for staffing at university archives.
4. Develop sequencing of Project Sites, starting with the named Year 1 priorities.	8. Include an archival product.	12. Prioritize outreach activities.	17. Ensure access to university records for IHP researchers.
5. Perform archival gap analyses.	9. Prepare for future memorialization efforts.	13. Implement the organizational structure described.	18. Revise the records management program.
		14. Conduct annual assessments.	19. Consult the IHP on emergent issues related to the university's history.
			20. Pledge a long-term commitment to the IHP's work.

A. Research Plan and Priorities

At the center of the Framing & Design Committee's work and at the forefront of its recommendations is a structure for the historical research that the IHP will undertake. With an expansive charge to produce a comprehensive history of the university with respect to diversity, equity, and inclusion and across its campuses, the committee was faced with the question of how to approach this task. Priorities included producing a structure for the next five years that is both sturdy and flexible, so that the new directions, priorities, and lessons that will inevitably emerge from the IHP's future activities are incorporated into a structure that allows them to cohere and build. Crucially, such a structure will allow for the research produced to have a collective impact by gathering and focusing it on particularly urgent, significant, and appropriately scaled projects. The structure must also allow space for the substantial work on the university's history that both precedes the IHP and proceeds during its activities, and enable collaborations and partnerships to develop over time.

As this framing work proceeded, questions arose about the starting point designated in the committee's charge: "an initial focus on the history of race and racism." The committee worried that this initial focus would give rise to what the committee came to call the "Year Five problem," or the concern that a particular group or constituency would have to wait for years to have their issues, questions, and needs to be addressed while other groups were selected to go first. More importantly, the committee views the histories of race and racism at the university as a central and ongoing focus for the IHP, and one that must proceed simultaneously with analyses of class, gender, sexuality, etc. Accordingly, the recommended structure employs an intersectional and thematic approach, which the committee sees as the best and most responsible way to proceed despite its departure from the initial charge.

The structure includes four essential topics or themes called *Frames* and several possible *Project Sites* that are more bounded and more specific, and that nest within the Frames.

The Frames provide a loose organizational structure for the development of both specific projects and various forms of broader institutional support for project incubation and development across all three campuses. The Frames will all be launched at the start of the project and will persist across the life of the IHP, while specific Project Sites within each Frame will be launched on a rolling basis and will often be of shorter duration. This organizational structure will provide stability through the Frames and flexibility through the Project Sites, allowing the IHP to maintain a degree of openness to innovative project ideas while also

assuring that it maintains an appropriate distribution of attention and resources among various project types and topics.

The Frames are also designed to accommodate Project Sites that exist in different relationships to the IHP. A number of Project Sites will be launched by and internal to the IHP. We anticipate that additional Project Sites will emerge externally in response to the IHP or be existing, ongoing projects, and these may elect to join the IHP and be brought into dialogue with the larger project.

Within each Frame, in keeping with the architectural metaphor, the IHP will designate as *cornerstones* those Project Sites that expand or build upon preexisting efforts that overlap with the IHP mandate. Cornerstones will be foregrounded and prioritized in order to properly acknowledge and avoid replicating important past efforts. Ideally, new Project Sites will be positioned in relation to cornerstones without being limited to their original scope.

A subset of especially significant, high-profile projects will be designated as *capstones*, and will serve the purpose of documenting and disseminating major IHP outcomes in its fifth year. This culminating round of projects, which might include physical installations, major policy initiatives, curricular innovations, community engagement commitments, or other high-impact developments, will function as a series of widespread and engaging ways of highlighting particular projects, achievements, and outcomes. It might take as its model the Stumbling Blocks pop-up exhibit that was part of the President's Bicentennial Colloquium on the Future University Community and focused on challenges and difficult moments from the university's past; like the original exhibit, the IHP capstones might use the entire campus—campuses, this time—as a canvas.¹¹ We envision the initial five years of the IHP as a process of building upward and outward, *from cornerstones to capstones*, with the final product serving as a prototype for the work that will follow.

The organizational structure of the IHP, described in Recommendation 13, will implement processes and provide guidance for the selection, support, and development of proposed Project Sites. The processes will encourage broad, multifaceted engagement inside and beyond the institution in ways that enshrine collaboration while not expecting or requiring consensus. In addition, the IHP will prioritize Project Sites that explicitly incorporate a reparative dimension

¹¹Anna Haritos, "Stumbling Blocks Pop-up Exhibits Draw Attention to University's Past," *Michigan Daily*, April 4, 2017, <https://www.michigandaily.com/campus-life/stumbling-blocks-confronts-universitys-past/>.

that enables us to build out from a renewed knowledge and acknowledgment of our institution's past to make concrete commitments to reshaping the institution's future.

Example Project Sites are suggested in the outline below, as a way to illustrate the Frames and to provide concrete guidance to those leading the next phase of the IHP, who will select Project Sites to undertake. Which Project Sites will be pursued will be an iterative decision, so that Project Sites are launched each year and the full slate does not emerge until the IHP is well underway. Recommendations 2, 3, and 4 provide more detail about recommended selection, funding, and management protocols for Project Sites, specific selection criteria, and initial sequencing.

FRAME A: Origins & Trajectories

This Frame houses projects that focus on the trajectory of the university over time. Priorities here include rereading history, recontextualizing ideas, and recentering marginalized stories. With its focus on origins, 1817 serves as a logical starting point.

Example Project Sites:

The 1817 Project: This Project Site would explore the original Native American land transfer that came with a promise to educate the children of Indigenous communities as well as the pre-history of this moment. It would seek to reimagine the institution's history with the transfer at its center, in part by building on the research that has already been completed. This project might also explore broader questions of the university's originary resources and their implications.

How Did We Get Here?: This Project Site would focus on the university's origins in Detroit (and how that story has been crafted over time) as well as the history of the extension campuses and the decision to end them and consolidate in Ann Arbor. It would also consider the histories surrounding the establishment of UM-Flint and UM-Dearborn and interrogate recent attempts to foster a tri-campus sensibility and issues raised about equity.

The History of DEI at U-M: This Project Site would continue efforts initiated by the Reviewing Resources Subcommittee to trace the broader historical landscape of efforts related to diversity, equity, and inclusion at the University of Michigan, so as to share this history with the university and to inform the IHP's own efforts. Additional research would be devoted to investigating the history of efforts on the UM-Dearborn and UM-Flint

campuses and pursuing research in the following key areas: a) DEI work in the U-M professional schools, b) staff voices and experiences, and c) grassroots DEI activism by students, faculty, and staff.

FRAME B: People & Communities

This Frame includes projects that focus on the lived experiences of individuals and communities within and around our campuses and on how institutional policies, practices, and norms have affected these experiences. Project Sites in this Frame will ask how students, faculty, staff, and alumni have sought to create and inhabit a more inclusive and diverse university, despite a history of institutional barriers to full and equal access across race, gender, sexuality, disability, national origin, and citizenship/immigration status. Project Sites will highlight stories of success, empowerment, and joy in addition to those of resilience and struggle. Included in this Frame are projects that address how campus communities have impacted neighboring locales, and have been impacted by them in turn.

Example Project Sites:

African American Student Project: The AASP aims to provide a census of every African American student who attended the university for any length of time from 1853 until 1970.¹² This is a growing and living database created by the Bentley Historical Library, and would serve as a cornerstone project within this Frame.

Admissions Policies, Past and Future: This Project Site would assemble a comprehensive history of the values, priorities, and policies, as well as the broader societal trends, legal decisions, and activism, that have shaped student admissions decisions—and the constitution of the student and alumni communities—over the lifetime of the institution. This history would foreground contexts for major milestones and conflicts, consider stated and implicit rationales for ever-evolving policy positions, and review the present state of local and national conversations around 20th-century understandings of merit and meritocracy that are facing increasing challenges in the 21st. This Project Site in particular could potentially generate key policy recommendations consistent with the IHP's reparative principles, mindful of an ever-changing social, legal, and political landscape.

¹² For more information, see African American Student Project, Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan, accessed May 31, 2023, <https://africanamericanstudentproject.bentley.umich.edu/>.

FRAME C: Sites & Symbols

This Frame is designed to organize projects that set out to foreground and explore the significance to institutional life of symbolic and material sites of memorialization and commemoration. Whether they take the form of named spaces, legendary figures, public art, iconic structures, or shared rituals, these tokens of collective identity serve not only to express but also to shape and sustain systems of value that can help to forge community even as they demarcate zones of exclusion from it. Project Sites gathered under this Frame will encourage careful attention to the many ways people’s experiences within the institution are and always have been affected by both its built and symbolic landscape, often in ways that reinforce social systems of domination.

Example Project Sites:

Citizen Historian Project: This project would be a campuswide initiative dedicated to finding and documenting what is being commemorated across the three campuses—what is on the walls, whose names are enriched, where things are located, and what histories of the institution are and are not encountered as people move across the campuses. Modeled on Citizen Science initiatives, the IHP would sponsor this mass crowdsource initiative to document what we remember (and what we do not) in a participatory way that would yield intriguing datasets and visualizations.¹³

Campus Athletics: An historical ethnography of the university’s storied athletic culture might focus on the ever-shifting lexicon of symbols, slogans, and rituals that have carried and catalyzed powerful forms of group identification and belonging among students and alumni, but may also, at times, have done so in ways that have masked corrosive and racially tinged practices of exploitation and exclusion.

FRAME D: Research and Teaching

This Frame foregrounds the centrality of knowledge production to the university’s mission across time and place. It is intended to encourage reflection on how research and teaching have been defined, articulated, and practiced, how they have been resourced and evaluated, and

¹³ Citizen Science is a broad movement characterized by active public participation in scientific research, with members of the public volunteering to collect data and contribute in other ways to ongoing research of various kinds. For one example, see “About CitizenScience.gov,” CitizenScience.gov, U.S. General Services Administration, accessed May 31, 2023, <https://www.citizenscience.gov/about/>.

what the implications of these contingent understandings of the university's core activities have been for the education of our students and our contributions to society at large.

Example Project Sites:

Detroit Research Inventory: This project would set out to develop a broadly representative overview of the history of university research efforts focused in or on Detroit, with the aim of better understanding how the university's relationship with the city has evolved over time and how deeply rooted disciplinary norms and assumptions have shaped—and perhaps in turn been shaped by—engagements of various kinds with Detroit residents.

Curriculum Development Timeline: The growth and changes over time of an institution's curricular offerings and requirements say a great deal about the evolution of its priorities, values, and understandings of what, at particular historical moments, has been seen to constitute important and legitimate forms of knowledge—and what has not. This project would focus on significant milestones in curriculum development at the department and school/college levels, with an emphasis on salient points of intersection between the country's racial history and embedded pedagogical and epistemological assumptions.

B. Research Project Sites and Related Activities

Recommendation 1: Include and emphasize individual stories.

The IHP is intended to be more than an institutional history. We hope the IHP will always try to center methods of work that foreground individual stories, from all angles. Where policies and decisions that excluded certain people in the past were the work of individuals, the IHP should highlight their responsibility, while not neglecting to call attention to the deeply embedded institutional scripts such individuals followed, which help to normalize and reproduce collective norms and values. Similarly, communities or categories of people may have been excluded from the university in the past, but that exclusion was experienced by individuals. Finding ways to tell the story of the institution through individual voices will be a key challenge, as will discovering ways to capture narratives of decisions or conversations that people did not want written down. Difficult moments in institutions often go deliberately undocumented, yet those are the moments that often have the greatest impact on who is included or excluded. Such moments should be part of the histories the IHP brings forward. This recommendation cuts across all aspects of the IHP, and should be a guiding priority for its work.

Recommendation 2: Establish selection, funding, and management protocols for Project Sites.

Some Project Sites will be initiated, led, and managed by the IHP and its staff; others already exist and may elect to be affiliated with the IHP; still others will emerge from outside the project and in response to it. The IHP should encourage activity in each of these zones and, to the degree possible, capture what has been learned to better tell a full and wide-ranging history of the university. Over the course of the next five years, a limited number (10–25) of centrally originated Project Sites should be selected, so that the IHP may fully pursue them and they may have a collective impact. Each year, an open call should be issued for proposals for affiliated Project Sites, and the IHP should also engage in the targeted cultivation of projects to ensure equitable and full representation. Project Site management guidelines for resource allocation, project coordination, project scale and number, and balance among project types should be developed along with short- and long-term budget plans that fully account for the scale of the undertaking, and explicitly foreground equity considerations to enable broad participation across multiple campuses and stakeholder groups.

Recommendation 3: Establish detailed and transparent selection criteria for Project Sites.

These criteria should ensure that all Project Sites are situated in relation to the IHP vision statement, established Frames, and desired outcomes while contributing to the overall breadth of the IHP. Specific criteria may include clearly defined research components; a curricular component and/or a public pedagogy and engagement dimension; explicit connections between historical content and present-day experiences and concerns; concrete connections with, or the potential to build upon, relevant past or ongoing efforts within and beyond the university; awareness of and adherence to relevant best practices in community engagement work; the production of a new archive or other resource that can support future research; a reparative dimension focused on the development of specific ideas for material commitments and/or policy changes to address past harms and devise a more just course for the future; and the potential to lead to IHP capstone efforts. More broadly, the IHP offers the particular opportunity to pursue projects that are large in scope and nature and that need institutional backing and support because of their potential to generate controversy. The IHP should ensure such projects are included and prioritized.

Recommendation 4: In Year 1, announce and launch all four Frames and selected Project Sites, with decisions about the sequencing of future Project Sites to be made as the IHP progresses.

The IHP's year-by-year sequencing of Project Sites within the Frames is a complex decision that must be informed by a number of factors, so decisions about the launch of individual Project Sites should be made on a rolling basis as the IHP progresses. For year 1, place primary emphasis on Project Sites in Frame A: Origins & Trajectories and Frame B: People & Communities to honor the IHP's tri-campus commitments and its emphasis on putting people first. Among these Project Sites should be The 1817 Project, the African American Student Project, and others to be identified that focus on the regional campuses and Michigan Medicine. New Project Sites in each Frame should be launched in years 2, 3, and 4. By the end of year 4, inventory and complete all projects in terms of acknowledgment, achievement, and accountability. In year 5, shift attention to the IHP's capstones as a way of bringing this phase of the IHP to a close.

Recommendation 5: Perform archival gap analyses for each Project Site.

What stories are not told about the history of the university because it seems like the sources do not exist or are not available? How can potential sources that address such gaps be identified and made available? The IHP's particular Project Sites will dictate what archives and collections will be required. As those requirements come to light, the IHP should develop a process to identify archival gaps, also known as archival silences, and find ways to fill them. These strategies might include class projects that focus on surveying gaps in archival holdings on campus relevant to particular histories; appeals to alumni for materials related to specific histories; and engagement with segments of the university, such as the Office of University Development, the Alumni Association, and the Office of the Vice President and General Counsel, that have records that may not be included in the university's official archives. In addition, while there are many reasons these gaps in our knowledge exist, acknowledging archival silences that result from the unintentional or purposeful absence or distortion of documentation will be essential to this process. Throughout this year, we have heard repeatedly that many communities, groups, and individuals whose stories we seek to tell with the IHP are distrustful of institutional archives and interested in finding ways to develop and sustain community archives. The IHP's efforts at gap analysis should assess the reasons for this distrust and generate suggestions for changes in institutional policies and funding priorities that may improve trust and faith in institutional repositories and in policies related to the university's relationship to community archives.

C. Products

Recommendation 6: The IHP should create a range of products that disseminate its research findings and enable meaningful engagement with them across the university.

To realize the IHP's aspiration to create cultural change at the university, the historical research and scholarship that are central to the IHP should be aimed at a variety of audiences and disseminated in a variety of ways, including through publications, course materials, digital resources, new campus orientations for faculty, students, and staff, and more. Findings from the IHP should be shared as they are available throughout the next five years, at least annually. In addition, the IHP should develop an annual cycle of public events, which might include a high-profile event focusing on new findings and compelling storytelling and designed around what is restorative and reparative about the IHP's work. We also recommend producing a final scholarly report at the end of the five years that gathers the research produced.

Recommendation 7: Develop central repositories of a variety of materials and information related to the IHP.

For a university that has long prided itself on decentralization, we see the need for some degree of centralization when it comes to resources about our history and how it is told and represented across our campuses. Likewise, there is a range of university information relevant to the university's history that would benefit from being systematically collected and updated. Over the course of this year, Framing & Design Committee members repeatedly observed how materials pertinent to the IHP seemed to exist everywhere, and initiated efforts to collect them. Part of the IHP's work in the future should be both to continue these efforts and to make the collected materials available and accessible by building repositories to be housed on a future IHP website. These repositories should include existing syllabi and curricular materials related to the IHP or developed through its efforts, information and resources from the variety of projects undertaken on the university's history that exist across the university, and more. Importantly, such materials should be shared only with the permission of their creators, and with attribution. We see developing and maintaining such repositories as offering numerous benefits. The assembled materials would allow for a more comprehensive understanding of the university's current capabilities, needs, and areas of opportunity as they pertain to IHP-related research, curriculum, and programming. More centralized access to these kinds of materials also advances the goal of transforming systems and culture by reducing redundancy and duplication of effort, promoting cross-campus and cross-unit collaborations and engagement, and providing models for those in the start-up stages of projects. Building and maintaining

repositories would therefore help to communicate the expansive opportunities for faculty, staff, students, and community members alike to actively participate in the IHP while also allowing the university to signal the depth of its investment in this domain.

Recommendation 8: The IHP should include an archival product.

Whatever collections this project draws on that currently exist in collecting units on our campuses, as well as those collections that are identified and developed as part of the IHP's work, should be accessible to community members now and in the future, to the extent that the owners of those materials are willing to allow. Archival creation, maintenance, and access are crucial for the success of the IHP's inquiry and for meeting its goal of producing meaningful historical insights. The IHP should therefore include an archival product that will exist after the IHP has concluded and be accessible to all interested parties to support future research. Provision of digital access to materials (when possible) should be a guiding principle, especially when working with community archives and their stakeholders. A key challenge will be how to build an archival product that would live outside a formal, institutional archival space and be structured on processes of community archiving in order to provide groups that do not want their materials to be part of an official U-M archive a method for contributing to the project. Building trust with these groups should be a crucial part of the IHP.

Recommendation 9: Memorialization efforts, including the placement of new memorials and the potential revision of existing ones, should be part of the IHP and flow from its future research findings.

The IHP believes that proposing new or revised memorialization will appropriately follow from the historical work and engagement activities the project undertakes in the years to come. All proposed changes should be developed through thoughtful, transparent processes and the broad engagement of a diverse group of university stakeholders. For now, the IHP should prepare for future memorialization efforts through two strategies: learning more about critical contexts, and undertaking pilot projects that allow for the reconsideration of existing memorialization and representation practices in individual units. First, the IHP should continue efforts started by the Memorialization Subcommittee to learn about contexts critical to any future efforts to propose new memorials or change existing ones. The Memorialization Subcommittee began to construct a comprehensive census of building names, named professorships, etc., on the three campuses, and in doing so noted the significant time and resources that would be required to complete it. Future efforts may include, but are not limited to, surveying existing memorials across the university's campuses (including names in and on

buildings), surveying peer institutions' policies and practices regarding the retrospective evaluation of memorials on their campuses, and reviewing the empirical literature as to the effects of memorialization on diverse stakeholders. There was some disagreement on the committee about the appropriate course of action with regard to memorialization efforts, particularly concerning whether the IHP should embark on cataloging and analyzing all existing memorialization in order to make comprehensive recommendations about needed changes. We recommend that the IHP should start small and take a grassroots approach. Therefore, the IHP should support pilot projects that seek to inventory and consider what is represented through the names, artwork, and images that are currently on display in individual units or prominent public spaces. Such projects should be undertaken only with the invitation and participation of members of those units, and should provide opportunities for developing processes and tools for future projects. The Citizen Historian project, described as an Example Project Site in the Sites & Symbols Frame, offers additional opportunities in this regard. For an additional recommendation at the university level pertaining to questions of memorials and naming, see Recommendation 19.

D. Processes

Recommendation 10: Create an Inclusive History Project Fund to support small-scale research initiatives and teaching innovations.

The IHP should serve as a locus for a range of activities and partnerships related to its mission. As such, it should provide funding for faculty, students, and staff on all three campuses to undertake research projects and engage in the development of courses, experiential activities, and community engagement activities that facilitate learning about and communicating U-M's history. Grants may take the form of start-up or seed funding for new ideas, funding for existing projects to propel them to completion or expansion, and/or funding targeted to different groups. As part of the support offered, the IHP should provide consultations and facilitate connections to other resources across the university, including potential institutional partners and the leaders of similar projects. For instance, those funded might participate in a workshop each year to share perspectives, resources, and best practices. In line with these goals, the process for awarding funding and the monetary range of the awards will need to be determined.

Recommendation 11: The IHP should develop and support a range of opportunities for undergraduate and graduate students to engage with the project, meaningfully contribute to its research activities, and learn from its findings.

There should be many ways, both curricular and co-curricular, for students across U-M's campuses to be involved with the IHP. With regard to curriculum, the IHP should continue efforts begun this year to engage with units and stakeholders on campus to understand ongoing efforts to teach topics related to the university's history, with an eye to developing new curricular materials based on the IHP's future findings and making them widely available to instructors for their use. The IHP should also engage with institutional partners, such as the Center for Research on Learning and Teaching (CRLT) at Ann Arbor, the Hub for Teaching and Learning Resources at Dearborn, and the Thompson Center for Learning and Teaching at Flint, to identify common needs and potential opportunities to incentivize and support the involvement of faculty and student instructors in courses related to the university's inclusive history. In addition, students should also participate in the IHP through research assistantships, internships, and other forms of compensated or for-credit work and be encouraged and supported to pursue independent research projects related to its mission, whether those take the form of undergraduate or graduate theses, projects supported by the IHP Fund, or other opportunities.

Recommendation 12: Conduct transparent, accessible, inclusive, and effective outreach activities that lead to institutional transformation.

IHP outreach should not only facilitate a clear-eyed look into the history of the University of Michigan but also contribute to fostering meaningful changes in how the institution will operate going forward. Outreach activities should disseminate information as well as provide access points for individuals and groups to be continuously involved and engaged in IHP activities, with an emphasis on soliciting input and developing relationships. To accomplish these goals, the IHP should employ the following strategies:

Strategy A: Coordinate communications. Effective coordination and communication with on- and off-campus U-M organizations, campuses, and non-UM affiliates are critical to the success of the IHP's mission. Centralized coordination should be established to ensure consistent communication and effective implementation across all elements of the IHP's activities, and should also focus on ensuring that grassroots efforts and developing partnerships play a significant role in contributing to the IHP. Strategies should include centralized outreach, as described in Strategy C below, as well as

targeted outreach to institutions, organizations, and individuals. Because many projects will take place under the IHP's umbrella, the IHP should assume responsibility for overseeing communication, fostering collaboration, and onboarding new projects to follow outreach protocols. A well-staffed structure is necessary to provide this centralized coordination.

Strategy B: Ensure inclusive best practices. A Best Practices Guide should be developed to provide clear guidelines for making the values, activities, and products of the IHP transparent and accessible by using best practices for language and engagement in all outreach activities. This guide should contain an inclusive language guide to cover the different constituencies and stakeholders for the IHP and guidelines on approaches to outreach that are non-extractive and trust building.

Strategy C: Provide accessible and timely public relations. The IHP should develop a range of public-facing materials that are accessible to all whom the IHP aspires to reach and include timely and interactive elements. At the center of this strategy is a public-facing website that serves as a robust engagement tool, with information about the project's vision; updates about its ongoing historical research; additional news and events; resources like syllabi, bibliographies, and toolkits; and ways to connect with the project. Marketing materials and opportunities should include events, regular newsletters, media coverage, and more.

Recommendation 13: The following organizational structure is recommended for the next stage of the IHP.

To ensure continuity, the current project leadership and administration should continue; these roles include the two current IHP co-chairs and senior project manager. Additional leadership roles should be added in the form of directors on each campus, who will be responsible for overseeing and advancing the research and engagement efforts on their campuses and for helping to guide the IHP more broadly. These positions should be administrative appointments at quarter or half effort to allow dedicated time to pursue this important work.

An executive committee composed of the above leadership should be responsible for decision-making with regard to the project. The project should also have a separate, larger advisory committee drawn from across the three campuses and Michigan Medicine, including faculty, staff, students, alumni, and local community members, with responsibility for advising the project, providing open avenues of communication to their units and constituencies, and

helping to promote the project's objectives. Beyond these leadership roles and committees, a robust research staff should be hired, to include postdoctoral fellows, graduate and undergraduate students, etc.

Importantly, structures for research and engagement on each campus should reflect their realities, priorities, and distinctive characters. Each campus should have the autonomy and the necessary support, resources, and staffing to pursue the IHP's overarching work in their particular context. In short, each of the university's campuses should tell its own history, and that history should be shared with the entire university as relevant to our shared story.

Recommendation 14: IHP leadership should undertake regular assessments to evaluate needs and opportunities and adjust the project structure accordingly.

We expect the IHP to grow and evolve as it progresses, and regular assessments will provide an opportunity to evaluate the work that has been accomplished, share progress and results, and make necessary adjustments to the alignment of the project's priorities, activities, and structure. These assessments should also evaluate what areas and topics IHP research has covered thus far and what gaps remain, both for this phase of the project and for the future.

VII. Recommendations for the University

While the previous recommendations lay out the work that will be central to the IHP over the next five years, in this section we turn to recommendations that point to broader institutional conditions needed to enable that work. Below we set out additional key recommendations—some related to funding, some to policy—that will be required for an honest and wide-ranging reckoning with the university’s history. In making these recommendations, we recognize the institutional support that has been afforded to the IHP thus far and the commitment it represents to the work to come. We also acknowledge that some of these recommendations may not be implemented immediately, but we believe the various forms of institutional support named below are necessary to move the work of the IHP forward and to realize its expansive ambitions.

As the IHP begins its research activities, we anticipate that additional recommendations on matters of university policy linked to those activities may emerge.

Recommendation 15: In order to continue and complete its work, the IHP must be insulated from potential changes to political configurations in the state of Michigan.

Guided by the knowledge that the University of Michigan has a level of constitutional autonomy and assured by the consistent support of President Ono, we presume that a shift in the political winds will not affect our study of the university’s history, the necessary representation of its histories of inclusion and exclusion, and its demonstration of the need for repair. Nonetheless, we are cognizant of the moment and affirm that the support of leadership is ever more crucial not only for this project, but also for the kinds of free inquiry it represents.

Recommendation 16: Increase funding for staffing at the Bentley Historical Library, the Genesee Historical Collections Center at UM-Flint, and the UM-Dearborn Campus Archive, in two key areas: processing and oral history.

We expect that the IHP will place considerable demands on the archives of our campuses, and will also present opportunities to expand those archives as outlined in Recommendation 8. Additional staff resources will therefore be necessary, including resources dedicated to the collection and preservation of oral histories that capture the experiences of individual members of the U-M community. Funding for permanent positions at the Bentley, the Genesee Historical Collections Center, and the UM-Dearborn Campus Archive must be provided. Additional funding for student positions—for both undergraduate and graduate students—would expand

the impact of this work more broadly throughout the university community. In the future, increases to the budgets of these archives may be necessary so that they are able to fully support activities related to the IHP, including by digitizing materials.

Recommendation 17: Ensure access to university records for IHP researchers, and begin a critical reexamination of current policies governing access to these records.

Project researchers must have access to the entirety of the university's records for good-faith critical retellings of our institutional histories. An institutional commitment should be made to provide IHP members with access to those records, including unit-based collections on campus that typically might not share materials with researchers. Because access to university records will continue to be a necessary condition of the IHP's work, we recommend a critical reexamination of current policies and processes pertaining to access, to include the university's current 20-year embargo period for records from deans, directors, and executive officers. In addition, we expect a need to revisit protocols for securing materials as a result of Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests. This reexamination should involve diverse stakeholders as well as representation from the Office of the Vice President and General Counsel (OGC). In the course of this year's work, and in dialogue with those who have been engaged in research on U-M's recent past, we identified these as potential obstacles not only to IHP researchers but to all those who are interested in studying the university's past.

Recommendation 18: Revise the university's records management program.

In consultation with the Senate Advisory Committee on University Affairs (SACUA), provide units with more systematic and explicit guidance on what materials should ultimately end up in the university's archives. Such changes to current archival practices are forward looking, allowing for the possibility that future projects like this one will have the materials they need to study our present moment.

Recommendation 19: When future questions about the university's history or concerns about historical naming arise, the IHP should play a consultative role in determining how to address them.

The IHP should serve as both a hub of research on the university and a steward of its history. As the project develops, it may call into question current structures like the President's Advisory Committee on University History (PACOUH) and offer suggestions as to how they should evolve.

In the meantime, on emergent issues the IHP should serve in a consultative role to the Office of the President in concert with PACOUH.

Recommendation 20: This first five-year phase of the IHP's efforts should mark the beginning of a long-term commitment to its work.

We are purposefully bounding this first phase of the project so that it may culminate and conclude, and thereby allow for a pause and a full assessment of what should come next. Over the course of the next five years, and with thoughtful reflection on what the IHP has accomplished and what work remains, we will develop recommendations for how best to continue and institutionalize its work, which may include establishing a permanent Center for University History.

VIII. Vision for the Inclusive History Project

At the center of the committee's activities this year has been a conviction that the work of the Inclusive History Project should transform the university in many ways, which we describe in the paragraphs that follow. This transformation will occur through the histories produced, the processes engaged, the policies altered, the practices redesigned, and the range of reparative actions prompted. We provide a broad vision for the IHP here, as a culmination of this year's work and a guide for what is to come.

We envision a university community, instructed by a deep understanding of its past, that works to create an inclusive environment and a sense of belonging in the present and for the future. We recognize that the university serves and is embedded within larger communities in the state of Michigan, and we seek to understand the effects of the institution on those broader communities as well as its national and global impact.

In this envisioned community, we intentionally ask profoundly uncomfortable questions about how university policies and practices have included and elevated some, while excluding and erasing the contributions of others, and we work to craft programs, policies, and practices that avoid continued harm and promote repair. In this context, we understand that this will require us to address questions of discrimination on the basis of race, religion, gender, sexuality, class, and more.

We see our work as a multifaceted, multi-year effort, premised on a willingness to respectfully agree and disagree. Crucially, this work requires honest engagement with our past and the ways it continues to shape community members' experiences within the institution today. It requires us to create opportunities in multiple settings to share new knowledge and to grapple with its significance for the work of the university going forward. This work will demand sustained effort, honesty, and courage.

It starts with a thoughtful plan, one that considers matters of archives and resources, people and organizations, curriculum and pedagogy, engagement and outreach, memorialization and representation, existing work and the work to come.

Following the work of an initial framing and design committee, subsequent committees will explore the university's history through the themes of origins and trajectories, people and communities, sites and symbols, and research and teaching. Throughout, the approach will be

both chronological and thematic, intersectional and group specific. It is our goal that through these themes all of the university's communities will see themselves reflected in the project. The final products we imagine will touch on all dimensions of the university and its campuses, from governance and leadership to names on buildings, from patient care to athletics, from the student experience to faculty affairs, from the actions of staff to the reach of alumni, from the stories we have told about ourselves to the new stories we will tell about ourselves.

The measure of our collective success derives from where we start and how forthrightly we address our successes and failures. Our goal is not to criticize the university but, through a comprehensive look at its past, to point the way to a better future. In the end we hope to deepen and enliven our collective identity and produce tangible examples of institutional change.

IX. Acknowledgments

The Framing & Design Committee thanks all those who supported its work over the course of this year. In particular, many members of the U-M community engaged with the Inclusive History Project by sharing their thoughts and ideas in meetings, over email, in the open forums, and through other means, and this plan is stronger for it. We also extend our gratitude to all those who responded to our queries with key information, thoughtful advice, and crucial context, and to those who reached out to us with suggestions, invitations, questions, and support.

Members of the staff of the National Center for Institutional Diversity were key partners this year, especially Janine Leah Capsouras, Administrative Coordinator; Charlotte Ezzo, Communications Specialist; Edmund Graham, Associate Director; and Mary Lai Rose, Anti-Racism Collaborative Program Manager.

Crucial support for communications was provided by Michigan Creative and by the Office of the Vice President for Communications, and especially Lauren Love, Senior Public Affairs Representative, and Nikki Sunstrum, now Assistant Vice President of Strategic Communications at Indiana University. Meetings and events throughout the year were supported by University Unions at the Ann Arbor campus; University Unions and Events at the Dearborn campus; Conferences and Events at the Flint campus; and the College of Literature, Science, and the Arts Technology Services, especially Christopher Taylor.

As earlier sections of this document make clear, the committee has benefited from the efforts of many other colleges and universities to critically reexamine their histories. The opportunity to learn directly from leaders of such efforts at our February symposium came at a crucial moment. We offer thanks to our speakers—Kacie Lucchini Butcher, James Campbell, Evelyn Hammonds, and Kirt von Daacke—and to our partners at the Eisenberg Institute for Historical Studies: John Carson, Elizabeth Collins, and Gregory Parker.

Finally, we thank all of you who want the work of recovery, analysis, critique, and transformation to have started already. Over the course of this past year, we heard from several of you eager to get started. With the planning and design completed, we look forward to engaging you in the work ahead. We appreciate both your patience and your sense of urgency.

X. Appendix: Framing & Design Committee Charge

U-M Inclusive History Project Framing & Design Committee Mission	<p>U-M’s Inclusive History Project is a journey of institutional self-discovery committed to challenging our conception of the past and taking action that enables the university to build a truly inclusive present and future. The Framing & Design Committee will chart the course of this journey and complete its first leg with comprehensive and thoughtful historical analysis and community engagement.</p>
Sponsorship	<p>Santa J. Ono, President</p>
Statement of Purpose	<p>To frame and design a comprehensive project that will study, document, and engage the present and future U-M community in understanding the university’s history with respect to diversity, equity, and inclusion with an initial focus on the history of race and racism. The range of possible outcomes of the overall project could include (but are not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● the development of new scholarship, research, and courses; ● new expressions of a more inclusive and accurate institutional narrative for use in settings such as exhibits, campus tours, websites, updated ceremonies, and other forms of institutional storytelling; ● new and revitalized community relationships and partnerships; ● changes in our institutional landscape and physical environment such as new kinds of monuments and public art; ● new and revised building and space names; ● expiation and other acts directed at alumni and others who have been in some measure harmed by earlier practices and policies; ● new institutional programs and policies that address the contemporary effects of historical and systemic racism and other forms of discrimination and exclusion on our community including but not limited to actions as permitted by law in areas such as admissions, financial aid, and faculty and staff hiring, promotion, and compensation; and ● many other tangible ideas that will emerge from a thoughtful and engaged process.

Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Commission the necessary historical and benchmarking analyses, working in close partnership with the Bentley Historical Library. ● Map the scope and subsequent phasing of the project, including (but not limited to): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Creating a process for robust and broad community outreach and engagement including deep engagement with our internal and extended external communities, such as the African American community in Detroit, Native American tribes in Northern Michigan, multi-generation alumni, and staff families to develop a fuller understanding of our past and the contemporary effects of our history. ○ Identifying leadership and an organizational structure for carrying out the subsequent phases of the project that will be focused on developing recommendations for action.
Scope	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● University of Michigan’s history with respect to diversity, equity, and inclusion, with an initial focus on race and racism ● All campuses (Ann Arbor, Dearborn, and Flint)
Membership	<p>Co-Chairs Elizabeth R. Cole, University Diversity and Social Transformation Professor of Psychology, Women's and Gender Studies, and Afroamerican and African Studies and Director, National Center for Institutional Diversity, College of Literature, Science, and the Arts, University of Michigan-Ann Arbor</p> <p>Earl Lewis, Thomas C. Holt Distinguished University Professor of History, Afroamerican and African Studies and Public Policy and Director, Center for Social Solutions, College of Literature, Science, and the Arts and Gerald R. Ford School of Public Policy, University of Michigan-Ann Arbor</p> <p>Committee Members [Full committee roster provided in Section I]</p> <p>Staff Support Jennifer Brady, Sr. Project Manager</p>
Resources	Budgetary resources will be provided that are appropriate to the ambitious scale and scope of this project and will be supported by the President’s Office.
Timeline	Fall 2022 through Spring 2023 (with the possible need of extension)
Progress Reports	As needed

XI. List of References

Haritos, Anna. "Stumbling Blocks Pop-up Exhibits Draw Attention to University's Past." *Michigan Daily*, April 4, 2017. <https://www.michigandaily.com/campus-life/stumbling-blocks-confronts-universitys-past/>.

Inclusive History Project and Eisenberg Institute for Historical Studies. "Confronting an Institution's Pasts." Feb. 10, 2023. University of Michigan. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=im8tMBbJEjs>.

"A Matter Requiring the Utmost Discretion": A Report from the Advisory Task Force on the History of Jewish Admissions and Experience at Stanford University. September 2022. <https://news.stanford.edu/report/wp-content/uploads/sites/3/2022/10/TASK-FORCE-REPORT.pdf>.

Report of the Brown University Steering Committee on Slavery and Justice. 2006. <https://slaveryandjustice.brown.edu/sites/default/files/reports/SlaveryAndJustice2006.pdf>.

The Towards Recognition and University-Tribal Healing (TRUTH) Project. *Oshkigin Noojimo'iwe, Naġi Waŋ Țetu Uŋ Ihduwaš'ake He Oyate Kiŋ Zaniwiçaye Kte*. March 2023. https://mn.gov/indian-affairs/assets/full-report_tcm1193-572488.pdf.

University of Michigan. African American Student Project. Bentley Historical Library. Accessed May 31, 2023. <https://africanamericanstudentproject.bentley.umich.edu/>.

University of Michigan. "Angell Name Review." President's Advisory Committee on University History. Accessed May 31, 2023. <https://pacouh.umich.edu/historical-name-reviews/angell-name-review/>.

University of Michigan. "Historical Name Reviews." President's Advisory Committee on University History. Accessed May 31, 2023. <https://pacouh.umich.edu/historical-name-reviews/>.

University of Virginia. "Universities Studying Slavery." President's Commission on Slavery and the University. Accessed May 31, 2023. <https://slavery.virginia.edu/universities-studying-slavery/>.

University of Wisconsin-Madison. Public History Project. Accessed May 31, 2023.
<https://publichistoryproject.wisc.edu/>.

U.S. General Services Administration. "About CitizenScience.gov." CitizenScience.gov. Accessed May 31, 2023. <https://www.citizenscience.gov/about/>.