## 1. Defining Context

Please describe your institutional context, specifying the characteristics, traits, and conditions that influence your inclusive excellence work.

### Response

Kalamazoo is a liberal arts college with nearly 1500 students and 111 full-time faculty. We are STEM intensive with nearly 30% of students graduating in a STEM discipline. Kalamazoo is known for our K-Plan with significant experiential components: internships, civic engagement, study abroad, and a required Senior Individualized Project (SIP). We are also known for our Arcus Center for Social Justice Leadership, which runs programming for the campus, local, national, and international communities. Over the past 12 years, through intentional recruitment efforts, the student body has changed dramatically. The percentage of students of color has more than doubled from 14% to 33%, the percentage of students underrepresented in STEM (American Indian/Alaska Native, Black/African American, Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander, Hispanic/Latinx–URM) has tripled from 8% to 24%, and 17% of our students are first-generation (FG). Our campus now much more closely mirrors the nation’s diversity.

Kalamazoo is now at a crossroads where we must either be content with being a diverse institution, or decide to engage in the difficult transformative work to become a truly inclusive institution. Through careful introspection during the development of our proposal, we brought to light entrenched institutional barriers to full inclusion. We know our URM/FG students persist in STEM at lower rates, have lower GPAs on average, and enroll in graduate and professional school at lower rates than majority students. While most do a SIP in their major, students can choose to do a SIP in another department. We have found that URM science majors are less likely than their
majority peers to do a SIP in science. Focus groups, surveys, interviews conducted by external reviewers, and reports from student services reveal that many URM students feel marginalized in classrooms, labs, and academic support programs. Experiences include feeling underprepared, not being listened to during group work, and being tokenized.

Our students are more than ready for change. With the IE initiative as an important catalyst, our faculty has begun introspective work on how we need to change, and we are beginning to take steps toward realizing that change. We have a relatively new administration (our President, Jorge Gonzalez took office in July 2016 and our Provost Danette Ifert Johnson began her duties in July 2019) that voices support for our inclusivity efforts. Our Board of Trustees is more removed from and ambivalent toward our efforts. As would be expected, newer, younger board members are fully with us, while older board members express concern over K potentially losing its distinctiveness in STEM education if we move toward inclusivity.

2. Assessing and Understanding Institutional Contexts

Given your response to PIER Question #1, in what ways does your institutional context negatively and/or positively influence the implementation of your project activities?

Response

We start with the positive influences. We have a faculty, staff, and administration that are largely willing to engage with change, even if we do not yet know fully what that will entail. Our faculty is slowly diversifying and we are changing our hiring, tenure and promotion policies to encourage further diversification. We have small, relatively interconnected STEM departments with a structure and history of regular interactions. All departments have been engaged in the development of our IE proposal. The Arcus Center is a huge resource that we are working to engage with on this initiative. As a small college, we feel we have more potential for our efforts to spread across the institution and reach hesitant or resistant pockets. Although many faculty strongly support union rights and wish we could unionize, our discussions with other institutions make clear that the fact that we do not have a faculty union to also bring on board makes us more nimble in changing hiring tenure and promotion policies.

Now for negative influences. Like many institutions of higher education, we developed as a white (unspoken) elite (loudly spoken) college. Many formal and informal structures that served those characteristics remain. We have a long history of hierarchical, centralized, secretive decision making. We have weak department and division chairs with much power concentrated in the offices of the President and Provost. Closed-door sessions are the norm for meetings of the BOT and President’s staff. Despite our faculty governance structure, many of the most important college decisions are simply handed down. As much as we recognize this and wish to change this, such structures have influenced and impeded our initial implementation efforts, even by those of us trying to do the implementation. Our IE initiative is STEM-centered but necessarily and intentionally intersects with other campus segments. The “two cultures” problem exists on our campus as well and impedes efforts to interact with the social sciences and humanities. Student services are largely separated from the faculty governance structures, which has impeded our efforts to work with those offices.

3. Defining Institutional Aspirations

Based on your understanding of your institutional context and its influence – either negative or positive – on your project, please define (or re-define) your current and future aspirations for inclusive excellence at your institution.

Response

Kalamazoo College remains committed to high quality, inclusive STEM education. We continue to believe that this starts with faculty and staff who are aware of their implicit biases, actively work to mitigate those biases, and understand how racism and other forms of oppression function at the personal and institutional level. Such culturally competent individuals will be better able to foster equitable, inclusive, socially relevant learning environments in which all students can succeed and thrive. When realized, our entire structure, from our
mission, to policies and practices, physical spaces, curricula, and individual attitudes will be based on full recognition and participation of students who represent our nation’s diversity. We remain committed to our original 3 prongs—which we have termed CARE (Committing to Anti-Racism Education), INTRO (INclusive Teaching and Revised On-ramps) and REWARD (REWarding Anti-Racism faculty Development).

CARE. We commit to develop culturally competent faculty and staff who are better able to connect with the varied backgrounds and value systems of our students. We choose to lead with the heart. We believe lasting change will come when enough people really want to change rather than feel they have to. We believe changing hearts (hard, introspective work) will lead to natural desire to change pedagogy and interpersonal relationships. This will lead to all students feeling a true sense of belonging which will result in natural engagement and resilience.

We are especially moved by the following quote, brought to our attention at IE 2019 “Anti-racist pedagogy is not about simply incorporating racial content into courses, curriculum, and discipline. It is also about how one teaches, even in courses where race is not the subject matter. It begins with the faculty’s awareness and self-reflection of their social position and leads to the application of this analysis not just in their teaching, but also in their discipline, research, and departmental, university, and community work. In other words, anti-racist pedagogy is an organizing effort for institutional and social change that is much broader than teaching in the classroom.” Kishimoto, 2018

INTRO. We will revise our introductory STEM curriculum to integrate career capital, emphasize shared concepts among disciplines and interface with enhanced academic support centers.

REWARD. We are revising hiring, tenure and promotion policies to reward cultural competency and inclusive practices.

An area which demands further programming is the inclusion of student voices. Our STEM departments recently formed student councils to solicit and channel voices to the faculty, and the CLT wishes to formalize this into our efforts. Several ideas were discussed at the IE 2019 meeting.

4. Reconceiving/Re-Conceptualizing the Future

How do your current aspirations inform project thinking, approaches, and practices? Describe how specific project activities are being used to impact policies, practices, and/or institutional norms and traditions? If they are not, please explain why.

Response

We take these in reverse order.

REWARD. This work has been moving very fast. A small, cross-campus group has been revising documents for hiring, tenure and promotion. Hiring documents were revised with the support of the Provost Office and are in place for searches that will commence in the coming academic year. Tenure and Promotion documents must also go through formal faculty committees, the full faculty and the Board. It remains to be seen how the full faculty will receive changes. Although our process is not a secret, the committee is working on the timeline to unveil the documents before the full faculty and move to fully implement. Some unresolved issues (learned directly at 2019 IE meeting) include: How will we ensure that individuals on HTP committees are competent to read such statements? How will we ensure that individuals’ work is accurately represented and assessed in a TP file and not simply become a box to be checked?

INTRO. It is important to point out that the INTRO team as originally imagined was functionally redundant with existing structures among the STEM department chairs and the actively engaged STEM faculty as a whole, and that the accomplishments of this year were largely achieved through those organizational structures. A goal for the intro work in year one was to examine the existing STEM curriculum guidance provided to advisors and students and rethink our approach for the first year of STEM study at K at the inter-department division-wide level. Summarized by our decade-old widely distributed document “Suggested First Year Course Sequence for Science and Math Students”, we came to the realization through broad conversations with key constituencies that our message to students was based on a number of exclusionary and even mistaken assumptions. At our first division-wide meeting in fall 2018, we set the explicit goal of producing an agreed-upon
the implementation of the grant and in wider college efforts, we note with some irony that it was created in STEM peer-instruction supports in year 2. While this position was created with the good intention of helping in we are now in a better position to achieve sustainable consensus-based paths toward improving access to defined teaching and learning initiatives including outside-of-class learning support across campus. We believe Assessment --- created to provide intentional leadership with consolidation of several existing and loosely-defined teaching and learning initiatives initially funded by a --- largely to the exclusion of non-STEM courses in the students’ first year --- could a student stay “on track”. The troublingly wide-spread belief was that getting “off track” effectively foreclosed the possibility of further STEM study at K. Through sustained, often recursive, engagement around these issues among the STEM faculty, the College Health Science Careers Advisor, the Center for Career and Professional Development (CCPD), the College Director of Advising, and the Center for International Programs (CIP), the culture began to shift allowing movement toward inclusive practices in this area. In response to timely input from the Director of Advising who was in turn responding to widely heard student and family concerns, the STEM departments created a new document to help prospective STEM students and their families during summer pre-registration. We regard this as especially important for URM/FG students and their families. The Biology Department (the largest among the STEM fields at K) re-imagined their system of STEM cognates with a recognition that study in Biology need not be synonymous with preparation for medical school or other health science post-grad programs with all the attendant STEM coursework. Other STEM departments embraced an approach to first-year course sequence based on actual trajectories of recent graduates from a variety of backgrounds, rather the formerly-embraced idealized student outcomes. Another important shift was to address that our first-year sequence document excluded any student who did not place into Calculus 1 initially. Specifically, our two-term sequence “Calculus with Review” which interleaves traditional pre-calculus and calculus 1 content, was nowhere to be seen in the first-year advice. As such, I am any student who placed into that sequence was immediately “off track”. These discussions laid the foundation for progress in year two with commitment from CIP to working with STEM departments on new or re-imagined international programs that allow for study abroad experiences that can more directly help students progress toward degrees in STEM majors and careers We have scheduled an all-faculty lunch event for the fall term in which we will discuss and incorporate faculty feedback into our approach and guidance to advising STEM students.

At the beginning of year 1, the CLT imagined a process by which the INTRO team would create a job description for a STEM Learning Specialist to support STEM departments’ existing outside-of-class learning programs and as an augmentation of the College’s existing resources in the Learning Commons. We planned to search for and hire a highly qualified person in that role with start date for fall of year two. Our subsequent experience and difficulty in achieving those goals revealed how much we needed to learn about leadership, the overall structure and approach of the CLT, and the institution and its historical approach to these kinds of initiatives. We began from the unexamined assumption that as decision makers on a project funded by and conferring the prestige of HHMI we could expect wide and uncritical support from affected constituencies. We repeatedly found ourselves unhelpfully falling back to a position of “it’s in the proposal and HHMI approved it, so it must be good and it must be done”. Further we imagined that existing College structures in these areas were clearly defined and robust, allowing for direct “power-to-power” negotiations and agreed frameworks. We discovered that the people comprising the Learning Commons had in the past come together more in response to lack of vision on the part of the College than as part of an articulated College vision for that work. We came to see that a series of uncoordinated first-order changes affecting STEM outside-of-class learning initiatives initially funded by a previous HHMI grant created an unworkable situation of simmering hostility between the Learning Commons and STEM departments and between STEM and non-STEM departments in competition for resources for outside-of-class learning supports. While there are limited College funds for paying peer instructors in this work, there were not sufficient organizational structures in place to workably administer those funds. The prospect of further uncoordinated programmatic additions and suspicions in an already competitive budgetary atmosphere that HHMI funds would increase that disparity between STEM and non-STEM departments in their ability to offer academic supports led to resistance and dissent. Sustained, recursive discussion over the whole of year 1 brought some clarity and healing to the situation. One important institutional evolution that resulted from this work was the establishment of a new position in the Provost’s Office --- Assistant Provost for Teaching, Learning and Assessment --- created to provide intentional leadership with consolidation of several existing and loosely-defined teaching and learning initiatives including outside-of-class learning support across campus. We believe we are now in a better position to achieve sustainable consensus-based paths toward improving access to STEM peer-instruction supports in year 2. While this position was created with the good intention of helping in the implementation of the grant and in wider college efforts, we note with some irony that it was created in
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closed-door session within the Provost’s office and simply announced as a fait accompli, thus unconsciously replicating the hierarchical and secretive nature of how our college often functions.

CARE. Launching this effort was to have been the major achievement of the first year of implementation. We encountered many obstacles, both personal and institutional and have strived to work our way through them. We feel we are coming out better for having confronted them.

As originally conceived, the CARE efforts were to have incorporated interested parties across the campus. Concerns were raised that in order to institutionalize it better, it should actually be one person’s job and the budget was constructed to create a new full time position. There was initially hope from some quarters that this could be a full time VP level position for equity and diversity but this was not supported by the administration. A scaled back search for a “CARE coordinator” was launched but ultimately was terminated due to concerns both about the scope of and support for the position and the diversity of the applicant pool. This process itself revealed several fault lines at the college. Some of these were temporary (e.g. having an interim Provost), but some were deeper (see 5. below for a more detailed description). A revamped approach is closer to the original idea of a team of committed individuals designing and carrying out the program. This new approach was fully sanctioned by our Core Leadership Team in early August of 2019 and is as follows:

The CARE team’s work is comprised of two core aims: to aid in the development of culturally competent faculty and staff who can act as institutional change agents through the identification of faculty/staff personal development needs and the development and implementation of commiserate trainings. As such, the CARE team will be organized into two LANES

- The TRAINING LANE will work to identify, and evaluate appropriate and practical trainings that will lead to skill-development needed to meet the goals of the HHMI CARE priority
- The PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT LANE will work to develop framework and activities targeted to address individualized needs in concert with training experiences. These activities may include, but not be limited to coaching sessions, emotional support, and individualized identity development consultation.

In order to facilitate a clear, strong, and sustainable framework for the CARE priority and to increase the likelihood of effective implementation of team activities, the CARE Team Director will convene a group of 4-5 consultants to develop a strategic plan for each LANE. This strategic plan work will begin in the summer 2019 and will continue until a comprehensive plan is received from each consultation team. After receipt of plans, the HHMI CLT will be advised about the plan and implementation schedule. It is expected that implementation activities will begin no earlier than January 2020.

PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT LANE

CONSULTANTS: Jennifer Mills Langeland, Kyla Day Fletcher

OVERALL GOAL: to consult on and create a strategic plan around PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT for faculty and staff, in order to lead to more inclusive academic experiences. The focus of this development would be for faculty and staff directly affiliated with the K College Science Division.

SPECIFIC OUTCOMES:

- Identify and predict the bi-directional effects of faculty/staff involvement in cultural competence TRAINING
- Develop and implement individual racial identity and competence assessments
- Operationalize a PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT support plan (general and individualized)

ACTIVITIES:
1) Discern best practices for the PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT efforts
   a. Review previous research on anti-racism and inclusion efforts in higher education
   b. Identify relevant theoretical approaches to this work, select appropriate best practices, and develop a set of working theoretical assumptions.
2) Conduct personal development assessment via participant interviews
   a. This assessment will consist of one-on-one interviews with a subset of participants (est. n=10). The interview schedule (form) will be developed and piloted; it is expected that the interviews will be 30-45 mins, and will be conducted by consultants over a 2-week period.
b. De-identified transcripts from these interviews will be made available to the HHMI CARE and CLT teams.
c. Scheduling of these interviews will be done in consultation with CARE Director and current Science Division chair

3) Develop strategic plan for responsive personal development activities
a. The plan will identify possible developmental trajectories based on current racial identity and competence positioning of Science Division faculty and staff
b. The plan will recommend individualized plans that will be responsive to TRAINING participation experiences
c. The plan will Map out possible barriers to internalization of cultural competence training efforts, and identity plausible solutions
d. Identify personnel and administrative needs to implement strategic plan
e. Propose feasible timeline for PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT plan implementation

TRAINING LANE

CONSULTANTS: Natalia Carvalo-Pinto and Kenlana Fergueson

OVERALL GOAL: to consult on and create a strategic plan around TRAINING and TRAINING NEEDS that would lead to the goals described in the grant. This would be a 5-year-plan to get faculty from where we are now to where we described needing and wanting to be

SPECIFIC OUTCOMES:
- Identify specific goals and benchmarks for faculty and staff moving through the program.
- Outline a series of workshops including a 1 year and 4 year plan, to meet those goals.
- Identify individuals and/or groups, both on campus and off campus who can implement (facilitate, conduct, and/or deliver) the programs, trainings and workshops.

ACTIVITIES:
1) Apply the project’s “identity” towards the strategic plan
   a. The proposal does a pretty-good job at crafting the overall identity for the program already. If this has not changed, we can use the proposal as a start/benchmark. If your committee has decided that things have shifted or priorities have been changed, then that needs to be communicated and conceptualized before we can consult and create a meaningful strategic training plan.
2) Initial strengths and leadership assessment via Evaluation Workshop

5. Examining Assumptions

In what ways have individual and institutional values about diversity, equity, and inclusion influenced your project activities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In our first year of admittedly halting implementation efforts, we encountered a range of issues that intersect with individual and institutional values about diversity, equity, and inclusion. In trying to create and hire a single full-time CARE coordinator (a year one priority), and in even beginning the process of creating a new learning specialist position (a year two priority), we hit several sticking points and an administrative decision was made to reach out to HHMI for guidance. CLT hosted a visit from two HHMI staff members (Assistant Director Sarah Simmons and Program Officer Makeda Richardson) who were able to talk to a range of our constituencies and suggest plans for moving forward. This visit resulted in several face-to-face conversations that circumvented our own self-imposed structural limitations and blocks to communication and trust and resulted in 2 key staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
members and women of color becoming reinvested in the process. We also had a 2 separate daylong facilitated
retreats for the CLT focusing on issues of communication and inclusive approaches. We discussed and reflected
on several dominant culture attributes (e.g. defensiveness, fear of conflict, paternalism, quantity versus quality,
sense of urgency) and alternatives to them. This is a work in progress but our spirit is that by striving for them
within our CLT and associated teams we can help embody them in other areas of our institution.

6. Acquiring and Practicing New Competencies

How have insights gained from extant scholarship/theory informed your project’s approaches and practices for
building institutional capacity for inclusive excellence?

Response

This is an area that has not been as systematized as it could and should be. Each of us engages with literature
as it suits our interests, but there has been very little organized communication and sharing of these resources.
We definitely strive for a more uniform curriculum for our faculty as the work of the CARE and INTRO teams
matures.

However, these are documents that we think have collectively shaped our work and thinking:
  • ERACCE program. In particular the “Continuum on becoming an anti-racist multicultural organization.”
  • “Creating Healthy Organizational Climates through More Inclusive Approaches”
  • “Anti-racist pedagogy: from faculty’s self-reflection to organizing within and beyond the classroom”
  • “White fragility”

7. Crossing Disciplinary Boundaries

How has your project utilized the expertise of leadership team members and collaborative partners from other
disciplines and/or institutional units (e.g., student affairs, institutional research, etc.)?

Response

We feel that we have a very diverse and well-placed CLT. We have members from 3 different STEM disciplines
(PD Langeland, Biology; Barth, Mathematics; and Stevens-Truss, Chemistry). Each of these 3 has taught in their
disciplines at K for over 20 years and plays or has played significant other intersecting roles on campus
(Langeland as a Posse mentor and former division chair; Barth as current division chair and new Assistant
Provost for Teaching, Learning and Assessment; Stevens-Truss as member and former Chair of the Faculty
Personnel Committee as well as former Posee mentor). The CLT also includes Kyla Day Fletcher from
Psychology who brings extensive experience and passion in issues related to diversity and inclusion. Our CLT is
rounded out Danette Ifert Johnson, our new Provost. In addition to her role as chief academic officer, Johnson’s
background in Communication Studies will be an asset to our efforts.

Our CARE program as initially proposed was co-developed by 3 other non-STEM individuals who now have
continuing roles with the program. Dr. Kenlana Ferguson is the director of our Counseling Center and
independently contracts as a diversity trainer. Natalia Carvalho-Pinto is the Director of Intercultural Student Life.
Dr. Jennifer Langeland is an Assistant Professor of Psychology who also runs a private counseling practice.
Together with Day Fletcher, this team has extensive experience in the personal and interpersonal growth that
must underlie our inclusivity efforts. In addition, they each intersect with our students in non-STEM settings and
thus have an invaluable lens on the student experience. One priority of the CARE team is to further identify and
enlist other members of our faculty and staff who are knowledgeable and active in this work.

Other institutional units that are engaged with or will be engaged with our IE work include Arcus, our Center for
Career and Professional Development (CCPD) and the Diversity and Inclusion Committee (DIAC).

8. Re-invigorating Institutional Steering

Reference: GT11055  Page 7 of 8  Date submitted: 8/31/2019
In what ways will the processes of building institutional capacity for inclusive excellence be institutionalized and made continuous?

**Response**

Our developing CARE program has the goal of deeply and irreversibly changing our faculty and staff members’ relationships to themselves and their students. Our thesis is that faculty who are fully aware of their implicit biases, acknowledge them and actively work to mitigate them will naturally create a more inclusive environment. Not only do we hope to touch as many STEM (and other) faculty as possible over the life of the grant, we will institutionalize a version of these trainings into our new faculty orientation program. Since a short orientation program cannot fully encompass our envisioned CARE program, we recognize the need for additional post-grant resources to continue this work. Once the program is fully functioning we will have better data, both objective and subjective, to lobby the administration for continued support. Curricular revision should be and is a continual process. Traditionally this has happened at the department and course level. Our focus on revisions that highlight inclusion, students’ lived experience and shared concepts across disciplines is a new direction, however. We think this will serve as a catalyst to bring our curriculum to a very different and lasting place. Our work to restructure the learning commons will also be lasting, in particular as the college has committed to continuing the new position after the life of the grant. The new Assistant Provost position is also an example of lasting institutional change. The most tangible institutional change happening at this time is the revision of our HTP guidelines. These documents will clearly outlive the grant period and will inform personnel policies for many years to come. A faculty that is hired and promoted, in part, for their inclusivity efforts should have dramatic long term effects.

9. Unanticipated Outcomes to Date

Is there any additional information that will assist the IE community (HHMI, IE grantees, and the IEC) in better understanding how your project is building institutional capacity for inclusive excellence?

**Response**

NA

10. PIC Engagement

Provide a brief summary of lessons learned from PIC activities, including how the PIC is helping you with your efforts towards institutional change.

**Response**

We met in Chicago in December 2018.