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1. Defining Context

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In developing our report, we reviewed the 2019 HHMI PIER Response (26 February 2020). Among a number of observations in this document, we noted three insights that will provide thematic threads throughout our own reflections: the need to 1) consider how the campus responded to race-related events (and how they illuminated IE challenges), i.e., the COVID-19 pandemic and the Black Lives Matter protests after the murder of George Floyd; 2) watch out for a tendency to conflate or mistake inclusive initiatives, pedagogical practices, and/or curricular development with enduring institutional change; and 3) note efforts to distribute leadership, develop broader “ownership” of Inclusive Excellence (IE) work, and foster intentional collaborations among faculty, students, staff, and administration. In short, we wish to keep our attention on institutional change and the College and cultural legacies that support and/or hamstring IE work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response

While changes over the past ten years suggest that we may be at a tipping point in terms of building an inclusive institution, students, faculty, and staff of color still voice concerns in remarkably similar terms. There is a dissonance between how the College may appear and/or represent itself as a progressive campus undergoing meaningful demographic change and the day-to-day realities of students of color and first-generation students. Thus, as the College shows inroads regarding diversity, the structures, practices, and attitudes of predominantly white institutions (PWIs) pervade all dimensions of the College.

In the last 10 years, for instance, the College has worked hard to increase the diversity of the student body; today, over 40% of the students identify as Asians, Black, Hispanic, American Indian/Alaskan native, multicultural, or international, with about 34% of the total student body (1,491) being domestic students of color.

The College has had a smaller increase in the number of tenure track faculty of color (specifically, Asian, Black, and Hispanic), from 20% to 29% in the same 10 year time frame (2010-2019). It is important to note that, in that same period of time, the total number of tenure track faculty increased from 80 to 85 (6.25%) while the student body increased by about 14%. The Faculty Search Procedures and Guidelines Handbook provides information to departments to ensure that search ads are cast with a wide enough net to provide that qualified persons of color are considered in the finalist pool of applicants. These measures have indeed been successful.

We have not made as many inroads with inclusion. In spring term of 2013, several student focus group sessions were conducted. The students were selected by word of mouth with no specific major or year requirement. Race and ethnicity were used in deciding which focus groups to place students; focus groups with students of color were facilitated by students of color, and those with white students were facilitated by white students. In spring term of 2020, as part of our HHMI-funded project, two STEM students focus groups were conducted to gauge feelings towards studying primarily in the STEM disciplines. One group was composed of only students of color and was moderated by two alumni of color who had been involved with the 2013 sessions, and the other was composed of predominantly White students (one student in this group identified as White and Latina) and was moderated by Anne Dueweke, the former Director of Institutional Research who conducted the 2013 focus group study. Although these studies are seven years apart, student comments and opinions have not changed much. To provide a sense of focus group responses, we offer some of the main findings from the final reports.

2013 Focus Groups:

What Was Surprising When Students Arrived

Students of color: When they arrived at K, students of color were surprised by the whiteness of the student body and faculty/staff, the prevalence of micro-aggressions, racism, and stereotypes, and the foregrounding of racial, national, cultural, or ethnic identity. There was a theme of not feeling safe and not belonging, in either social or academic
settings. Many students of color were also surprised by the wealth of many students and the Euro-centric nature of the curriculum. Some students said they were surprised by feelings of being underprepared academically compared to many white students, especially in the natural sciences.

White students: When White students were asked what was surprising, they talked about their high schools and home communities being either more or less diverse than K. Many White students said they were taken aback by the overall whiteness of the student body and faculty/staff. However, students who came from predominantly White communities found K to be very diverse and some even expressed feelings of culture shock regarding the level of diversity. Some students also mentioned the wealth of many students on campus and the cliquish nature of the student body. White students were also surprised by the number of international students. They said that the diverse viewpoints offered by international students were unexpected but nevertheless appreciated.

2020 Focus Groups:

Interpersonal Interactions
Students of color recounted numerous interpersonal interactions (with both faculty and peers) that have surprised them and brought their racial or cultural identity to their attention in ways that are marginalizing or demeaning. On several occasions, students asked the facilitators “do you want more incidents?” or “do I keep going” after already describing multiple negative interactions.

White students spoke broadly about very few interpersonal interactions that did not seem too individualized or personal. They explained that science labs are usually more “laid back environment[s]” which allow for more “interpersonal communication” than a typical lecture setting. They also explained that study groups do form because these types of courses are difficult. But they did not describe any negative interpersonal interactions due to their racial group membership. Additionally, White students did not highlight any examples where they were the antagonist or where they witnessed a negative interpersonal interaction with a student of color.

During this past year, the institutional response to COVID-19 offered further insight into factors affecting IE efforts. For example, the pandemic made more visible the conflicting beliefs concerning the role of traditional assessment (e.g., formal grading) in student motivation and learning, the way on-campus support staff and structures may (or may not) mediate inequities in terms of preparation prior to and during time at the College, and the very real impact of ongoing and most often invisible family expectations, finances, and needs of underrepresented minorities (URM), first-generation students (FG), and individuals with disabilities. Thus, in the transition to and conducting of online courses, the faculty, staff, and administration had to confront issues of access and equity. Debate over whether to convert traditional grading to a CR/NC format—though there were a range of viable arguments and solutions offered in the faculty forum—did not always demonstrate a fully-informed sense of particular challenges that URM, FG, and students with disabilities had to navigate and the learning strategies (e.g., use of the Learning Commons peer-to-peer instruction support, face-to-face appointments with faculty, peer mentoring, collaborative learning, etc.) with which they often engage. In short, the extra time and effort for those with less incoming educational capital, financial support, and family networks seemed unacknowledged.

In addition, with the killing of George Floyd (and the deaths of Breonna Taylor, Ahmaud Arbery, Tony McDade), it became clear that, while impacting the entirety of the campus, Black students, faculty, and staff experienced an even deeper and more unsettling response to national events and thus a fuller disruption to academic work. The ensuing protests called attention to the historical legacies and macro- and microaggressions that form the daily realities at a PWI, regardless of the changing demographics, endowed commitment to social justice, and more. These discrepancies were made visible to members of the campus through a series of town-hall style meetings. Following the murder of George Floyd, the Arcus Center for Social Justice Leadership (ACSJL) sponsored two virtual town hall meetings. Organized by the Black Student Organization (BSO), the first took place on June 8, 2020 (titled Black Lives Matter: Now and Forever) and centered Black students’ voices. Put together by the Faculty Advisory Board of the Arcus Center for Social Justice Leadership (of which three of the IE CLT are members) and several senior Black employees, the second town hall event (titled Black Voices Matter) took place on Juneteenth, 2020 and centered the voices of Black staff/faculty. Importantly, President Gonzalez approved paid time for all employees to attend. (Over 130 employees joined this town hall.) A Black Faculty & Staff Council (BAFSA) was incepted on August 01, 2020, following this event, and this council plans to organize an annual Juneteenth celebration, something that also has the President’s endorsement. These forums provided opportunities for broader understanding of the experiences of Black campus members. There were well-received and illustrated the depth and frequency of racist beliefs, attitudes and actions still present on our campus. Moreover, it underscored how meaningful diversity initiatives and the mere presence of our project are not sufficient to cause a culture shift to anti-racism; instead, it is best viewed as an important step in the journey.
As a result of the twin pandemics (COVID-19 and racial injustice), the HHMI IE Leadership Team dramatically shifted its plans for the spring term. There was an urgent need to roll out immediate and easily accessible antiracist initiatives; to that end, two main activities were conducted: (a) collaboration with library staff and administrative offices to help provide access to and occasions for deeper learning in relation to antiracism and (b) support for colleagues in antiracism study. These initiatives are outlined in the next section of this report.

The goal of this next year (the 3rd year of our grant) will involve positioning this work as part of efforts toward long-term institutional self-reflection and, ideally, a recursive and less reactive model as it relates to the inevitable conflicts (local, national, and international) associated with difference (racial, class, cultural, cognitive, gender, etc).
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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The institutional context has both positively and negatively impacted implementation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Leadership re-organization: In the second-year of the grant, changes in leadership were necessary as progress was blocked and halted by a series of difficult interactions among the CLT and exacerbated by the loss of our Director of Institutional Research who had been playing a critical role in both the development of the proposed work as well as its implementation. A new Provost, Danette Ifert Johnson, was also added to the team. Within the CLT, the original Program Director (PD) of the grant resigned, and Regina Stevens-Truss was appointed as PD moving her from the role of the REWARD team leader. Bruce Mills, who had been a member of the REWARD implementation team in year one, assumed the role of this team’s leader – a decision which ensured a positive transition of leadership and no loss of information for that team. Rick Barth, INTRO team leader, and Kyla Day Fletcher, CARE team leader, remained in place. One of our first changes was to enact a more “distributed leadership” model rooted in greater transparency among the HHMI Leadership Team. In light of these changes, the work of the year played out as follows:

- In fall term (September – December), the CLT regrouped and began having constructive discussions that helped in plotting a direction for the work.
- During the winter term (January – March), several initiatives were taking shape: (a) the INTRO implementation team, composed of the chairs of the five STEM departments, Rick Barth and Regina Stevens-Truss, generated a list of traits desired in the new learning specialist, (b) the REWARD implementation team established a plan to begin scheduling meetings with each department at the College to discuss how the disciplinary boundaries that impact tenure and promotion files manifest themselves, and (c) as part of the consulting work hired out in summer of 2019 by the CARE lane, a strategic plan for professional development was being finalized and included a workshop conducted by the consulting team to gauge the STEM faculty goals and aspirations (February 2020).
- Then COVID-19 hit, and during spring term (March – June) and summer (July and August), we conducted work in the virtual space. By June 2020, we developed a relatively radical re-prioritization of activities. We focused on getting information and resources into the hands of our campus constituents as quickly as possible. Our four separate teams and initiatives were effectively collapsed into one large working group as we reorganized activities and re-delegated tasks.

The Positive: The work of the IE team has seen some small but incremental changes at the College, most catalyzed by the pandemics.

I. Even prior to the pandemics, one change that our IE work has institutionalized is on the Hire, Tenure and Promotion front: All new faculty positions (tenure track and visiting) now require candidates to submit a diversity and inclusion statement. The REWARD team is working with HR to institute a similar requirement of non-faculty hires at the staff rank. It is unclear how this requirement will be manifested at the Administrator levels; this complication is discussed below.

II. Since the pandemics, we’ve experienced an increased interest and willingness of faculty and staff in participating in solutions. Lasting change, however, requires regular and continued learning and reflection, which led the CLT to develop the following initiatives:

(1) #ReadingForChange and #AntiRacism Reading nook

To capitalize on the watershed moment of racial unrest and newfound interest in anti-racism education, we created...
the initiative entitled #ReadingForChange. We wish to highlight three aspects of this initiative:

(a) We mailed a physical copy of Dr. Beverly Tatum’s Why Do All of the Black Kids Sit Together in the Cafeteria? to all faculty, staff, and administrators at the College, as well as to the Board of Trustee members. This book discusses the relevance of racism in education and provides insights for those working with students of color.

(b) We partnered with the library to create an antiracism reading collection of influential books recommended by antiracism experts. Multiple copies of these books (including digital) have been made available in this collection in order to increase access to all members of our community. This HHMI funded collection (#ReadingForChange) lives alongside other antiracism collections in the library.

(c) It is our goal to ensure that our initiatives do not become static, so to that end we are now working on programming to make the #ReadingForChange initiative constantly visible. Specifically, because educational materials and booklists can be daunting, the #AntiRacism Reading Knook (#ARRK) seeks to reduce the barrier for engaging with the texts by providing guidance and context. Campus members will lead monthly discussions of key portions of texts such as Tatum’s book, Ibram X. Kendi’s How to Be an Antiracist, and others. This marks a meaningful collaboration with library staff and has also led to connections with other members of our community. An example of such a connection is that of an Advancement Office staff member who, through her own effort, will be convening colleagues in her area to discuss Kendi’s book this fall term.

(2) 19: This Month in Black history

The Faculty Advisory Board of the ACSJL and the HHMI IE faculty team will also present monthly notices aimed at educating the K community on African American history and culture. The number 19 for Black people represents 1619, the year in which the first set of African captives were brought to what would become the United States, and June 19th, 1865, the day that Blacks celebrate the end of enslavement in the US. These dates, and their meanings, were largely unknown to many outside of the Black community. Since we feel that much of the “surprise” at recent uprisings led by the Black Lives Matter movement derives from a lack of knowledge of the rich fabric of Black history, these announcements on the 19th of each month will help better educate the College community as we work towards being an antiracist institution. This initiative has also resulted in another meaningful collaboration with our College archivist, which now gives us a way to point to individuals who have an historical connection to the College as well as to shed light on some of our more painful history as we move towards being more welcoming and inclusive. For example, our July 19 story featured Justice Thurgood Marshall. It turns out that Justice Marshall received an honorary degree from the College in 1961. In the fall of that same academic year, James Baldwin gave an address to the College /entitled “In Search of a Majority” (later published in Nobody Knows My Name). Such information does not erase the legacy of white supremacy at the institution (e.g., 19 notices have also included a link to K’s Racist and Hate Incidents archives) but does offer the possibility of drawing from another heritage as well, one rooted in ideals now associated with antiracist efforts.

(3) Teaching Forward Initiative

Teaching Forward was envisioned specifically in response to the COVID-19 pandemic and as part of our IE work. During the month of July, a 3-day (2 hrs each day) Teaching Forward virtual retreat was attended by 25 STEM faculty and staff members as well as 5 non-STEM CLT and implementation team members. During this retreat, moderated by Mark Nepo (poet and spiritual adviser), attendees were asked to reflect on how the pandemic (a) affected us personally – our sense of being and knowing and our loss, (b) allowed us to get a glimpse of the reality that is our students’ lives, and (c) impacted how we think about teaching going forward. A post-retreat survey revealed that the STEM faculty are ready to have cross-departmental discussions about teaching and learning once believed to be difficult. A follow-up meeting this month (August) of 12 of the 30 retreat attendees, which came on the heels of the College administration announcing that instruction would be all virtual for fall term 2020, demonstrated the thirst of the STEM faculty for change in how we educate our students. This multidisciplinary group discussed best practices for virtual teaching, with the focus during the entire discussion on student learning and engagement. This group agreed to having similar and regular discussions about the inclusion of all students in the learning enterprise. Faculty felt an immediate need to learn about grading for equity and inclusion as has been practiced by several of our STEM colleagues in their classes with measurable success. This group now has plans to meet during the first week of September to discuss these ideas.

Despite these moderate gains, there remains substantial barriers to realizing inclusiveness.
The Black Lives Matter movement became more visible and important to our campus, surrounding city, and larger nation during the late spring of 2020 (and in the midst of the global COVID-19 pandemic). The continued deaths of Black Americans at the hands of racists (for example, Ahmaud Arbery, Breonna Taylor and George Floyd), along with the recurring acts of verbal and systematic racism on Black Americans (for example, Christian Cooper) were an impetus to a new level of nationwide outrage. The impact of this outrage was experienced by our college community in ways previously unseen; the pandemic-necessitated social distancing meant that campus constituents were unable to discuss the racist events in person. As a result, many constituents were forced to process the events in their existing silos (with close family, friends, and neighbors). This presented both challenges and opportunities for the College and our project:

1) Conflicting and Complex Reactions: Black students, staff, and faculty developed new connections with one another; several virtual “debriefing” sessions were held (mostly orchestrated outside of the administration). Early sessions invited other, non-Black identified campus constituents to participate; later sessions were limited to Black-identified campus members. From the relatively few Black members of our campus community, these sessions reflected the great frustration, despair, hopelessness, fatigue, disengagement, anger, and yet also a heightened solidarity, commitment, and insistence on antiracism efforts by the college. The responses by White members of the campus community reflected sympathy, confusion, uncertainty, and a renewed commitment to dismantling racism. This concurrence of emotions, experiences, and expectations manifested in a renewed call to action along with a familiar confusion about the best next steps.

2) Complicating Factors: College leadership faced unique challenges as they attempted to address the renewed interest in dismantling racism while in the midst of a global pandemic. Many in the College community faulted what was considered a delayed response that seemed to give greater emphasis to the College’s commitment to social justice in the context of the Black Lives Matter protests but that did not acknowledge the institution’s history and its failure to meet the needs of Black, Brown, and Indigenous people of color (BIPOC). (The President later sent a video that acknowledged the shortcomings of the initial College communication.) Other concerns focused on the difficulty in getting campus solidarity around antiracism efforts considering individuals’ personal struggles around the pandemic (such as housing and health insecurity, increased work demands, and complex family responsibilities). Experiences during the spring made visible what might be considered deeply entrenched assumptions and attitudes toward how students learn and what might be impediments for long term change. There is still a broad need to account for factors that affect learning, lower BIPOC persistence in a STEM field, and fail to account for the resilience and transformative personal commitments that could enrich and deepen learning and disciplinary investment. For example, curricular content and high stakes testing that fails to link STEM study to the life experiences of URM, e.g., their community knowledge and personal investments, suggest the need for further self- and institutional reflection.
3) Shifting Priorities: Project activities needed to be halted and immediately redirected at the onset of the pandemic in March 2020. In relation to the revelatory and paradigm-shifting impacts of COVID-19 and the Black Lives Matter movement, we did learn that, given College commitments, knowledge of faculty and staff strengths, and the institutional nimbleness that can come with smaller relative size, some meaningful initiatives could be made with greater speed when there was a broader campus will and existing resources, including the HHMI funding. For instance, the faculty as a body committed to the CR/NC option when a number of institutions resisted such a change. Moreover, through leadership from the Provost Office, including that of Rick Barth, Assistant Provost for Teaching, Learning and Assessment, and a CLT member, the institution was able to convene faculty and support staff to provide information and, as much as possible, training concerning available technologies and interactive platforms to enhance distance learning and assist with face-to-face interactions. While certainly not a route we would like to have chosen, our ability to transition quickly and devote the entirety of our spring term to an online format provided extensive data and experiences to mine as we enter the 2020-2021 academic year. And, of course, this learning curve is quite relevant to the aims of the HHMI IE grant and its effort to institute changes in the short and long term. (As of the completion of this report, the College has committed to going completely online for the fall trimester.)

Again, one theme (and continuing challenge) of our work is the need to move beyond the tendency to purchase and provide resources, create programming, and foster dialogue as a kind of ongoing “performance” without lasting institutional change. We are beginning to see some moves towards changes at the top of the College’s leadership regarding antiracism and inclusivity work – workshops with these themes are now being planned to be a recurring part of the BOT annual meetings (twice/year).
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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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the 2005 AAC&amp;U paper Towards a Model of Inclusive Excellence and Change in Postsecondary Institutions,[1], the authors argue that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“To succeed in making excellence inclusive in the ways described in the introduction to this series of papers, campuses must create synergy within and across organizational systems through the alignment of structures, politics, curricular frameworks, faculty development policies, resources, symbols, and cultures. The discussion of diversity in higher education too often reads as though change occurs in a rational and ordered manner, in a static environment, and detached from the academic and social context of the institution.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to achieve Inclusive Excellence, they state in the introduction that campuses must “(a) integrate their diversity and quality efforts, (b) situate this work at the core of institutional functioning, and (c) realize the educational benefits available to students and to the institution when this integration is done well and is sustained over time.”

To this point, Kalamazoo has engaged in Diversity as an “isolated initiative.[1]” During the 2019-20 academic year, accelerated by the COVID-19 and police brutality pandemics, the HHMI IE work began to put in place a number of initiatives, listed in response to question #2 above, intended to help Kalamazoo mitigate the problems associated with isolated diversity initiatives and develop ways to achieve real educational excellence.

Our aspirations are simple - we want to create initiatives that have legs with buy-in from all constituents, and that become a part of policies and practices at the institution.


Under the REWARD priority:

During the first year of the grant, the REWARD team made significant progress in revising critical documents in relation to hiring, retention, tenure, and promotion. Given that Regina Stevens-Truss served as chair of the Faculty Personnel Committee (FPC) (as well as leading the REWARD initiative in year one), we were able to move more quickly in creating shared institutional language regarding inclusive hiring, review, and promotion practices. (The REWARD team was also well-selected, including faculty from all divisions and at different ranks.) In the spring of last year (2019) and then again this past fall (2019), FPC and the HHMI REWARD implementation team brought these changes to the entire faculty with the understanding that, in 2019-2020 academic year, we would engage in an even more extensive and collaborative consideration of practices within the various divisions. Bruce Mills (the current REWARD leader) joined the department chairs meeting late in the winter term and presented the REWARD team’s spring term plan to seek information from each academic area in addressing the following questions:

(1) Within your area, what are some good examples of how people understand and engage in fostering an inclusive learning environment regarding teaching and mentoring?
(2) In relation to scholarship, what work in your area can (and should) be understood as meaningful and measurable commitments to inclusivity?
(3) In your area, what dimensions of service contribute to the College’s commitment to inclusion?

Unfortunately, the COVID-19 pandemic interrupted what could be accomplished in spring 2020. During 2020-21, the plan is to engage departments and draw from disciplinary knowledge with the aim of more fully addressing and ultimately instituting inclusive practices in mentoring and personnel procedures. Our aspiration is to re-write and codify changes to the personnel committee’s procedures and thus to institutionalize how we assess and credit inclusive work in teaching and advising, scholarship, and service.
Under the CARE priority:

The 2019 PIER response highlighted “using evidence and observations to arrive at deeper understanding of causality and consequences of changes.” As part of our work last year, we felt that it was important to take a step back and work on articulating what STEM faculty believe their values, aspirations, and overarching goals were when pursuing professional development training in inclusive excellence. To that end, a cross-departmental group of the STEM faculty attended a facilitated STEM Goals and Aspirations workshop in February 2020. Three overarching goals were identified and will be used that would inform future professional development and training plans: (1) Cultural competency - understanding the impact of racism in schooling and students of color’s educational experience; (2) Community life - understanding and prioritizing equity to create inclusion and belonging; and (3) Strength and resilience - understanding the intricacies and challenges of the work. The consultants that facilitated the workshop created a CARE Training Recommendations Report, which includes actionable learning outcomes as well as specific resources and workshop facilitators that the CLT will use to inform and guide the next three years of professional development initiatives. As of the writing of this report, the CARE team is in the process of inviting faculty to a year-long, six-sessions (2 per term) workshop on antiracism and inclusive pedagogy that will be moderated by an external and highly recommended expert in this field (Amer Ahmed).

An additional concern for CARE is the extent to which staff and faculty are supported in their individual antiracism journeys. Following the February 2020 workshop, a separate CARE consulting team, hired to create an antiracism strategic plan for the CARE priority faculty training work, were prepared to engage individual STEM faculty in projected growth paths based on racial identity and socialization theories. The consultants were scheduled to conduct interviews with a subsample of STEM faculty to assess their personal development in these domains. The pandemic deferred these interviews, but the consultants have provided recommendations based on evidence-based research in this area and on the results from the workshop described above. These recommendations suggest that individuals can be organized based on racial identity profiles along the following domains: (1) perceptions about one’s own race, (2) perceptions about race in general, and (3) personal relevance of race to one’s sense of self. These recommendations also suggest that psychometric tests of these characteristics be used to evaluate effectiveness of our project initiatives. Furthermore, the consultants recommended that the project re-evaluate its initiatives for racial awareness and development support. The CARE lane of the project will engage its implementation team to evaluate these recommendations and create an action plan for implementation. In addition to this plan, it is also our aspiration that the College will work with the HHMI CLT to hire and retain a Director of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) and establish a DEI office on our campus.

Under the INTRO priority:

The 2020 pandemics are stressing our understanding of what inclusive teaching and learning pedagogy is or can be. As stated earlier in this report (in the preamble response to question #2), the INTRO implementation team was well on the way to creating a job description and rolling out a job add to hire a STEM learning specialist. In addition, the INTRO team announced in February 2020 a HHMI-funded initiative for STEM faculty at K to share, learn from, and implement effective, inclusive pedagogical practices already in use by our colleague instructors in introductory courses at K. Toward that goal we announced the INTRO Share Grant program. While the pandemic brought this activity to a temporary halt, the community-based design thinking that went into its development served as a crucial test-of-concept for the College’s #KTeachDev2020 summer faculty development series, which focused on learning from each other to develop as a community of instructors to meet the career-defining challenges of online pedagogy during the pandemic. The College going virtual for spring of 2020 and the amount of work that was required during the summer to plan for teaching this fall put on hold any of the plans of the INTRO team whose leader, Rick Barth, is also the Assistant Provost for Teaching, Learning and Assessment. It is our belief that, as the school year gets on the way this fall (September 14) and the term settles in, the work of the INTRO team will resume and plug into the synergies that have been developed through the collaborative #KTeachDev2020 program. Our aspiration for this priority is to begin and complete the search for the learning specialist this year.
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

In many ways, the events that will mark the history of 2020 have positively impacted our work and aspirations. As stated earlier, the College seems ready to engage in the hard work and in difficult conversations. We have seen some small glimpses of this through, for example, the fact that faculty and staff in several non-STEM departments are asking for ways to be included in the HHMI IE work of the STEM faculty. Just this summer, over 40 white identified faculty and staff signed up to take part in a six-week course on unlearning white supremacy and teaching for social justice and liberation. STEM faculty have organically begun to have conversations together, across disciplinary lines, about teaching for equity and inclusion. The BOT will begin the work of understanding racism and inclusion during their fall meeting – much of that discussion will be centered in information contained in Tatum’s book Why Do All the Black Kids Sit Together in the Cafeteria, sent to them earlier this summer. Because people are listening in this moment, we plan to harness the goodwill currently being shown.

For the CARE priority:
The past year’s developments (at the project, institution, and national level) have afforded us the opportunity to critically examine the culture within which our project is located. This analysis yielded initial conclusions that the culture is lacking strong antiracist education, perspective, and actionable efforts. In some ways, our project itself allows some in the institution to believe that the institution is further on its antiracism journey than may be reality. While our project is not the only campus initiative working to address diversity and/or inclusion, it has come to be seen as the next major frontier for the College’s work in this area. We do, in fact, hope that our project will have a strong impact on our students’ experiences of inclusion at the College; however, we are concerned that the College may be led to prematurely consider the work “done” by the mere presence of this grant-funded project. Instead, we would like to encourage the College to intensify and enumerate its commitment to antiracism, beyond what is being done for this grant project.

To address campus culture, understanding, and experience with antiracism, the project activities have turned to education as a first line initiative. We are attempting to galvanize the energy of the moment and the (re)commitment to the Black Lives Matter movement and dismantling racism. We are working to identify community partners well versed in the scholarship of this area to help us radically re-examine our institution’s own racist beliefs, practices, and policies. Our HHMI IE project team is working to develop cohesive messaging about our project’s beliefs, mission, priorities, and plans. We are concerned that the institution has been hampered by the politicization of antiracism work, appearance management, and limits of each campus member’s personal investment. We have challenged ourselves (the project leadership) to critically examine our own biases, assumptions, and limitations. To this end, we plan to engage a long-term consulting firm to give us a consistent objective “bird’s eye” view of our efforts, while also providing real time feedback about our initiatives and strategic plan.

For the REWARD priority:
The REWARD team will be aiming to generate a white paper on a new paradigm for the College’s reward structures related to retention, tenure, and promotion arising from ongoing ERACCE training, antiracist reading, and dialogue with campus departments and constituencies (e.g., untenured faculty, FPC, BAFSA). For the REWARD team, it is becoming even clearer that the traditional division of teaching and mentoring, scholarship, and service remains an impediment toward supporting and rewarding inclusive and antiracist practices throughout one’s work. For example, it can be hard to disentangle scholarship and service for some faculty members. FPC codified the Boyer Model some years ago as a way to complicate or give nuance to these divisions as well as to provide a language and conceptual framework for different forms of professional research (e.g., the scholarship of Discovery, of Integration, of Engagement, of Teaching and Learning). Still, this model fails to account for the critical value of mentorship of BIPOC, one of the most time-consuming and critical commitments for faculty and one of the most essential needs for transforming Kalamazoo College. Black and Brown students especially seek out faculty and staff of color, but the full contribution of such mentoring remains hard to quantify and thus make visible—whether these contributions
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occur in the classroom, office time, teaching or research assistantships, or assisting with scholarship. More poignantly, our institution, as perhaps many others, has not committed to defining how this invisible work is accounted for in the “rubrics” used to assess this work. Moreover, at an institution conforming to conventional paradigms regarding what “counts” as “external review” within a discipline, it is risky for untenured faculty to try to unsettle entrenched (and not fully acknowledged) biases. Our work this next year will involve a deep investigation of emerging models in various disciplines and at various institutions as well as close listening to the expertise on and ideas on campus.

For the INTRO priority:
Several times in this report we have noted the current situation as a tipping point in the College’s inclusive excellence work. As it relates to the current aspirations of the INTRO priority, this important historical moment caused many STEM faculty to break out of a well-intentioned mindset based on an assumption that we know what BIPOC need and our challenge is to tweak existing structures and leverage relationships between students of color and faculty members to execute those modifications.

The Black Lives Matter protests made clear in few short weeks this past June that this task will require much more of us. In a step-by-step demonstration of how traditional structures are inadequate to meet BIPOC students where they are, STEM instructors and departments remained silent in the days following the murder of George Floyd. When challenged to respond, we provided platitudes. Under further pressure, we said a few more things --- “Black Lives Matter” --- but dithered while we debated amongst ourselves about the importance of deadlines and final exams during the crisis. We paid lip service to the “Shutdown STEM” day, as we largely went about our business. In retrospect, our responses were completely predictable as a dominant cultural group trying to preserve its status through feigned moral rectitude. The ensuing criticism of STEM faculty, departments, and the College as a whole in students’ social media platforms were withering and full of truth.

This troubled time has brought into clear view the incongruities that remain between our good intentions and the reality of the students we intend to serve through this project. Our aspirations must grow to take all this into account.
5. Examining Assumptions

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

**Response**

Our insights about the institutional values have unfolded during the life of the project and have been particularly elucidated this past year. Our institution is in many ways consistently working to diversify the campus. For example, five administrative level new hires were made this summer, three of whom were Black women and one is a Latina woman (the fifth is a white woman). On the other hand, the institution is still struggling to strengthen its efforts towards inclusion. This extended process of changing institutional values around inclusion have meant a re-examination of our project priorities and how we expend our capital – time and money.

Our biggest awakening to the unevenness of our educational practices happened with the movement to online instruction this past spring term. This move illuminated the ways in which pedagogies serving white, privileged students inform STEM (and disciplinary) courses. This move illuminated how much our instruction of students depend upon them having a baseline of past educational experiences as well as financial and support structures. The compensatory learning strategies (often invisible) employed by BIPOC and first-generation students, for example, could not easily be engaged in an online format. Use of office hours and the dynamic responsiveness to nonverbal cues between student and teacher—which may signal the unique intelligence, competencies, and resilience of URM in the sciences—became less possible or more difficult in ZOOM or MS TEAMS meetings. On the other hand (and more positively), the innovative teaching strategies and the decision to strip content for the end of deeper learning may point to ways to re-visit the seemingly essential material of various classes. Moreover, the centrality of one-on-one, out-of-class visits may have allowed for a greater learning intimacy and support (amid high expectations) that nourishes those without extensive educational capital or highly resourced schools. It is also worth underscoring that, not unlike what has been discovered in relation to teaching students with different learning styles and/or cognitive differences, inclusive content and pedagogies serve all students.

The road to achieving inclusion, however, will require that a Director of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI) be hired, and that an office be created and sustained. This person and office will have to have power to make bold and sweeping decisions about inclusivity activities impacting the campus. We have begun this conversation with our President, Jorge Gonzalez.
6. Acquiring and Practicing New Competencies

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

Response

In keeping with the theme that has threaded this report, the pandemics have guided much of our work and initiatives and have made us more aware of our limitations. For example, the #ReadingForChange book collection was constructed based on Ibram Kendi’s antiracist reading list (e.g., Chicago Public Library). Kendi is one of the leading scholars on race and racism in the USA.

INTRO – We have several members of the STEM division who have been incorporating evidence-based inclusive pedagogy into their classrooms. We acknowledge that it is not enough to simply read about and mimic described ways of incorporating “active-learning” into one’s class. But in fact, developing ways to assess how these tools impact student learning is critical. In addition to reading and experimenting with new classroom tools, we plan to encourage faculty to become partners in learning, to visit each other’s classrooms, and to become observers and ‘coaches’ of each other. Faculty will also be encouraged to attend conferences and visit other institutions where inclusive pedagogy has been evidenced to work, e.g., Cathy Drennan’s education work at MIT and the University of Minnesota’s Center for Educational Innovation.

CARE -- A lot of the work of the CARE priority has relied on a Strategic Plan developed by two separate consulting groups. The Training Lane consulting group worked to identify practical trainings needed by faculty in order to develop skills to combat behaviors that impede student learning; the Personal Development Lane consulting group worked to develop a framework and activities for individualized needs beyond skills learned during training. Both consulting groups are composed of members of the Kalamazoo College community who have been involved with the conception of our IE work from the start. Skills-development themes were identified in the report: Cultural Competency (understanding the impact of racism in the educational experience of students of color), Community Life (understanding equity to create inclusion and belonging), and Strength and Resilience (understanding the intricacies and challenges of the work). These themes are being used to form the basis for STEM faculty and staff training activities. With time, faculty and staff from other divisions may be included in these trainings.

REWARD – During this past year, the REWARD team began investigating materials related to retention, tenure, and promotion reviews in higher education. One set of reflections post-Boyer emerged from a collaborative effort at Penn State University (“Beyond Boyer: The UniSCOPE Model of Scholarship for the 21st Century,” 2001-02). While somewhat dated (and not directly addressing inclusion), the authors sought to think outside the box concerning the traditional three legs of the tenure stool (teaching, scholarship, and service). In preliminary and admittedly incomplete research, it appears that there is much more scholarship and working papers on inclusion as it relates to students in various disciplines and not so much on the reward structures within which faculty achieve tenure and promotion.
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How does your project utilize the expertise of leadership team members and collaborative partners from other disciplines and/or institutional units (e.g., student affairs, institutional research, etc.)?

**Response**

As described in the responses to several questions in this report, our project relies on and utilizes expertise on the campus.

The #ReadingForChange initiative made use of the library staff to curate and secure books for the collection, ensuring that our project did not duplicate already existing resources. They are also collaborating with us on the #ARRK initiative. In addition, the College’s archivist is working closely with us to make sure that the College’s history is made visible to all as part of our 19: This Month in Black History initiative.

The CARE Strategic Plan was created from consulting with Kenlana Ferguson (Director of the Counseling Center), Natalia Carvalho-Pinto (Director of Intercultural Student Life), Jennifer Langeland (Counseling and Health Psychology), and Kyla Day Fletcher (CARE priority leader and Professor of Psychology).

In addition, we have relied on our Institutional Research office for aggregate data about persistence and success in STEM classes and about students who leave STEM or the College all together. The information about the changing demographics of the faculty reported in response to questions #1 was obtained from the Provost and had been put together by our Director of Institutional Research.

We are currently availing ourselves of the expertise within the Communications Office and our Web Design Services Specialist to create our brand, logo, and website.
8. Re-invigorating Institutional Steering

In what ways will the processes of building institutional capacity for inclusive excellence be institutionalized and made continuous?

**Response**

Although the work of the REWARD priority (to re-write hire, tenure and promotion policies) is being done by a faculty body, any changes to the working documents of the Faculty Personnel Committee must be embraced by the members of that committee, voted on by the entire faculty, and must mirror/match College policies as established in the Plan of Employment. The HHMI IE team understands this and will work with all stakeholders towards institutionalization. Depending upon potential recommendations to reward policies and structures, the HHMI IE leadership team will need to work with the administration, BOT, and faculty in implementing changes.

The work of the INTRO priority (reimagining teaching of 100-level STEM courses) is more focused on changes to how STEM courses are taught and therefore institutionalization of any changes will take place at the departmental and divisional level. The HHMI IE team will work with department chairs and the Provost (administrator to whom faculty directly report) to inculcate more evidence-based, culturally responsive pedagogy into teaching.

The HHMI IE team understands that the institutionalization of any initiatives, in any organization, requires buy-in at the top. Like others on our campus who are listening, President Gonzalez is listening. He has given us his blessing on several of our initiatives already: (1) the creation of the Black Faculty and Staff Council and support for our new annual celebration of Juneteenth, allowing all employees paid time in order to participate, and (2) the mailing of Tatum’s book to the members of the BOT. He is also working with BOT member Beth Washington (Vice President of Community Health and Equity & Inclusion at Bronson Healthcare, Kalamazoo) who is creating the information for their antiracism and inclusivity workshops. The President has also agreed to help us explore the possibility of creating an Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion, and we will continue to pursue this with the administration.
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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Although we have nothing additional to report here, we would like to highlight that many of the positive initiatives outlined in question #2 were unanticipated outcomes of the immediacy that the pandemics brought to our work, and therefore caused us to “collapsed [each of our individual projects] into one large working group.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We invite you to reflect on the ways the PIC is impacting you and your program. Please consider the following questions. What is your understanding of the purpose of the PIC? How have the PIC interactions influenced both the work at your institution and the capacity of your team to engage in inclusive excellence work, including any effect on personal and professional development?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Response</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The PIC 9 work has been spotty at best and dysfunctional at worst. We do not have regular meetings, and we are not sure that we clearly understand how we can support one another. We met once in person in November of 2019 in Chicago. We had one video meeting in January 2020, then one in May 2020. In fairness, the COVID-19 pandemic derailed plans to organize a visit to Syracuse University that would have happened in summer 2020. Following our meeting in July, we agreed to take part in Mark Nepo’s moderated Teaching Forward virtual retreat. This was the same retreat that the Kalamazoo STEM+ team attended in July that is intended to help us address how the pandemics have affected us and how we see and therefore think about teaching our students. This retreat took place on Aug 7, 14, and 21, 2020 and was attended by about 18 people.

In a partnership between Kalamazoo and Kenyon, in September 2019, a Supportive Liberal Arts Cluster of schools (SLAC) developed [Bates, Chaminade, Davidson, DePauw, Kalamazoo, Kenyon, Lawrence U, Mt. Mary, Oberlin, St. Thomas, Vassar, Wellesley, and Wheaton]. This group has been incredibly helpful to each other. We began meeting in October, 2019 by Zoom, and met for lunch in November, 2019 during the AAC&U meeting in Chicago. We continue to meet once a month, including while our schools were teaching in virtual mode; it felt even more important during that time to connect with each other. During our meetings we share ideas, provide resources to each other, and discuss issues important to specific programs (different school’s Program Director signs up to host the meeting and also sets the agenda for that meeting). These interactions were instrumental in this group organizing a series of Communities of Practice workshops along STEM departments branches; Biology (organized by Wellesley College), Chemistry (organized by Kalamazoo College and Lawrence University), and Mathematics (organized by Bates College). Members from each of our respective schools attended their respective branch’s workshop, creating conversations with faculty from across institutions. Faculty from the Minerva School guided the Chemistry and Mathematics workshops, which were intended for us to explore together teaching in the virtual space; at the Minerva School, students complete all four years of their undergraduate degrees online. This affinity group has proven to be a much more functional, efficient, and effective peer group. We have found that the shared challenges, approaches, and cultures have made this group more useful than the pre-assigned PIC group.

Going forward, we hope to remain in close communication and partnership with the affinity group, particularly in light of the continuation of distance learning and the unique impact that it will have on small, liberal arts colleges.

Regarding the PIC, we plan to develop a more strategic plan for collaboration that is more beneficial and effective. |