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1. Defining Context

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

Response

Kalamazoo College continues to value and support its diversity. Even during the COVID pandemic year our student body did not diminish much (383 new first year students enrolled in fall 2020, a 3% drop from 2019, with the total student body at 1451), and we maintained an ~42% diverse student body. In addition, the College worked hard to minimize the faculty and staff that were lost due to COVID-19 during this most difficult year; there were no COVID-related furloughs or releases or loss of Kalamazoo College faculty or staff. In addition, new members of the upper administration (referred to as President’s Staff) were added this past year; of three women (in admissions, business and finance, and major gifts office), one is a Black woman (Vice President for College Advancement), and a Black man was hired as Vice President for Student Development and Dean of Students.

One thing we are learning is the importance and benefit of engaging the entire community in this work, including the capitalizing on existing programming and opening participation across campus and not just in STEM.

Our inclusive work continued in a positive forward direction. In response to our pandemic isolation, three major initiatives brought colleagues together in the virtual space:

* The Reading for Change #ARRK collaborative initiative with the library, started in September of 2020, engaged 20-25 staff and faculty from many areas of the College in reflection and discussion of a short anti-racism reading.

* The monthly 19 Black History stories which began in July 2020 as a collaboration with the ACSJL were continued to be shared with the campus.

* Some new HHMI collaborative initiatives were also undertaken:

  Faculty-Staff Collaborations:
  As a follow up to the generally successful Teaching Forward workshops attended by a multidisciplinary STEM group of 30 faculty and staff in July and August 2020, over 50 interdepartmental faculty engaged in a year-long (6 sessions -2 per academic term- 2 hrs each) virtual Intercultural Skills and Inclusive Pedagogy workshop. Representing all five academic divisions, the 50+ participants were predominately faculty (94%), with the natural sciences (STEM) making up 32-38% of participants on average (18 STEM faculty per session, on average).

Although everyone complained about virtual meetings fatigue, 82% of participants attended 4 or more of the six sessions, indicating that we are indeed ready and willing to do this work, especially when there is an opportunity to collaborate with colleagues. The workshop also included colleagues who teach classes and work with students in extracurricular settings.

  Staff and Administrators Collaborations:
  Staff and administrators attended an online partly moderated class titled Justice at Work offered by the Freedom Lifted program. This class involves self-directed engagement with several online modules, plus attending three 1 hr moderated sessions. The program was purchased for 50 persons, and although 50 staff and administrators signed up for the course only 27 (54%) completed it. Although staff were provided time during their workday to complete the modules, compliance with that was low. The reviews of the program, however, suggest that the class is valuable, so we are re-structuring it and offering it to the whole campus (except students) with some programmatic changes.

The Board of Trustees began engaging in DEI work during their campus meetings by reading and discussing Beverly Tatum’s Why are all the Black Kids Sitting Together in the Cafeteria, and alumni, in efforts to connect back with the work at the College, also created reading groups around Tatum’s book.

Despite the seeming positive results described above, many negative issues remain. In their response to PIER Year 1 reports, HHMI noted that “[s]pending time to understand and explore root causes is worthwhile” and that
they saw "promise in approaches that are using evidence and observations to arrive at deeper understanding of causality and consequences of changes."

(1) From the reports of our commissioned student focus groups sessions we learned once again that "students of color and white students have starkly different experiences in the STEM departments." The report highlights the fact that there is a dissonance between how the College may appear and/or represent itself as a progressive campus undergoing meaningful demographic change versus the day-to-day realities of students of color and first-generation students. It additionally highlights that the College takes credit for the work of inclusion that students of color take on (specifically the work of Sukuma, a group created to support students, is mentioned).

(2) Stress Culture impeding Institutional Change - students, faculty, and staff attribute this campus defining feature to a combination of things, including the intensive pace of 10-week terms, high academic expectations, and insufficient academic and mental health support. Students and faculty of color experience uneven impacts of these various factors and more. While these concerns regarding campus climate have been ongoing, the pandemic put them under a sharper focus. During this past year, evidence of these issues and resulting tensions emerged in communications between the Kalamazoo College Council of Student Representatives (KCCSR) and faculty, through the Faculty Executive Committee (FEC), resulting in some back-and-forth discussions:

An initial letter from students to the faculty through their council, KCCSR, on 2/17/2021, offered a widely held sense of the campus culture: "For K students, the stress culture and fast paced nature of the quarter system has led to serious difficulties managing mental health. Our students are hardworking, competitive, and tend to lean towards the category of perfectionists. As a result, many struggle with opening up when they are struggling and push themselves to the point of breakdown throughout their time at K. These usual stressors have been compounded by the pandemic, political turmoil, and protests over the past year. Typically, students have a support system of peers as well as easy access to professors in office hours. Despite the resemblance of this community online, it is extremely difficult to emotionally engage through a screen.... We are calling upon professors to create (or bring back) classroom environments that promote empathy and compassion to address this culture of stress. While we understand and appreciate the need to remain a rigorous and fair institution, the experiences of students indicate that some classroom environments are detrimental to our health."

A 61-pages “Review of the ‘Strategic Plan’ and the Student Climate” document from students, again through their council, KCCSR, followed on 5/24/2021, offered reflections of student experiences over time. And while exacerbated by Covid-19 protocols and online teaching, these reflections echo a sense of K College. The 61-pages report that became known as the “Student Climate Report” offered an extensive analysis of key issues, ones that, the materials underscored, unevenly impacted BIPOC and first-generation students. The report noted that commitments in the College’s “Strategic Plan” regarding support services for students (especially BIPOC) did not appear to be available or easily identified or accessible. At the end, the document invited faculty to be "signatories" to the following pledges:

· I acknowledge the existence of the problems addressed in the Student Affairs Manuscript.
· I commit to actively combating these issues and building a more welcoming and inclusive space for all students.
· I pledge to calling in and calling out my peers and colleagues when I see them engaging in harmful behavior.
· I promise to circulate these documents and engage in difficult conversations to support every student.

Though the 61-page document acknowledged the presence of supportive faculty and offices, its findings and tone emphasized a continuing lack of support from professors and the College as a whole. Faculty had a mixed response to the pledge requests, even if sympathetic to the document, and many felt unease with the seemingly binary choice of being “for” or “against” the document.

In a “Clarification and Reconciliation Statement” sent to the Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) on 6/1/2021, KCCSR student council addressed the tone of their “demands” and other concerns.

In this letter they stated that they recognized “the manuscript has been a polarizing document, which was intended in order to encourage more conversation about these controversial topics.” The KCCSR report embodies the striking amount of extra labor often taken on by those already marginalized and made more acute during an exceptionally difficult year.
This illuminating glimpse from students into the community dynamic, which was also echoed in the voices of faculty regarding our reward structures, suggests that 1) the "stress" environment is deeply embedded and represents an impediment to our collective efforts, and 2) that we have limited structures and communication networks in place to move beyond a crisis-response mode and/or a model that sees a "polarizing" stance as a constructive one. DEI efforts call for ongoing communication between different constituents; however, the stress culture and its workload—as well as hierarchical lines of authority and isolated work and communication silos—work against transparency and trust. All parties—administration, faculty, staff, and students—are implicated in this dynamic.

As we move into the fourth year of the grant, it seems clear that to address the goals of the HHMI IE Grant, we need to continue to consider and attend to (a) the unevenness of faculty and students of color workloads and (b) the "stress" culture of the college.
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

The general feeling on campus is that we are ready for institutional inclusivity change.

The positives:
Faculty, staff, and students are in a positive trajectory towards Inclusive Excellence (IE). Although it may be hard to define what IE looks like, we are certain that this is work with which we must all engage.

The over 50 faculty from various disciplines who engaged together in the Inclusive Pedagogy workshops discussed the value of cross-disciplinary conversations and the power of listening to and learning from diverse perspectives.

Every month, 20-25 faculty and staff took part in antiracism discussions during the Anti-Racism Reading Knook (#ARRK) sessions, having first read a chapter from a book or an article tied to the #ARRK discussion. Of note is the fact that the #ARRK discussion leaders are volunteers from varying areas at the College.

Almost 30 staff and administrators (60% of those who enrolled) completed the online Justice at Work course and engaged virtually together in debriefing of the course information. It is important to note that this was done at the end of a very difficult year and extended into the summer. The consensus about the sessions was that having opportunities for discussion in small and large groups was worthwhile.

The general themes that have emerged from these collaborations are that the sessions were opportunities to connect and have conversations with colleagues providing spaces to hear what other departments and colleagues were doing and that they helped maintain connectivity during a year of online work-from-home.

Our students continue to exert their power by making their voices heard on issues of fairness and inclusion and are willing and able to articulate their needs. For example, the student council, KCCSR, was able to get faculty to discuss issues of academic disparities and the hidden work done by some students that are impediments to the success of especially BIPOC students. Students’ voices were also loud and clear during the search for the new Executive Director of our Arcus Center for Social Justice Leadership (ACSJL), holding the administration’s feet to the fire as it pertains to the mission of the Center “to develop and sustain leaders in human rights and social justice through education and capacity-building.”

A couple of small but not insignificant positive changes were also observed:

DEI training for the Board of Trustees was included in their annual campus meetings for the first time during 2020.

President’s staff, as its members were mostly in place during the 2020-21 academic year, attended a day-long Introduction to Systemic Racism Workshop moderated by the Crossroads Antiracism Organizing and Training (although these were not completed as a unit but in separate sessions); our hope is that administrators will continue this education this year.

The Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) created a new Justice, Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (JEDI) standing committee of the faculty who will have faculty governance power. The inaugural year will be 2021-22.

The administration (the President specifically) supported the creation of the Black Faculty and Staff (BAFSA) Council, and additionally supported the Council’s new Juneteenth annual celebration. It is important to note here that this celebration approval was in place prior to the National observance of this holiday.
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The not so positive/negative - which are huge impediments to long-term and sustained growth of the community towards IE.

We are still in need a Justice, Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion office where this work can be housed beyond this grant, and we continue to get push back from the administration on the creation of such an office. At a minimum, this office could help with gathering under one umbrella all of the continued work that is occurring in siloes at the institution and help us message with one voice.

We still need mandatory annual inclusivity training for the entire campus much like the Title IX training, as DEI training remains optional, and although a significant portion of the campus community participate, there remains a sizeable portion of the community who choose not to participate in any programming. This could be partly due, however, to life under COVID, which created genuine exhaustion, adding another layer of difficulty in asking people to engage in online programming. Messaging will be front and center in our minds as we create opportunities this year.

Impacts on our specific grant priorities:

Under the Committing to Anti-Racism Education (CARE) priority - as we continue this work, we are reminded daily about the difficulty and slow process of dismantling racism. Faculty and staff generally agree that we need to have conversations and trainings to break up the status quo and are willing to work together towards being a more inclusive place. However, the work feels hard and the road too long, which leads to skepticism about what is possible.

Successes: Involving a broad swath of the campus (faculty, staff and administrators) in the various anti-racism programs has been a welcomed success. Both the #ARRK and the Inclusive Pedagogy programs brought together an eclectic group of people in constructive conversations. Feedback made clear colleagues’ desire for spaces and opportunities to discuss campus issues, teaching, and current events. The Justice at Work course further highlighted for us the thirst that members of our campus have towards changing the exclusionary title often attributed to us.

Challenges: Appealing to a larger number of our community members in these programs and inviting-in those who don’t typically attend these kinds of programs. Although the current initiatives appeal to a diverse group on campus, it appears to be the same 25 or so people that commit to the work by attending all sessions, engaging fully, and completing assignments.

Under the Inclusive Teaching and Revised On-ramps (INTRO) priority – creating inclusive classrooms continues to drive much of the work of this priority. The faculty acknowledges that changing how and what we teach is on the road to becoming a more inclusive place. Buy-in from faculty in all areas towards changing classroom dynamics continues to be high.

Successes: Reconfiguring & restructuring the Learning Commons to achieve some much-needed equality across the members of the commons.

Challenges: Working with faculty to imagine different ways to approach teaching their subject matter and developing inclusive grading practices.

Under the Rewarding Anti-Racism Faculty Development (REWARD) priority – as we strive for systemic change, it is becoming clear to us that our stress culture must be acknowledged and addressed. In our Hire, Tenure, and Promotion (HTP) conversations with faculty, it seems that some of the frustrations and cynicism regarding our potential for progress relates to the fact that there are major structural impediments: calendar, workload expectations, and unremunerated work. These impediments are also voiced by our students in their focus groups conversations.

Successes: Through the REWARD lane of the grant during the 2020-2021 academic year, we conducted a rich set of conversations that involved 81 faculty members, including the following departments and/or divisions
Throughout the discussion, faculty reported constructive individual and programmatic efforts directly and indirectly related to the work of DEI, including, though not limited to,

* Fundamental changes to course content and pedagogical strategies
* Department wide curricular revision with specific attention to equity and inclusion
* Implementation of innovative grading practices within various departments
* Exploration of how to identify student commitments/passions in order to meet students where they are and, as a result, revise SIP processes and options as well as other curricular needs.
* Attention to effective mentoring practices
* Widespread participation of faculty in campus and disciplinary workshops to retool teaching and/or build from and upon individual and programmatic expertise
* Department and division initiatives motivated by the desire to better support learning goals, address student needs related to changing demographics, confront evidence of uneven student success and/or retention in majors, and develop a compassionate teaching model (a need illuminated by COVID-19 and recurring local/national concerns related to racial injustice and more)

Evidence of this ongoing work speaks to our belief that the College is invested in institutional change.

CHALLENGES: Alongside these efforts described by a wide range of faculty and departments, we also heard themes that speak to the challenges needing to be addressed to realize systemic change:

* At a PWI like Kalamazoo College, BIPOC and queer students seek unique and time-intensive support and mentorship from faculty of color as well as from faculty who self-identify as LGBTQIA+ and thus, for receptive colleagues, add a significant workload alongside typical teaching, service, and scholarly expectations.

* At a PWI like Kalamazoo College, with explicit commitments to equity and inclusion, some faculty carry a greater institutional burden through the additional workload associated with their identity, their courses, service, and/or research commitments, and/or their need to devote time to the pedagogical demands (in and outside the classroom) to meet expectations.

* Though not necessarily true as it relates to each individual faculty member (whether White or BIPOC), it is generally the case that faculty of color negotiate scholarship expectations on top of significantly greater (and more untraditional and emotionally taxing) mentoring and service—to students, staff, fellow faculty, and College offices (e.g., Admission, Student Development, etc.).

* For some White faculty whose content area calls for the teaching, directing, or conducting of non-White literary, historical, theoretical, choral, and/or musical traditions, they navigate unique challenges in confronting histories of appropriation of non-White traditions or in integrating non-Western knowledges, i.e., issues that have had a real and/or perceived impact upon student and peer evaluation processes.

* For all faculty, it is broadly acknowledged that, if seriously embraced and engaged with the desire for institutional change, work associated with DEI is a meaningful, personally and professionally rewarding, continuous, and exceptionally time-consuming investment of labor.

* Within tenure and promotion processes, the enumeration and description of work contributing to an inclusive environment is seen as a difficult task and such labor often remains invisible, felt to be celebrated at best, and, in practice, frequently misunderstood or discounted as an intersecting dimension of teaching/advising, scholarship, and service.

* Numerous faculty voiced the worry that, in practice, addressing how one is “fostering an inclusive learning environment” may become another “leg” in the review process.

* Any change must resist the practice (and College culture) of adding additional responsibilities without some reduction in existing expectations related to teaching/advising, service, and/or scholarship as well as a
corresponding investment of monetary support.

"Without systemic changes to the value structure (in terms of tenure and promotion, workload adjustments, compensation, faculty grant support), DEI will function as "extra work" or an "add on" rather than a core dimension of student learning, professional development, and the institutional mission.

While so much emerged in the conversations with departments and divisions, two moments stood out to the degree with which comments reflected a kind of harm arising from the reward structures and campus culture. Arising from two different departments in the social sciences, these reflections point to the urgency of instituting systemic not simply superficial changes.

"In relation to the idea of "invisible labor," one person noted that "we are the [program] where people who are invisible on campus find themselves." In this context, then, it was said that until the "conditions" that lead this exhausting work are "dismantled," this HHMI-initiated dialogue can be seen as "performative." It was also noted that, for faculty of color, the very nature of the conversation around equity and inclusion, i.e., as it relates to naming labor that should be rewarded, constitutes engagement in the sharing of stories that revisits the trauma of this institutional harm. What does it mean, after all, to be asked to name what should already be accounted for if the institution treated its members humanely?

*The history of people not receiving tenure or full promotion seems to suggest that traditional, peer-reviewed articles may still be the standard for assessing promotion to tenure or full professor. This perception conveys a larger message that work flowing from and thus offering evidence of inclusion (at and beyond the college) has lesser importance in a program or discipline. Differently stately, it communicates the idea that centering social action and social justice in one’s teaching, scholarship, and service puts one at risk in “reward” structures.
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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**

The variety of programs we engaged with during the 2020-21 academic year and their successes makes it feel like the wind is at our backs. In many ways, the process of changing how we as a community see inclusion has begun. Can we capitalize on this momentum is the million-dollar question. We acknowledge that, for many, change is not happening fast enough. But we know that meaningful and sustained change is hard and comes slowly.

Our aspirations are again 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 Committing to Anti-Racism Education (CARE) priority:

This past year we contracted with the Higher Education Data Sharing (HEDS) Consortium, of which Kalamazoo College has been a member for years, and with whom we’ve collaborated with on several past projects. In addition to providing the HHMI team with critical feedback on the overall program, they will work with us to assess specific projects as they develop. This past year, they ran several small (4-5 person) faculty focused group sessions with faculty who attended the Intercultural Skills and Inclusive Pedagogy workshops. In these sessions they focused on faculty’s experience with the workshops and identified themes that emerged from the conversations.

Regarding future institutional aspirations, they helped us identify 2 strategies moving forward.
* First, continuing to build on existing strengths (substantial interest in furthering toolbox, digging deeper, more application into classroom).
* Second, broadening participation and inviting people in who have not participated in the past.

For the 2021-2022 year, we are inspired by a couple of themes from colleagues’ feedback:
* facilitating social connection and providing colleagues space and material support for making major changes to courses. We see this as an application-focused program that builds from workshops we’ve already held, rather than adding additional trainings that have a broad entry point. There is an appetite from faculty for the “next step” that helps them apply what they’ve learned from past workshops. However, feedback shows that the main challenge being a lack of time and mental capacity to make the major changes they desire. We also heard feedback that having stipends were important (e.g., material support to hire babysitter, compensating ‘extra’ work).

With our CARE budget, we would have a “mini-grants” program that financially supports instructors inspired by workshops and trainings to make changes to their work with students. Faculty will be in small groups expected to meet 2-times a term (paralleling the same rhythm as the workshop from 2020-2021). These groups may use meeting times to share progress and feedback, test-out ideas, or revisit content from the 2020-2021 workshop. To make these grants most accessible, we won’t be asking colleagues to compete detailed applications with fully formed idea for a major change before awarding grants; rather, we would encourage colleagues to experiment, try small incremental changes one term and then fine-tune in later courses.

In the HEDS report, the consultants noticed multiple uses of insider/outsider language in how participating faculty talk about non-participating faculty. The consultants shared several helpful insights for thinking about faculty who consistently do not participate in diversity and inclusion work (e.g., feeling like an “outsider” in spaces like a workshop on inclusion and diversity). One insight that stood out was that faculty might not be participating because they have intellectual disagreements with the way workshops or programming are framed as anti-racist, the need to decolonize a discipline or institution, or attributing behavior to white fragility. In retrospect, we realize that our workshop leader very intentionally used a framework and language of intercultural awareness and considering what unspoken norms and values faculty have in the classroom. In fact, the leadership team member who organized and publicized the workshops may have undermined the facilitator’s attempt to avoid these possible trigger words that turn off the very faculty we were trying to involve in the workshops.

In sum, aspirations for professional faculty development workshops include opportunities particularly for faculty
who want to push their inclusive pedagogy further, with spaces for faculty to continue to work together on
designing courses or work on personal development among people they feel comfortable being vulnerable around
because they’ve been working on similar issues. Aspirations also include building programming that attracts
faculty and staff who haven’t participated in the past, by working on how to frame workshops or sessions using
language that may be more inviting to these members.

Under the Inclusive Teaching and Revised On-ramps (INTRO) priority:
A major theme in this PIER report is the “stress culture” at the College generally, and its outsize effects on
students of color and first-generation students. The INTRO priority aspires to a growing acknowledgement on the
part of our instructors that the introductory STEM courses contribute to and in many cases reward a stress
mentality in our students.

Following on the lessons from the year-long Inclusive Pedagogy workshops, we hope to see individual STEM
instructors designing their courses with students’ sense of belonging and mental wellness as a guiding principle.

We hope that the wholesale rethinking of possible pedagogies and curricula during the pandemic time has created
an opening for our STEM instructors and departments to examine the assumptions underlying previous policies
and practices and move away from traditional structures that unduly impede students of color and first-generation
students.

As part of the work in the Learning Commons to reimagine their work together and in partnership with other
student support entities on campus such as the Counseling Center, we look ahead to a common thread of
emotional regulation and stress management as features of the peer-led learning support services we offer to
students in the STEM fields and across campus.

Under the Rewarding Anti-Racism Faculty Development (REWARD) priority:
Even when considering meaningful challenges, department and division discussions reflected a broad and
consistent embrace of the aims and work of equity and inclusion. Though conversations narrowed the focus to
address discipline-specific practices and potential changes to the review process and reward structure, faculty
participants demonstrated a readiness for and commitment to instituting changes to tenure and promotion policies
and procedures.

In terms of future aspirations, then, the next two academic years (2021-22, 2022-23) will be critical in moving from
having written equity and inclusion into the Plan of Employment and Faculty Personnel Committee (FPC)
expectations (2018-2020) to instituting T & P revisions that impact real and perceived harms of the review
process. Two members of the REWARD team were elected to FPC in 2021 (Amy MacMillan from
Business/Economics and Bruce Mills from English). They will join colleagues who have reviewed initial faculty
efforts to respond to “fostering an inclusive learning environment” in review statements.
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 COVID pandemic has catapulted us into activities that might have been difficult to pull off under normal conditions. In addition to stating that their desire to see institutional change is a motivating factor for engaging in the various programs rolled out this past year, faculty and staff also indicated that these programs have helped them deal with some of the feelings of isolation brought on by the work-from-home model.

Impact on practices - On the third Tuesday of every month, 20-25 faculty and staff gathered during the Anti-Racism Reading Knook (#ARRK) sessions for 1 hr to discuss a reading (book chapter or article). These sessions can be and are moderated by anyone at the College (moderators this past year included the Academic Director of the Arcus Center for Social Justice Leadership (ACSJL), the Director of our Intercultural Center, a professor of anthropology, our Associate Provost, and a team from our Development Office). The Development Office team, in fact, has created an internal reading book club and discussed several books already. A couple other mix-persons book clubs also developed this past year around some of the books discussed in the #ARRK. #ARRK is now a living thing for our community, here to stay, and may even continue in the virtual space in order to be available to a wider swath of the campus. These, what we refer to as “low stakes” activities, appeal to a broad range of colleagues who are at varying stages of the inclusive understanding journey, and although they may be low stakes, we believe they may be high impact.

Impact on institutional norms and traditions – what we’ve discovered through the 19: This Month in Black History series is that Kalamazoo College has had a fairly progressive history. For example, our story about Justice Thurgood Marshall unearthed the fact that he had been a commencement speaker in 1961 and was awarded an honorary degree at the College, and our story about Black Sororities and their role in US elections revealed that Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm was the speaker in 1985 and also awarded an honorary degree. James Baldwin’s visit in the fall of 1961 also inspired a 19 posting (and an #ARRK event on the address he delivered). The College archivist is amazing at helping us remember our past as we grapple with our present and plan for our future.

This past year, with support of the administration, the newly created Black Faculty & Staff (BAFSA) council pulled off an amazing weeklong celebration of Juneteenth that we called Black Joy Week. This celebration brought together current faculty, staff, and students, alumni, and community partners - most notably are the Western Michigan University's Black Graduate Students Association and the Kalamazoo Orchestra Jammbo'laya (O.Jamm). Funding for the events was obtained from the President and from the ACSJL. Like our annual MLK Celebration, celebrating Juneteenth is a tradition that is now here to stay. Our work this year is how to make this institutionalized and carried forward.

Impact on policies – A new Justice, Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (JEDI) standing committee of the faculty was created this year. Its charge is to “oversee policies and programs of the College in order to develop and sustain an inclusive and diverse campus community and to evaluate the effectiveness of the College's practices toward that end.” To that end, the members of this committee during this inaugural year, include the director of our IE grant, Dr. Stevens-Truss, will work towards creating a Diversity Office with a Chief Diversity Officer with power to effect necessary change.

Reference: GT11055
5. Examining Assumptions

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

Response

In our HHMI IE work, we have often voiced a common aim: our shared challenge of and commitment to creating a meaningful learning environment for students. In the parlance of the College over the decade, this has evolved into addressing a sense of belonging for individuals with a broader range of identities, experiences, and histories. For some faculty, this purpose gets imagined primarily in relation to course content, i.e., fostering a knowledge of a specific subject area and the capacity to think critically. To convey a respect for individuals as capable of success at a demanding educational setting—and to set up structures of support to enable this success—reflects a common aim. And, for many, especially given our growing understanding of the needs of a greater diversity of students, this aim is joined with addressing diverse student needs as they relate to College practices, programs, and policies.

Aspirations for the 2021-22 year:

It's become apparent that there is a critical mass of colleagues who value the tenets of a more diverse, equitable and inclusive campus. Programming for this coming academic year will involve activities for all constituents at the College.

At the student level – multiple offices on campus that interface with students' lives outside of the classrooms have begun conversations on programs to help guide students thinking and behaviors. During orientation all incoming first year students will take part in a series of activities to help build community and communication amongst the students. This will be followed by a series of 1st year Forums on topics such as microaggressions and implicit bias moderated by experts in the field, some from inside the institution. Our Athletic Director for the past year has been active in discussions with HHMI, the ACSJL, the Director of the Counselling Center, and the Director of the Intercultural Center, in hopes to create training for coaches on how to foster inclusive and understanding environments on athletic teams.

At the faculty and staff level - building from the 2020-21 yearlong Inclusive Pedagogy workshops, we plan to organize opportunities for faculty to continue conversations and learning from each other (e.g., discussing in-class strategies faculty have tried and finding time and space to work on syllabi changes). More emphasis will be placed on redesigning courses. We also plan to continue offering programming to invite in faculty who haven't participated in past workshops or trainings. From our focus group assessment of last year's workshops, it was recommended that we think about additional frameworks with which to address inclusive pedagogy and multicultural perspectives. We will also continue to offer anti-racism training to the campus; the Justice at Work course will be offered to all faculty and staff at the College on an annual basis. This training was shown to be great for giving everyone common language that can then inform additional discussions across areas. Folks who completed all or parts of the training in spring and summer 2021 stated that this is one of the best parts of the lessons. We will build on that with additional small and large group discussions tailored specifically to issues on campus, something that participants also stated was very good about the class. This online course, which from now on will be an annual private course available to all, was created in response to the COVID-19 pandemic as part of the Freedom Lifted Social Justice education programs of our former Executive Director of the Arcus Center for Social Justice Leadership.

At the institutional reward level – over the past academic year (and into this one), the effort to engage all departments (individually or in cohorts) in a discussion on inclusivity has not only served the function of hearing of successes and challenges but also set the foundation for proposing changes. In short, it has provided the opportunity to listen and reflect back what we have heard to faculty. (After each meeting, departments or divisions were given an extensive record of the conversation with the invitation to confirm the accuracy of the notes, offer corrections, or make additional comments.) In the fall term, we will provide a summary of findings to the Faculty Executive Committee, Faculty Personnel Committee, and the faculty as a whole (at one of our three fall faculty meetings).
meetings).

The following questions came out of discussions by the Rewarding Anti-Racism Faculty Development (REWARD) team this past summer. The discussions centered around the past year’s meetings with faculty and are offered as reflections as we move forward. In our conversation, we consistently returned to the fact that the pandemic has foregrounded the desire among the campus community to find ways to feed our passions.

*At this PWI, what must be recognized and redressed as a critical first step in order to intervene in institutional harm (on all but particularly in relation to students, staff, and faculty of color)? In other words, what are the necessary changes that, without which, the issue of “rewards” is meaningless?

*Given that individuals are hired after a time-intensive, fully-vetted search process, what if the assumption were that people were doing their jobs well, and the “burden of proof” were on departments to identify problems, challenges, mediocrity, etc?

*What if Faculty Development funding included a specific category for DEI work? Would such a designation more clearly institute a valuing of this labor (as it relates to teaching, service, and research)?

*What if we were to shift to the notion of “Professional Engagement” rather than “Professional Development”? Would such a shift enable a conceptualization of our work in ways that value DEI work, community outreach, social justice initiatives, etc?

*What if funding went towards projects that “feed” students and faculty? E.g., Student/faculty projects, faculty-only projects that come from intrinsic motivation rather than the external motivation of performance reviews?

*What if statements about teaching, inclusion, equity, etc. were departmental statements rather than individual statements, at least in those departments where much of this work is collaborative?

*How might structures (e.g., Tenure & Promotion processes) be developed to reward faculty who embrace DEI initiatives (and want to be recognized and rewarded for that)?

*In first-year reviews, what if faculty were invited to identify what excites them? (“What fuels you? What can you do to serve the students and the institution in the best way possible?”)

*Does the review process currently support those who identify as a teacher first? Are the frameworks defining research still somewhat coercive—whether in reality or perception—in giving value to traditional scholarship, i.e., what the Boyer model defines as the “scholarship of discovery”?

*What if the institution met faculty more fully where they are? Not unlike how we are seeking to find a way to meet students where they are in encouraging their own research (SIPs), might we not build a more inclusive, equitable (less harmful) workplace for faculty if we were to honor such centering passions (within individuals and departments)?

Reference: GT11055
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, nothing that will yield lasting change can be done in a bubble and MUST include all members (stakeholders) of a community. As we reflect on the work of this past year, it is becoming clearer and clearer that all our programs/activities involve(d) collaborations and working with experts.

**Under the Committing to Anti-Racism Education (CARE) priority:**
Much of the work in this lane relies on experts in the field. Dr. Amer Ahmed who moderated the Inclusive Pedagogy workshop, for example, is the Interim Executive Director for the Office of Equity and Inclusion at Dickinson College and the Founder and CEO of AFA Diversity Consulting (http://www.amerfahmed.com/about/). Dr. Ahmed brings a wealth of knowledge to the diversity and inclusion space with his many years of experience.

**Under the Inclusive Teaching and Revised On-ramps (INTRO) priority:**
During this past year faculty attended a number of pedagogical workshops through Coursera (https://www.coursera.org/), ASBMB-CUREs (https://www.asbmb.org/meetings-events/2021-annual-meeting), ACS (https://www.acs.org/content/acs/en/meetings/acs-meetings.html), and AAC&U (https://www.aacu.org/events/conferences), to name a few. These meetings showcase novel pedagogical tools and in most cases provide assessment information. It appears that faculty felt more inclined to attend these workshops in the virtual space as it provided more flexibility. It is our hope that this will continue and expand this year.

**Under the Rewarding Anti-Racism Faculty Development (REWARD) priority:**
We continue to seek information regarding how colleges and universities address DEI in their hiring practices and their tenure and promotion processes. For instance, we considered changes that the Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI) recently proposed (spring 2021) to their “Promotion and Tenure Guidelines.” (See https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2021/05/14/iupui-creates-path-promotion-and-tenure-based-dei-work.) This model offers possibilities, though, as we discussed, it also has the potential to create a “track” that may narrow faculty member’s professional roles even while making visible and giving value to DEI work in teaching, scholarship, and service.
7. Crossing Disciplinary Boundaries

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

Once again, we are reminded that our Kalamazoo College community has a wealth of individuals inspired to engage in this difficult work and a wealth of expertise to draw from. For instance:

*Trainings and workshops: we relied on recommendations from colleagues at the Arcus Center for Social Justice Leadership and the Intercultural Center.

*In hiring the Learning Support Specialist [Director of the Science, Math, Business, Economics (SMBE) Learning Centers], we relied on expertise from the Counseling Center professionals and the Learning Commons staff where our new colleague will be housed.

*For the Anti-Racism Reading Knook (#ARRK) - one of our Research Librarians has taken the lead on organizing and publicizing the program. It’s been valuable to have opportunities for faculty and staff to interact with each other. And having a non-faculty member as the face of #ARRK is likely to have created a greater sense of inclusion for colleagues who often feel like outsiders in faculty-centered spaces. K’s Advancement Office has also been doing a department-wide reading group and hosted an #ARRK session on a chapter from one of the anti-racism books they’ve read together.

*For the 19: This Month in Black History series – we relied on our Archivist every month to discover the history of the College within the context of inclusive practices.

*Getting information about students: for demographics, personal and academic, we relied on both the Admissions Office and the Office of Institutional Research, and to learn how students feel they are experiencing the place, we relied on our former Director of Institutional Research, Anne Dueweke, who conducted a series of student focus groups sessions again this year.

*For Web and Social Media presence – we relied on expertise of our Web Design Specialist and our social media savvy library team.
8. Re-invigorating Institutional Steering

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

Response

Continuing Intercultural and Anti-Racism Annual Training:

As noted in this reflection under Examining Assumptions, anti-racism training has been a part of our campus ethos for the past 10 years through the Eliminating Racism & Creating/Celebrating Equity (ERaC/CE) training principally driven by our Arcus Center for Social Justice Leadership. This will be continued and expanded by incorporating the Justice at Work - Freedom Lifted course into the life of the campus. In this way, current and future community members will all operate from a common set of language and paradigm actions.

Building Capacity in the Kalamazoo College Learning Commons:

We are proud and excited that on August 30, 2021, Dr. Rachel Love will join the College as the director of the newly-formed Science, Math, Business and Economics (SMBE) Learning Centers in the Kalamazoo College Learning Commons. She will coordinate peer-led learning support in each of those areas. Her office is in the newly expanded Learning Commons on the first floor of the Upjohn Library Commons. The SMBE Learning Centers encompass the Math-Physics Center, Supplemental Instruction in Chemistry and Biology, and the existing outside-of-class learning supports provided for student in introductory Business and Economics courses. The inspiration for the new position of SMBE director comes from the HHMI funded Inclusive Excellence initiative to create programs and spaces in which students from all backgrounds are welcomed and supported.

In the original IE project description, an important area of the College for planned capacity building was the Learning Commons. As the locus for outside-of-classroom learning support to students, the Learning Commons was at the center of conversations that inspired the INTRO priority of the K College IE project. In addition to spelling out a general inclusion and equity rationale for bringing HHMI IE resources to bear on strengthening Learning Commons STEM student learning services, the project narrative was quite specific about how the proposed HHMI-funded Learning Specialist would connect with existing organizational structures. From the very first meeting of the nascent Core Leadership Team in August of 2018 --- exactly three years ago! --- it became clear to us that the assumptions underpinning that specificity were naïve, ultimately reflecting an institutional fault line. It is indeed ironic that proposed interventions of the IE initiative pushed the Learning Commons to a breaking point.

The first work was probing fractures to slowly discover that a decade of uncoordinated first-order changes had created an unworkable collection of inequitable employment conditions for the directors of the existing learning centers, an over-mandated and under-funded set of demands on their collective time, and an unspoken stance on the part of the College administration that imagined a vertical organization structure (reflected in the IE project narrative) on a group of individuals whose past strength had come from outside-of-worktime collaboration around shared values.

A long, slow, intentional process of reconciliation and relationship building has brought us not to the point we thought we were already in 2018, but in fact to a much more sustainable one. Imagining and developing the new director position over many iterations with the INTRO team, the existing Learning Commons directors re-imagined their collaboration as well as their own positions and responsibilities. Crafting the description of what became the SMBE Learning Centers director was an opportunity for center directors to rewrite their own formal job descriptions to fit their lived experience in the Learning Commons. All the director positions now are commensurate in their working conditions and compensation, with formal responsibilities that reflect the work they perform. Evidence of the renewed strength of the Learning Commons collaboration and the institution’s understanding and trust is the award of a College Scholarship of Teaching and Learning grant to the directors in support of a project to bring an Executive Functioning framework to peer-led student supports.
To recognize their ongoing contributions as instructors at the College, Provost Johnson has committed to granting faculty status to each director, giving each a voice in faculty governance. One existing member of the Learning Commons was on the search committee for the SMBE director this summer, and the entire group of current directors met with each candidate on campus. The judgement of the Learning Commons directors was central to the committee’s consideration and selection of Dr. Love. There is great confidence that the Learning Commons will provide all the collaborative support and mentorship needed for the new SMBE Director to undertake and succeed in providing the inclusive support to our diverse community of STEM learners imagined by the authors of the IE project narrative.

Institutionalizing Equity and Inclusion into Hiring, Tenure, and Promotion practices

As noted earlier, our grant has also targeted reward processes as an essential component in institutionalizing values and practices associated with equity and inclusion. We have already revised the Plan of Employment, hiring materials, and Faculty Personnel Committee (FPC) processes and procedures to require attention to inclusivity. In the last two faculty review cycles (2019-2020, 2020-2021), for instance, the following expectations have been instituted: "For faculty beginning at the College in Fall 2019 and after, we will expect candidates to address this criterion [regarding inclusivity] in their work and personal statements during their reviews." At multiple faculty meetings (and on our College website), FPC stated that “[r]ecent search ads have included language about creating an inclusive learning environment, so we feel that colleagues starting in the fall of 2019 or later are beginning work at the College with this expectation already in place." All faculty, however, are encouraged to address this institutional commitment.
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

Perhaps the most unanticipated outcome was the willingness of all members of our community to engage in the work even during this most difficult year of isolation. The isolation may have been instrumental in coaxing people into spaces and work that otherwise they may not have ventured into. Either way, it was incredibly satisfying and heart-warming to find so many in our community ready to engage in the work and have difficult conversations together. We hope to capitalize on this momentum this year.

For many in the K community, the COVID-19 pandemic also seems to have brought to the forefront of our attention the unequitable learning situations students face, particularly first-generation students and students of color – inequities that predated the pandemic, but which COVID-19 exacerbated. With the pandemic highlighting these differences, faculty were especially motivated than ever to work on creating learning environments that support all their students. We hope faculty keep the changes they made in response to the pandemic toward creating more supportive learning environments.
10. PIC Engagement

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?

Response

Albeit all virtual, this past year, the PIC 9 had regular meetings (once every 2-3 months) following our summer meeting where we agreed on three objectives:

Objective #1: Addressing student and faculty trauma and loss and developing ways to help us all deal with learning and the traumatized brain – Kalamazoo organized a Teaching Forward PIC 9 retreat with Mark Nepo, that took place in August 2020.

Objective #2: Helping each other be better leader-agents to continue to guide our campuses towards change – led by UIC’s CLT, wherein they discussed how HHMI work is catalysing additional grant support opportunities for various areas of the University to obtain funding for DEI work. (Sept 2020)

Objective #3: Begin and continue discussions about what is working and not working on our campuses – our Syracuse University partners discussed several initiatives that that guiding them to changes that are persistent – they specifically discussed work of their Biology department. (Oct 2020)

We had two additional meetings:

February 2021, we met and each school presented an update of the work on their campus: Roosevelt described their Diversity Theatre program; UIC spoke of what they called “high-impact reading clubs” and reminded us of the work of Project Kaleidoscope; Syracuse spoke of their Cultural Identity Workshops, and shared the fact that their faculty annual update form now includes a question about DEI work. This allowed us (Kalamazoo) to elaborate on our work with changing our Hiring-Tenure-Promotion policies and guidelines.

What we have found helpful is the opportunity that PIC conversations provide in gauging how other institutions have sought to address many of their DEI issues. To know of impediments when trying to effect change has illuminated opportunities at our own institution. Moreover, we can define necessary changes with a greater confidence given what we are hearing beyond our campus.

Best example for us concerns our work related to the Hire, Tenure, and Promotion review processes as they related to equity and inclusion. The issue for R1 colleges and universities is principally navigating faculty governance structures and administrations. At Kalamazoo, we have a much nimbler process with our reviews being handled by one elected faculty committee (Faculty Personnel). Even so, we understood the need for meetings with all departments/divisions and thus setting up a collective listening that offered the promise (though certainly not a guarantee) of shared understandings and assumptions in moving forward.

Our Supportive Liberal Arts Cluster (SLAC) did not meet this past year. We did, however, continue to provide each other opportunities to learn from each other and collaborate in ways specific to individual pairs/groups.

Examples:

Lawrence University – building from our Discipline specific Communities of Practice workshops, individuals from our institutions were invited to participate in Faculty Peer Feedback Groups to foster connections with peers that could help in in course design and implementation.

Davidson College – invited all members of the SLAC to attend their Fostering Inclusivity and Respect in Science
Together (FIRST) series events.

Kalamazoo College – shared some implicit bias resources with the group.