Campus Climate Committee AY 2018-19 Final Report
Submitted by co-chairs Ruth Chung and Renee Smith Maddox

History, Context, and Goals of the AY18-19 Campus Climate Committee
The Campus Climate Committee (hereafter referred to as CCC) completed its fourth year of service since its inception in 2015. The co-chairs, Ruth Chung (Rossier) and Renee Smith-Maddox (Dworak-Peck), have been members of this committee since its inception and co-chairs for the last two years. The members of the AY18-19 committee are listed in Appendix A.

The official charge of the CCC is as follows:
The Campus Climate Committee identifies, and shares with the Senate, effective approaches to cultivating a culture of equity, inclusivity, and respect that enhance the success of all faculty within a pluralistic context.

As a standing committee of the Academic Senate, its primary jurisdiction is over faculty-related matters. However, the expansive and seemingly all-inclusive term, *Campus Climate Committee,* has imposed an implicit responsibility to also address the need for programming and training centered on diversity, equity, and inclusion (hereafter referred to as DEI) campuswide. This has been a challenge for the CCC since its inception. Given the evolving and expansive scope of responsibilities, the goals and objectives of AY18-19 CCC were twofold:

- **Provide education and training focusing on inclusive practices in hiring and retention of diverse faculty.** This objective was achieved through two training workshops in the Spring 2019 semester with support from the Provost's Office and in collaboration with the Provost's Diversity and Inclusion Council. Lori Nishiura Mackenzie (Executive Director of the Clayman Institute on Gender Research at Stanford University) presented on inclusive faculty hiring practices, and Vijay Pendakur (Dean of Students at Cornell University) conducted an interactive workshop on applying universal design for learning principles in equity work.

- **Conduct review of peer institutions engaged in DEI work to support the development of a proposal that would focus on coordinating and supporting DEI work on campus through a center.** This objective was achieved by a systematic document analysis of peer institutions to determine the type of structure, resources, and programs that are in place to support DEI at the respective institutions.

In light of the above objectives, the organization of this year-end report begins with a summary of the two training events, followed by a summary of the document analysis of DEI work at peer institutions, and concludes with a set of recommendations for the future work of the CCC.

Training Events to Support Inclusive Hiring and Retention of Diverse Talent
On March 25, 2019, **Lori Nishiura Mackenzie** presented her talk on inclusive faculty hiring and development at the Vineyard Room of the USC Davidson Conference Center. Approximately 70 faculty, staff, and students attended the event. A smaller group (about 12) met with Ms. Mackenzie after the talk and lunch. This smaller group included members of the CCC, the Provost's Diversity and Inclusion Council, and a few Diversity Liaisons.

Ms. Mackenzie spoke about research regarding faculty hiring processes with a particular focus on gender. She also provided information regarding the implementation of inclusive hiring practices at Stanford University - in particular, at its Department of Chemical Engineering. She shared specific practices that yielded a diverse set of recruits, including the establishment of precise rubrics for assessment of candidates' qualifications, guidelines for discussing candidates by hiring committees, and ways to retain diverse faculty.

A detailed summary of the event's proceedings was compiled by CCC member, Holly Willis, and is attached as Appendix B. This summary, along with Ms. Mackenzie's slides, a video of her presentation, and photos from the event, is also available on the Academic Senate website on the CCC page.

On April 1, 2019, **Vijay Pendakur** presented an interactive workshop entitled, "Closing the Equity Gap: Design Principles for Institutional Transformation," at USC Davidson Conference Center. Approximately 80 faculty, staff, and students attended the event.

Dr. Pendakur facilitated an interactive workshop showing how principles of UDL can be applied to equity work. He alternated his mini-lectures with "design sprint" workshop exercises to illustrate how reaching the people at the margins can lead to innovations that benefit everyone. Dr. Pendakur also discussed the importance of data collection and iterative processes to measure the efficacy of equity-focused programs.

A detailed summary of the workshop proceedings was compiled by CCC member, Helen Choi, and is attached as Appendix C.

Recommendations Regarding Events Hosted by CCC
1. Continue joint sponsorship of events with the Provost D&I Council to make planning more efficient and messaging for engagement a priority.
2. Coordinate one event during the fall semester that provides a general overview of faculty diversity issues, followed by a spring semester event that provides a more in-depth training on a DEI specific topic. This schedule can help to make faculty development events more established and highly recommended for faculty colleagues, administrators, and other faculty members in leadership roles.
3. An Event Planning Summary is available from Helen Choi to serve as a guide or template for future events planned by the CCC.

Review of DEI Efforts at Peer Institutions
The primary work of the AY18-19 CCC was to conduct a thorough review of DEI efforts at peer institutions. This review was done for two main reasons. The first was to gain an understanding of DEI work in higher education (including faculty diversity, hiring, and retention) to determine what promising practices USC can

adopt. The second reason was to use this information to shape the proposal for the development of a center to coordinate and support DEI work at USC, tentatively called the Center for Inclusive Excellence. This section outlines the methodology used in this systematic review, the main findings, and resulting recommendations.

Methodology Overview of Document Analysis

As a starting point, the *U.S. News and World Report*'s ranking of top 25 R1 universities was used (with the acknowledgement that the ranking itself includes some biases). From this list, a subset of schools was selected by individual members of the CCC based on either their personal interest/knowledge of the institution and/or their reputation for being a leader of DEI initiatives in higher education. The resulting list of 13 institutions is as follows:

1. Brown University
2. Columbia University
3. Cornell University
4. Dartmouth University
5. Georgetown University
6. Massachusetts Institute of Technology
7. Stanford University
8. University of California, Berkeley
9. University of California, Los Angeles
10. University of Michigan
11. University of Pennsylvania
12. Washington University, St. Louis
13. Yale University

A set of initial codes to guide the document analysis was developed by the committee to provide a common framework for a systematic review of content available from publicly available sources on the internet for each institution.

1. Data Dashboard
2. Faculty Hiring Policy
3. Faculty Retention Policy
4. Faculty Hiring Initiative

5. Faculty Retention Initiative
6. Curriculum
7. Chief Diversity Officer (title)
8. Other Diversity Position(s)
9. Training/Professional Development
10. Access/Availability of Info

Upon completion of an initial review, CCC members decided to expand the analytic codes to reflect the additional information collected, such as:
1. Terminology: DI, DEI, EDI
2. Publications
3. Organizational infrastructure
4. Allocation for the infrastructure
5. Programming
6. Strategic Plan
7. Strategic Priorities
8. Strategic Actions

Once the relevant information was collected in these 18 fields for each institution, CCC members then summarized their findings. This summary report presented the loci of faculty diversity efforts within the institutions and the organizational structure of formal faculty diversity efforts, along with institution-specific faculty hiring, recruitment, and retention practices that USC might consider adopting. CCC members also provided guidance as to which faculty diversity practices USC may want to avoid. CCC member and qualitative methodologist, Artineh Samkian, with the assistance of graduate student worker, Nathalie Karimian, compiled the findings in **Appendix D**. The summary findings are described below.

Summaries by Relevant Categories

While we started with a larger set of codes, as we sought out information from the various schools' websites and were reminded of our committee's charge to focus on faculty recruitment, hiring, and retention, we narrowed our focus on issues

relevant to faculty. Below are draft summaries of the most relevant themes gleaned from this website/document analysis.

Organizational Infrastructure

Almost all the institutions had senior level administrators, often in the Provost's Office or directly advising the President, who oversee other DEI offices and initiatives. For example, Yale University has a Deputy Provost who oversees the Office of Faculty Hiring and Diversity, the Office of Diversity and Inclusion, and the Office of Equal Opportunity. University of Michigan has an Office of DEI, headed by the Chief Diversity Officer, which works in consultation with the Provost's Office and the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs. Most notably, UCLA has structured its DEI efforts by appointing a Vice Chancellor to oversee its initiatives. This is the most senior level administrative position compared to other peer institutions, and UCLA's structure should be seen as a model.

Data Dashboard

Many peer institutions have simple data dashboards for demographics (i.e., student, faculty, and staff gender and race/ethnicity breakdowns). A few of the universities have trend data. A notable practice is the inclusion of links to additional data from other data collection sources such as climate surveys and progress on strategic plans. For example, Cornell University has links to their Institutional Research website, which includes trend data for faculty demographics from 2010 to the present, but also data on climate surveys conducted every few years, including one for "faculty and academics." Brown University also has the results from multiple climate surveys and reports, which are all easily accessible on their website. University of Michigan has its recent DEI strategic plans and external committee reports on faculty diversity, and 15 specific tasks are marked as "in planning," "in progress" or "completed." UCLA has a separate office, BruinX, dedicated to research on issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion.

Access/Availability of Information

CCC reviewers who coded for access/availability mentioned that it was easy to find websites when searching for diversity or equity, and that many of the schools had easily navigable sites. Yale, UCLA, and Cornell all have centralized websites for policies, initiatives, and information related to equity. On these websites, links to other relevant offices and entities are present, even if their work is not explicitly related to DEI. For example, the Office of Institutional Research is linked to Cornell's diversity page, which takes the viewer to the demographic and campus climate surveys; and the Registrar's Office is linked to UCLA's equity page for information about the diversity requirement in the curriculum.

Faculty Hiring

In support of diverse faculty hiring outcomes, several universities require the inclusion of trained advisors on faculty search committees. For example, the University of Pennsylvania has diversity liaisons sitting on search committees. These are faculty trained in DEI and with the rights of approval over position postings, the right to participate in final interviews, and voting power on search committees. They can also veto candidates chosen by the Deans. At Brown, the Office of Institutional Diversity partners with every department undertaking a faculty search. They have diversity representatives present on faculty search committees.

In addition to advisors who are sitting members of search committees, a few of the universities, namely Cornell and UCLA, require implicit bias training for search committee members. And finally, in some peer institutions, financial resources are set aside to hire faculty that will bring diversity to the universities. For example, while the specific figures are not provided on their websites, the University of Michigan and Cornell allocate funds at the university level (through the Provost's Office, in the case of University of Michigan) specifically for diversity hires.

Faculty Retention

Faculty retention is an area that seems to be lacking in most of the institutions reviewed. While clear efforts have been made to support an equitable hiring

process across all universities, fewer institutions seem to be tackling the challenge of retention once faculty are hired. The approaches vary from professional development opportunities, to mentoring, to incentivizing equity focus in promotions/tenure guidelines. Below are the few exceptions:

University of Michigan and Cornell University have faculty development and training opportunities. Cornell has an Office of Faculty Development and Diversity, and it has an Institute for Diversity and the Inclusive Excellence Academy, which hosts summits and workshops. Both universities also provide mentorship resources. In the case of University of Michigan, faculty can become members in the National Center for Faculty Development and Diversity and the ADVANCE program, which is dedicated to initiatives, resources, and research supporting faculty recruitment, retention, climate, and leadership.

University mentorship opportunities are available at Dartmouth, where newly hired underrepresented faculty are matched with faculty/staff to show them around the school and neighboring towns. Similarly, Stanford organizes informal gatherings and lunches for underrepresented faculty. And finally, Washington University's Diversity and Inclusion Forum for Faculty and Staff (DIFFS) is a supportive network for all underrepresented faculty and staff. It aims to provide a welcoming, supportive and fair work environment and supports confidence building and self-reliance strategies.

Though these efforts do exist, CCC members found it much easier to find information about faculty recruitment and hiring, rather than retention.

Allocation of Funds
While not all summaries included information on how institutions allocate resources for DEI efforts, five universities specifically noted dollar amounts for diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts, although the details were understandably unclear from viewing the public website. Brown University allocated $3 billion for "Brown Together," approximately $165 million of which is dedicated to endowed funds included in the campaign to support the initiatives outlined in the diversity

and inclusion plan. This includes support for endowed professorships, graduate student fellowships, and curricular and co-curricular initiatives. Cornell University has allocated $60 million in the next five years. Money was also set aside from the Provost to find and hire faculty of color.

Recommendations from Document Analysis of Peer Institutions
1. Determine strategic DEI priorities
2. Elevate DEI work by appointing key, senior level administrators to oversee DEI initiatives that align with strategic priorities; centralize all initiatives; and communicate the progress of DEI initiatives to the USC community.
3. Work with the Research Office to develop a DEI data and evaluation office or team to examine data related to diversity, equity, and inclusion (e.g., develop and administer campus climate surveys, evaluate DEI initiatives on an ongoing basis).
4. In addition to the efforts started for training faculty search committee members, develop a robust retention effort; focus on faculty development for all faculty (including topics such as implicit bias, intergroup dialogue, cultural competence, equity-mindedness, mentorship, and informal programming for underrepresented faculty); and consider DEI efforts when reviewing dossiers for promotion and tenure.

General Recommendations from the Campus Climate Committee
In addition to the specific recommendations contained in each of the sections above, we offer the following general recommendations regarding the future of the CCC.

1. Change the name of the CCC.
The term "Campus Climate" is misleading in its expansiveness. Therefore, we recommend that the current name be changed to reflect the more narrowed sphere of focus as a standing committee of the Academic Senate which is charged to address primarily faculty-related matters. We suggest that the primary work of this committee to focus on recruitment and

retention of a diverse, world-class faculty; enhance work environment for faculty; promote diversity, equity, and inclusion; and create faculty development opportunities. In keeping with these foci, the *recommended name for the CCC is* <u>*F*</u>*aculty* <u>*E*</u>*quity,* <u>*E*</u>*ngagement, and* <u>*D*</u>*evelopment Committee (FEED).*

2. **Need for coordinated effort to promote gender equity and monitor sexual harassment**
    One of the main themes of concern and discussion within the CCC this year was the need for a coordinated effort to advocate for and monitor gender equity and sexual harassment prevention. Because of the salience and timeliness of these issues, we recommend that a separate standing committee be established under the Faculty Senate to help plan, coordinate, and communicate efforts around gender equity and sexual harassment prevention in partnership with CCC. *The recommended name for this committee is the Sexual Harassment Prevention and Response Committee.*

3. **Suggested Strategic Priorities for AY 2019-20 CCC**
    Current and past efforts of CCC have focused primarily on effective strategies to support recruitment of diverse faculty talent. However, *retention* of faculty has received little attention to date. *Thus, it is our recommendation that AY19-20 CCC focus on strategies to support retention of faculty.*

4. **Expand the number and composition of CCC for AY 2019-20**
    Given the scope and importance of the work undertaken by the CCC, we recommend an expanded roster both for a larger working group as well as to ensure representation of faculty across the diverse landscape of USC. Those with specific expertise in DEI work should be sought as well as representatives from HSC, Counseling & Mental Health Services, Diversity Liaisons, and Faculty Diversity Recruitment Advisors.

Appendices

Appendix A

AY 18-19 Campus Climate Committee Membership

Ruth Chung (Co-Chair), Rossier
Renee Smith-Maddox (Co-Chair), Suzanne Dworak-Peck
Helen Choi, Viterbi
Chantelle Collins Rice, Ostrow
Ruben Davila (Executive Board Liaison), Marshall
Jesus Dominguez, Ostrow
Ken Foster, Thorton
Farida Habeeb, Dornsife College
Ange-Marie Hancock Alfaro, Dornsife
Cynthia Herrington, Keck
Sharoni Little, Marshall
Elahe Nezami, Dornsife
Artineh Samkian, Rossier
Kristan Venegas, Rossier (served through December 2018)
Holly Willis, Cinematic Art
John Wilson, Dornsife

Appendix B

Embracing Inclusion in Faculty Hiring and Retention
Lori Nishiura Mackenzie
Executive Director, Clayman Institute for Gender Research
Monday, March 25, 2019

Notes by Holly Willis

On March 25, 2019, Lori Nishiura Mackenzie, the Executive Director for the Clayman Institute for Gender Research at Stanford University and Co-founder of the Stanford VMware Women's Leadership Innovation Lab, visited USC to talk about faculty hiring processes with a presentation titled "Embracing Inclusion in Faculty Hiring and Retention."

Mackenzie started by recognizing that broad change related to equity and diversity across an entire campus can be challenging. In place of a radical overhaul of a particular campus and its climate, she advocated instead for "small wins" that accrue. Her talk, bolstered with extensive research, presented five ways we might score these small wins in the context of faculty hiring and retention. However, Mackenzie began her talk by outlining the barriers we need to address.

First, Mackenzie discussed bias, defining it as an error in assessing talent. These errors are in turn supported by stereotypes, which function as cognitive shortcuts in information processing. Mackenzie explained that every culture has at least three frames used to categorize people and, for the US, those frames are gender, race, and age; she added that our beliefs affected by bias and stereotypes happen largely outside our conscious awareness.

Mackenzie went on to say that biases are often more likely to assert themselves in four circumstances, namely 1) when we are overwhelmed with information; 2) when we are in a hurry to make decisions; 3) when the criteria for making evaluations are unclear; and 4) when we do not have a consistent process to guide group decision-making. When these circumstances are present, we need to pay extra attention to the role bias may play. For faculty engaged in hiring, these circumstances are quite familiar!

In addition to bias and stereotypes, Mackenzie addressed the relationship between gender and language. "The most common way that we transmit and maintain culture is through language," she said, explaining that while we tend to feel that our word choices are made independently,

often the words we use are based on stereotypes. Communal terms – words such as warm, tactful, helpful, sensitive, caring – are often attributed to women while agentic terms – such as intelligent, determined, ambitious, outspoken – are often attributed to men.

These biases in language in turn can prompt committees, often unwittingly, to make questionable choices within the hiring process. For example, a committee might unconsciously set a higher bar for certain candidates, asking for further evidence in order to regard a candidate as equally competent with others in the pool. Similarly, a committee might scrutinize certain candidates more carefully by introducing extra criteria or shifting the criteria based on race, gender, or age. There may be a tendency to over-value agency and under-value communal qualities as well. Finally, women and people of color may suffer what is known as the "likability penalty," which is the idea that while a powerful presence is deemed notable among some candidates, it can be construed as "bossy" among others. Women and people of color are expected – somehow – to be at once likable and nonthreatening, but powerful as well. The contradiction can be impossible to overcome. Worse, many people are not aware of these dynamics and their impact on thinking and decision-making at all.

Mackenzie offered five strategies to overcome the barriers that she outlined. First, she suggested that faculty create a diverse applicant pool in the hiring process by describing positions broadly in ads; avoiding a laundry list of requirements that can make jobs out of reach for diverse candidates; being wary of narrow searches; and considering ways that our institution can bring people to campus who might find the institution too intimidating to even apply.

Second, before evaluating applicants, discuss and find alignment on criteria for the position and be sure to avoid criteria based on style or personality, focusing instead on performance. Consider the ways in which some people may have had advantages that can appear as markers of success. For example, certain candidates may have earned awards that were in turn based on bias. Finally, read the work of those applying rather than simply viewing a CV.

Third, Mackenzie invited us to attend to the use of language and the ways in which communal and agentic terms may be used. For faculty, this can mean reviewing letters of recommendation carefully. If we are in the process of hiring, reading these letters with an awareness of unconscious bias can be useful. Similarly, when we are writing letters on behalf of our own students, we would do well to be sure that we are not unconsciously falling into gender stereotypes when we describe them.

Fourth, Mackenzie said that during the screening process, we should slow down and develop a consistent approach; monitor our criteria carefully during the process; and be on the alert for bias in recommendation letters, teaching evaluations, and other indicators of performance.

And fifth, during the interview process, once again, be consistent and stick to the criteria. Monitor behavior: research shows that women are more frequently interrupted during their job talks than men, for example, which in turn affects their ability to deliver a great presentation. Finally, structure faculty discussions of candidates to get input from everyone.

Mackenzie's talk was illustrated with abundant research, with report after report indicating the ways in which bias and stereotypes function to affect evaluations of candidates.

Overall, Mackenzie's presentation was a valuable introduction to the abundant research that shows the chilling impact of bias and stereotypes in hiring, especially in relation to race and gender. Her "small wins" approach offers a viable step forward, inviting us all to make even small, consistent shifts that will help reshape university culture.

Resources
VMware Women's Leadership Innovation Lab https://womensleadership.stanford.edu/

 "Minimizing Gender Biases in Modern Workplaces:" A 'Small Wins' Approach to Organizational Change," Shelley Correll, *Gender & Society,* December 1, 2017, Vol. 31, Issue 6.

Mackenzie, L., Wehner, J., Correll, S. (2019, Jan 11). *Why Most Performance Evaluations are Biased, and How to Fix Them*, Harvard Business Review.

Mackenzie, L., Correll, S. (2018, Oct.1). *Two Powerful Ways Managers Can Curb Implicit Biases*, Harvard Business Review.

Phillips, K. (2014, Oct. 1). *How Diversity Makes Us Smarter*, Scientific American.

Appendix C

Closing the Equity Gap: Design Principles for Institutional Transformation
Vijay Pendakur, Ed.D.
April 1, 2019

Notes by Helen Choi

On April 1, 2019, Vijay Pendakur, Dean of Students at Cornell University, visited USC at the invitation of the Provost's Diversity and Inclusion Council and the Academic Senate's Campus Climate Committee to guide attendees in a workshop designed to introduce methodological principles of universal design in equity work.

After a welcome and introduction by Renee Smith Maddox, Associate Dean of Equity, Diversity and Inclusion and co-chair of the Campus Climate Committee, Dr. Pendakur began the session with an icebreaker for attendees called "Easy as 1-2-3." In pairs, attendees first took turns counting to 3. They then repeated the exercise but replaced the numbers with claps and later with claps and snaps. Attendees shared their feelings when they "messed" up the exercise and how they reacted to each other when there was a mistake. Afterwards, Dr. Pendakur guided attendees on a reflection on the power of empathy and how body language, eye contact, and behavior changed over each exercise to strengthen connections within pairs.

Dr. Pendakur then shared stories of his immigrant background and his childhood growing up in a diverse neighborhood in Chicago. He noted that just as he sometimes felt a sense of longing and displacement, so too do many of our students who come to campus -- searching for a "home" yet "lost in our midst."

After briefly introducing us to his family, he began the workshop with the following agenda:
1. What is equity
2. A brief primer on design thinking
3. Design strategies mini-modules
4. Partial design sprint woven throughout

What is Equity?
Dr. Pendakur defined his understanding of equity as the principle that "[p]people need to be treated differently in order to optimize outcomes." He also noted that all students - even highly privileged ones -- need help at times, but that such help comes in different forms for different

students. Unfortunately, K-12 and higher education systems are not designed to treat students differently. Instead, they are designed to service specific learning types, and the further a student is from the intended end user type – the harder it may be for that student to find success in educational systems. "Equity-minded" practitioners are institutional and system-focused – with particular attention to learners on the margins. They focus on the educational system, its construction, and how the system's design reaches students on the margins.

5-Step Model of Design Thinking
Dr. Pendakur introduced a 5-step model of design thinking that attendees could use when designing programs to better support student success:
1. Empathy
2. Define
3. Ideate
4. Prototype
5. Test

Dr. Pendakur explained "empathy" by comparing it with Apple's approach to user-centered designs and experiences. He contrasted the user-friendly features of an iPhone with the early iterations of the home computers such as the Commodore 64 which was notoriously difficult to operate and use for non-computer scientists.

As applied to our campuses, empathy can be reflected in our willingness to understand who our students are (rather than ideas of who our students should be). Currently, many of our students are from 21.5% of the American population which is "Gen Z" – born after 1995. Our Gen Z students are social media natives, deeply affected by the Great Recession in 2008, more than 50% people of color, have heightened social consciousness, and face greater mental health challenges.

Dr. Pendakur asked if our campuses were designed for Gen Z students. He also asked if our campuses were designed faculty by faculty or researchers for researchers. Are our schools designed for GenZ students or for students from generations ago? He posited that the Equity Gap exists largely because we are using a system that is not designed with our users in mind and that we might be defining our user groups as having characteristics of those who may no longer be on campus. Extending his analogy about the iPhone, he noted that we might be using a Commodore 64 system for a generation of iPhone users.

As "equity-minded" practitioners, attendees should be:
1. evidence-based
2. race conscious

3. systematically aware
4. institutionally focused
5. equity advancing

We need to be equity-minded designers when examining existing systems and designing new ones that are more agile, responsive, and focused on bringing students on the margins to the center. When we do this, more students benefit.

Design Strategies – Mini-Modules
Dr. Pendakur then transitioned to the "Design Sprint" portion of the workshop where attendees engaged in exercises that modeled steps 1-3 of the 5-step design process. He presented three short lectures (mini-modules) - each of which was followed by a tabletop, hands-on design sprint exercise.

Dr. Pendakur noted that attendees should approach these exercises with the same sense of empathy that attendees exhibited during the icebreaker and also refrain from bringing in attitudes of "habitual defeat" that can overcome people working in diversity. He exhorted attendees to espouse attitudes of optimism so as to unleash creativity and embrace infinite possibilities.

Mini-Module #1:
Empathy Pathway: Create a genuine sense of belonging. This sense can be elusive if you are one of the few (hyper-marginalizations). Being the "only one" can be a threat to belonging. But even if we aren't the only ones and there is compositional diversity, that alone is often insufficient to create belonging. For example, many college campuses are diverse, and yet we still do not understand how to get along. Many students come from home communities that are not as diverse as their college communities.

Key Belonging Messages:
· you are not alone
· you are valued here
· it gets better

How do you get people to believe these messages? How can we operationalize these messages? Examples of successful campaigns include: #AmherstIBelong and Cornell's year-long campaign of faculty, staff and students discussing belonging on campus with hidden and visible disabilities.

Design Sprint Exercise #1:
Each attendee was provided with a worksheet titled "Designing for Belonging."

Each attendee reflected on prompt about a group of people or end users and what belonging might look like for this group. They wrote for 3-4 minutes on their own and they shared their thoughts with a partner at the table.

Mini-Module #2:
Universal Design for Learning (UDL): UDL is a methodology of building processes initially designed to help one community but helps many others ("greatest breadth of learners without the need for adaptation").

An example of UDL is "curb cuts." Curb cuts' intended and original application was to enhance accessibility for wheelchairs but in practice they also help others, such as people with strollers, suitcases, and people with mobility issues.

An example of UDL in course design can be seen in an undergraduate biology course at UNC, where an instructor who taught multiple sections approached them differently. The instructor taught some with traditional lectures, and taught others with more "structure" – which Dr. Pendakur defined as having more chances for small assignments with feedback, active learning, engagement, more questions/answers, and other shifts in pedagogical technique. The results showed increased student outcomes for white students, but even more improvements for black and first-gen students. All students benefited from the modification in the system. Thus, according to Dr. Pendakur, "when you change and restructure for the margins and bring margins to center, the center improves as well."

A common (and tired) response to changes in design is: "But we've always done it this way." But past design may fail to meet the standards of UDL – as it may not be designed for the greatest breadth of learners without specialized adaptation.

Design Sprint Exercise #2:
Attendees were instructed to write a problem statement with three elements: Human centeredness (center the user group), broad scope (don't limit creativity), narrow focus (manageable for your focus of control and influence).
Attendees spent 5 minutes reflecting on and identifying a program for their end-users that is failing to serve current users. Attendees then drafted clear definition of a problem statement beginning with the phrase, "how might we?" Beginning with this phase helps to remind attendees of the "infinite possibilities" and "intentional optimism" that enhance creativity.

Mini-Module #3: The Asset Lens
Deficit lens – shifts focus on students rather than systems and reduces students to what they are perceived to lack.

Asset lens – looks at what is happening with students in terms of what they have in terms of life experiences, resilience, and skills. We should center their assets and strengths – they are not broken. Start by studying success, and ask "how are women doing well in STEM?" rather than "what's wrong with women?" Ask "what strengths do female learners have that can be leveraged in STEM?"

Design Sprint Exercise #3: Ideate
Ideation was defined as the generation of ideas and contrasted with everyday problem-solving, as this step was designed to push the boundaries of creativity. Attendees were encouraged to:
1. think of centering the asset lens
2. dream curiously, disrupt/flip, adapt and connect

Attendees chose one "how might we" problem statement from Design Exercise #2. One attendee wrote the chosen statement at the top of a giant poster-sized post-it at the center of the table. Others then wrote suggested solutions on regular-sized post-its and stuck it on the poster-sized post-it. Attendees noted that this helped to "anonymize" responses – helping people feel freer about sharing.

<u>Conclusion</u>
Dr. Pendakur ended with a discussion about prototyping and testing designs, and he emphasized the importance of data capture and iterative processes to better understand user needs and how to meet those needs promptly with our re-designs. He noted the importance of response times, and he said that the length of time cycles depends on the concept and design. It could be days, weeks, or months but probably not years because that time lag would likely underserve users.

This presentation of methodological tools as applied to equity design provided attendees with practical ways to take action to existing systems and build new designs, and attendees were greatly encouraged and inspired by Dr. Pendakur.

Appendix D

Summaries of Main Themes of Document Analysis of
Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Efforts at Peer Institutions

https://www.dropbox.com/s/hlj7a51kcp9jls4/DocumentAnalysisDEI_InitiativesSummaries.pdf?dl=0