

**Block 2, Goal 2**  
**10.6.22**  
**3:30 – 5:00 p.m**

**Moderators** Peony Fhagen, (PF), Sarah Hautzinger (SH) and Aju Fenn (AF)

**Initiative 1**

Procedures, practices, processes policies and the handbook,

**Initiative 2:**

Review and revise the college Core mission and values (Not today)

**FEC members present: 8**

**Other Faculty present: 5**

Ratio: 4 pre-tenure, 8 tenured

**Staff: 0**

PF: Theme this year for Crown is the Antiracism Implementation Plan.

- Review and revise college policies, procedures, handbooks, processes
  - o Two years ago, review of the student handbook and revisions were completed.
  - o Staff handbook is currently being revised; stalled when there was no one in that job but back on now.
  - o Faculty Handbook review currently being handled by the task force, which will make revisions and bring them to the faculty floor.
  - o Other initiatives in different places across campus, including in departments and programs.
- Review and revise the college mission and core values

College mission: “At Colorado College our goal is to provide the finest liberal arts education in the country. Drawing upon the adventurous spirit of the Rocky Mountain West, we challenge students, one course at a time, to develop those habits of intellect and imagination that will prepare them for learning and leadership throughout their lives.” PF: We really haven’t gotten to this yet.

CC core values: “As members of the Colorado College community, we share a commitment to

- honor the life of the mind as the central focus of our common endeavor;
- value all persons and seek to learn from their diverse experiences and perspectives;
- practice intellectual honesty and live with integrity;
- serve as stewards of the traditions and resources of Colorado College;
- nurture a sense of place and an ethic of environmental sustainability;
- encourage engagement and social responsibility at local, national and global levels;
- seek excellence, constantly assessing our policies and programs.”

Concern: announcements should come out earlier. AF: there was an earlier announcement from the Crown center, but we can do more reminders. Yom Kippur concerns. Add religious holidays to the academic calendar.

Open time for discussing what we're doing in our programs and departments.

- Chemistry: lots of ongoing, interlinked conversations. Progress in values and priorities. Updated vision and mission statement and developed a set of core values that we then want to use to address our departmental handbook. Classroom and departmental procedures. Clarifying expectation vs. departmental culture. What are the real expectations for taking summer research students? This is not a College-wide requirement. Service equity: what department committees and subcommittees are, who stays on them and how long.
- Anthropology: identifying core aspects of the discipline that have been antiracist from the beginning, making those more explicit. Reorganizing classes and syllabi. Departmental statement on antiracism and identifying the antiracist foundations of American anthropology. Developing resources on white fragility that can be included in syllabi.
- FEC personnel review—such attention to all kinds of different things that people are doing, no one right way, more about efforts and assets than about one right way to do this. Absence of it isn't necessarily a problem.
- Political Science: more explicit onboarding processes that invest all of us in the success of new faculty, who are bringing diversity to the department. Focusing on success and retention as a collective responsibility.
- Economics and Business: BIPOC students in Econ focus group moderated by faculty of color. Students voiced a desire for a wider range of pedagogical options, which faculty have implemented. Also for more diverse faculty. Doing ADEI training for hiring and have hired two new faculty members who have brought diversity to our department. Looking forward to reconnecting with BIPOC/marginalized students and to let them know about this process and how the department has responded.

Guidelines for engagement:

1. Critique the idea, not the person.
2. Listen to understand rather than to respond.
3. Step up/step back.
4. Reporting back honestly to those who are not in that room.
  - a. Depersonalize reports back elsewhere.
  - b. FEC collecting thoughts without attribution.
5. **Consider difference between intent and impact**
6. Assume best intentions.

Idea of incorporating ADEI into annual reviews/other forms of evaluation:

- Expectation vs. invitation:
  - o Expectation vs culture. Will people feel like they don't technically have to do something but then feel punished if they don't actually include it?
  - o More open conversations about broader definitions of antiracism if we're going to make it into an expectation (i.e., expanding beyond the United States). ADEI

considered “just one thing” but not everyone knows what that one thing is—that there is a clear idea out there about what this means, and that it isn’t a capacious or pluralistic approach. Clarifying what ADEI actually means to us. What are the *range* of things that this can include? Are we okay with different disciplines engaging in different ways?

- Many dimensions of injustice in the world—is this the *only* thing we’re doing? Can people address other forms of injustice as they see fit? Preserving diversity of trajectories over time, with interests waxing and waning as people go through their careers. Sometimes you’re doing more pedagogy, sometimes you’re doing more service, sometimes you’re doing more teaching.
- There may be constraints on pedagogical or research innovation in different disciplines and at different places in people’s careers. Beholden to external reviewers, disciplinary expectations. We should push back against that, especially if we have more power, but we shouldn’t necessarily expect junior scholars to make it in a field where they’re not in the dominant group.
- May have to be both. Trying to make it clear to people that antiracism is part of our mission at the college, so we need to ask about it—but we also need to keep in mind that that people are at different places in the college and positioned differently. Maybe someone doesn’t do so much ADEI effort, but they are a person of color, or work on disability?
- Performance review for staff: explicit question about DEI [not explicitly antiracism] contributions. Asking different things of staff than of faculty.
- Encouraging departments to create expectation statements about antiracism, the way we do with scholarship. So that people can have conversations and also expectations at the departmental level are clear.
- What are annual reviews for, anyway? How are they being evaluated? According to what standards?
  - The form of the report itself is evaluative, so it seems odd to include something that isn’t evaluative or is an invitation.
  - Lack of transparency about annual reports (FEC PP is working on this)
  - Is this to some extent already in the existing language around annual reports?
  - Would such a segment on ADEI in the annual/bi-annual faculty reports duplicate work already done in dept./programs annual ADEI reports?
- What about including ADEI in TYR/tenure/promotion?
  - Concern about holding junior faculty to different standards than faculty who have gone through the tenure and promotion process.
    - This already exists for scholarship expectations, and there is tension there.
    - If we’re serious about the commitment, ADEI should be central to everything we do (should be incorporated into teaching, research, and service).
    - Phased introduction?
- How do we evaluate scholarship that is critical of anti-racism? Department would have to talk about it. What about critical engagement with anti-racism?
- Is antiracist work as assessable as scholarship, service, or teaching? Should it be separate from personnel reviews? Perhaps a separate kind of document—an individual version of the departmental/chair’s assessment that we already do.

- Lack of capacity to understand what we're already doing that is inclusive/antiracist? Many of us are doing these things already, and would be happy to work on improvement. Some antiracist work is very visible, but there's a lot of smaller things we already do. Can we expect people to be thoughtful and reflective.
- What constitutes an anti-racist practice or pedagogy? Sense that we have more suggested practices than we have evidence. Assume it works on a theoretical basis but actually don't have much evidence for it. Do what degree is the institution supposed to prohibit the teaching of resources (for example, racist materials for the purposes of critiquing racism).
  - Best practices may seem loose and experimental, but they are based on research that's been done in classroom. Evidence of things that have created discriminatory environments—and the best practices that are being offered by experts are based in that.
- Having a clear mission with clear statements would really help for bringing something into annual salary and tenure/promotion files.
  - We've gotten out ahead of our mission.
  - Current mission statement was voted on by the faculty. Many possible ways that colleges can revise their mission statements. Perhaps it would be important to do a more inclusive process on this to increase buy-in.