

DEI 200 CASE STUDY

1 Cameron is an Assistant Professor at a research-intensive university who is actively preparing their
2 dossier for tenure and promotion. At their 3-year review, their department chair advised Cameron
3 to reframe the overarching story illustrating the core components of their research, teaching,
4 and service. Although a bit confused about the chair's comments, Cameron continued forward,
5 considering they received national recognition for their outstanding commitment to teaching
6 and learning for undergraduate and graduate students and raised 1.5 M in federal funding within
7 two years. A few months ago, the chair offered to review Cameron's dossier, so Cameron sent
8 the materials. In an email, the chair reiterated their initial concerns with Cameron's dossier. For
9 example, the chair suggested that Cameron's community engagements may conflict with the
10 values and beliefs of some of the reviewers. Out of concern, the chair worried their dossier might
11 elicit mixed responses from the P&T committee resulting in a puzzling report to the dean of
12 engineering.

13 This advice was unsettling, and Cameron sought advice from trusted peers and mentors to
14 discuss the suggestions provided in the review. During their meetings, they reflected on the
15 hiring process. They recalled how supportive the department chair and faculty were about their
16 previous research and teaching experiences and plans to build community partnerships to
17 ensure their research was implemented into practice. In fact, during the on-campus interview,
18 Cameron intentionally inquired about the institution's willingness to promote a tenure-track faculty
19 member with these core values. However, upon Cameron's reflection, it became apparent that
20 the institution was more concerned with recruiting a "diverse candidate" rather than recognizing
21 their work as legitimate contributions to the engineering field. As a result, Cameron struggled to
22 reconcile the internal values that resonate in their research, teaching, and service with the ideas of
23 what it meant to be institutionally acceptable.

24 Despite Cameron's concern, they completed and submitted their dossier as is. Several weeks later,
25 they received notification that the committee reviewed their materials and that they would not
26 be recommended for promotion to Associate Professor, citing a lack of traditional academic-type
27 background.

KEY TERMS

DIVERSITY:

Diversity is variety of race, gender, sexuality, (dis)ability, neurodiversity, personality, intersecting identities, different ways of knowing, doing, being, and cultural norms and values.

EQUITY:

Equity is the dismantling of systemic and institutional barriers, and giving people what they need to succeed.

INCLUSION:

Inclusion is the ongoing act of welcoming and valuing people's differences in terms of their identities, experiences, and ways of thinking and being.

INSTITUTIONAL BIAS:

Institutional bias is when procedures and practices operate to advantage (privilege) certain groups and disadvantage (oppress) or discriminate against others.

RACISM:

A system of oppression involving systematic subordination of members of targeted racial groups by those who have relatively more social power. This occurs at the individual and institutional levels.



DISCUSSION PROMPTS

WHAT MATTERS? → HISTORY ■ JUSTICE ■ RACE ■ LANGUAGE ■ FUTURES

Winn's Transformative Justice in Education Lenses

ERASING INSTITUTIONAL BIAS SYSTEMIC CHANGE FRAMEWORK

(Jana & Diaz Mejias, 2018)

Identify and set a clear intention. Identify and name biases that create institutional inequities.

Lead with data. Contextualize the opportunity for change with local data.

Diagnose accurately. Create a shared vision of change by listening to and understanding the experiences of all stakeholders, especially students. What is the current state?

Deconstruct: Eliminate subjective processes. Use the shared vision to critically analyze current processes and identify strengths or opportunities for growth. Prioritize opportunities.

Reconstruct with objectivity. Pretend you have a clean slate and envision what inclusion could look like. Select a process based on the priority list. Develop an action plan for achieving your vision.

Build in accountability and ongoing measurement. It takes time to make change in institutions with entrenched practices. Add metrics (dates, person accountable, success measures) that are ambitious, but realistic to begin taking action. Incorporate transparent continuous feedback loops to update progress and solicit feedback.

CASE STUDY REFLECTIVE PROMPTS

What are the systemic forces active in this case? (*Use the lenses of Transformative Justice*)

What systemic conditions can be deconstructed for Cameron (and others) to thrive?

What systemic conditions can be created or reconstructed for Cameron (and others) to thrive?

How can we build sustainable systemic changes for Cameron (and others) to thrive?

REFERENCES

1. Hall, E. T. (1976). *Hall, Beyond Culture*. New York: Anchor. (The Iceberg Theory of Culture was developed by Edward T. Hall in 1976 in order to illustrate how what influences a culture lies below the surface of what we are seeing at first.)
2. Senge, P., Kleiner, A., Roberts, C., Ross, R., Roth, G., Smith, B., & Guman, E. C. (1999). The dance of change: The challenges to sustaining momentum in learning organizations. *Performance Improvement*, 38(5), 55-58.
3. Winn, M. T. (2018). *Justice on Both Sides: Transforming Education through Restorative Justice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
4. Winn, M. T. (2019). *Paradigm Shifting Toward Justice in Teacher Education*. TeachingWorks working papers. https://www.teachingworks.org/images/files/Winn_TeachingWorks.pdf

