ABOUT
This document provides scaffolding to guide institutions in conducting their self-assessments and developing their related action plans. The aim of the SEA Change Bronze criteria and process is ultimately to provide an institution and the peer reviewers of its application a “30,000-foot view” of the principal barriers, challenges, and opportunities to advance equity, diversity, and inclusion at an institution. To present the expected scope and depth of information in a Bronze application in manner that helps peer reviewers gauge whether the institution has identified and is proposing an action plan that addresses key barriers and challenges, and seizes on key opportunities to address them, an institution’s self-assessment team will need to use these detailed self-assessment guidelines.

NOTE: While some general awareness-raising guidance on policy and law is provided, and we hope you find it helpful, nothing in this Criteria & Guidelines document or the SEA Change program constitutes legal advice to any institution. Institutions should consult their own legal counsel for legal advice specific to their facts and circumstances. This is noted in some places but applies throughout.

We rely on, and need, your feedback about this document. Please send comments to seachange@aaas.org
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INTRODUCTION

The SEA Change Institutional Bronze Criteria & Guidelines provide scaffolding to guide institutions in conducting their self-assessments and developing action plans in response to the findings of the self-assessments.

The aim of the Bronze review criteria is ultimately to provide an institution and the peer reviewers of its application a “30,000-foot view” of the principal barriers, challenges, and opportunities to advance diversity, equity, and inclusion at an institution, in a manner that helps peer reviewers gauge whether the institution has identified and is proposing an action plan that addresses key barriers and challenges, and seizes on key opportunities to address them.

To arrive at the 30,000-foot view, institutions will need to gather and evaluate more in-depth information but will not present most of that detailed information to SEA Change. To arrive at the scope and depth of information expected in a Bronze application under these criteria, an institution’s self-assessment team will need to use the detailed self-assessment guidelines.

The application should summarize the findings of the assessment, tie conclusions to actions as appropriate, and provide a detailed action plan that will address key findings and move the institution forward over the award period.

In other words: the reviewers want to see the institution demonstrate an understanding of the relevance, meaning, and impact of information they have gathered and assessed, as it relates to revealing and removing barriers to diversity, equity, and inclusion—not a regurgitation of data.

To help guide this process, information in this document has been partitioned into distinct categories within each area of self-assessment:

REVIEW CRITERIA

These criteria are what peer-reviewers will be using for guidance while reviewing the application and also are meant to help self-assessment teams navigate to the “30,000-foot view” to demonstrate an understanding of the impact of what was found in their self-assessment.

GUIDELINES

These are the detailed self-assessment guidelines for the team to use to develop its own evidence base for identifying barriers, challenges, and opportunities. All of this detailed information is not to be included in the application but is necessary to decide what will be included in an application and action plan. Much of the self-assessment process involves detailed exploration of the programs, policies, practices, and processes used at the institution. Teams may consider this a “micro-level” understanding of the STEM landscape at their institution. Coupling the guidelines with the review criteria will help the teams see overarching issues that need to be addressed and determine the priority and sequence for addressing them — a “macro-level” understanding of the STEM equity landscape at the institution.
The following orange boxes should be considered a part of every section of the self-assessment; if there are additional, unique considerations for a section, that additional information will be included in boxes within that section:

**RETAILING CONFIDENTI ALITY: INTERNAL LEGAL ADVICE AND LEGAL EVALUATION AREAS**

Please see “Retaining Confidentiality: Internal Legal Advice and Legal Evaluation Areas” and “Demonstrating Depth of Self-Assessment While Retaining Confidentiality” in the Bronze Handbook for an in-depth overview of internal legal advice.

Each institution that decides to submit an application must do an in-depth self-assessment of all topics of the SEA Change program (from a good policy perspective) and then must develop a forward-looking action plan (that reflects both good policy and legal sustainability) for those topics that the institution decides are its priorities.

The in-depth self-assessments undertaken in the SEA Change program cover a broad range of distinct policies, procedures, practices, and undertakings of an institution and it is understandable that an institution would seek confidential and privileged legal advice from its internal and external attorneys on distinct topics within that broad range, whether or not the institution were participating in SEA Change. Each institution may decide in its discretion to seek legal advice on a confidential and privileged basis from its internal or external legal counsel on:

- any distinct topics referenced, in broad terms, by the SEA Change application Criteria & Guidelines and handbook for the purpose of determining the institution’s current and prior legal status and legal strategies regarding such distinct topics;
- the readiness of the institution (from a legal perspective) to submit a SEA Change application overall or to include forward-looking actions respecting topics referenced, in broad terms, by the application Criteria & Guidelines and handbook; and
- how to retain privileges and confidentiality of legal advice to the extent possible

All such legal advice sought by the institution from, and legal advice provided to it by, its attorneys—including the substance and findings, and related data compilation and analysis—are “internal legal advice.”

When a distinct topic within those broadly referenced in the SEA Change application Criteria & Guidelines and Handbook is the focus of or within the scope of internal legal advice, it becomes a “legal evaluation area” with respect to: its current and prior legal status and the institution’s associated legal strategies; the institution’s readiness (from a legal perspective) to submit an application at all and to submit an application that includes the particular topic; and how to retain privileges and confidentiality. **Internal legal advice and legal evaluation areas are not within the scope of the SEA Change program and are not required to be included in a SEA Change application or to be disclosed to SEA Change.**

In contrast, forward-looking action, with metrics to monitor progress, respecting any topics that an institution includes in a SEA Change application (as the institution develops metrics for that distinct forward-looking purpose), must be included in the action plan and are within the scope of the SEA Change program.

Also, institutions need not disclose any involvement of their lawyers or internal legal advice (including, without limitation, on legal evaluation areas); failure to do so does not mean lawyers were not directing the analysis. Also, the fact that an institution seeks to protect privileges and confidentiality of internal legal advice, or that an action plan...
addresses future actions on any topic, is not an indication of any wrongdoing. Responsible institutional action for continuous improvement often requires these kinds of analyses and actions.

The application should reflect that appropriate HR, legal, and/or other experts are involved in the development of the action plan (which includes forward-looking actions that are both good policy and legally sustainable).

Legal advice to an institution from its attorneys on the development of a legally sustainable forward-looking action plan is separate and distinct from internal legal advice on prior and current legal status and strategies (including without limitation on legal evaluation areas). Institutions may want to consult their attorneys on how to keep each type of legal advice confidential and privileged to the extent possible.

REMINDE R: PERSONALLY IDENTIFIABLE INFORMATION

SEA Change applicants are prohibited from providing personally identifiable information (“PII”) to AAAS/SEA Change. While members of the self-assessment team may work with PII, the applicant institution may not (directly or indirectly) provide PII to AAAS/SEA Change.

INCLUDED IN APPLICATION

What should be included as part of an application? What is a 30,000-foot view? Which analyses and information should be presented, and in what detail?

In order to determine institutional priorities for action, and why those are priorities, the team must conduct the thorough self-assessment using the detailed guidelines. It might be tempting to pick and choose parts of the self-assessment when not everything needs to be included in the application. If a self-assessment hasn’t been thorough or holistic, reviewers will notice.

For each section in the application, identify which topics the self-assessment team has determined should be prioritized to have the greatest impact on the removal of barriers to diversity, equity, and inclusion in STEM. For any specific relevant topics that are not included in internal legal advice and are not legal evaluation areas, consider and briefly address inquiries included in the “Included in Application” box for each section.

What barriers have been identified (note: a barrier might be lack of necessary information or data to make informed decisions)? Why are these determined to be priorities, including their impact? Identification of priorities needs to be based on evidence, thus the application needs to include high-level depictions of key data and information to support the decisions (other than internal legal advice and legal evaluation areas which are outside the scope of SEA Change).

Other barriers or information gaps discovered in self-assessment in each section that are not considered priorities should be conveyed, briefly, along with an explanation of why they are not an institutional priority for the succeeding 5-year period of the Award.
Finally, embed any actions in the action plan that the institution will pursue over the coming five years to address the institution’s priority barriers and challenges, and seize its priority opportunities, based on information gathered in the self-assessment in this section. Include definitions of merit or success and measures of progress, as well as the management and evaluation systems that will be employed. See ACTION PLAN in this document for more details.

INCLUDED IN APPLICATION: EXAMPLE

Using STEM faculty mentoring as an example (section 6.2), the self-assessment team might choose to include in the application:

1) a figure summarizing qualitative feedback from climate surveys or other sources about faculty experience disaggregated by race, ethnicity, and gender (sense of isolation and marginalization or welcome and full participation); and

2) correlate that with
   a. a figure or two depicting the participants across all STEM faculty mentoring programs, disaggregated by gender x race/ethnicity;
   b. a chart showing participation in these programs (both mentor and mentee) compared to the disaggregated STEM faculty profile of the institution; and/or
   c. a figure identifying any faculty groups not being included in or benefiting from these programs or faculty groups with disproportionate mentoring responsibilities.

A short narrative or bulleted list of action(s) proposed to address why there may be inequitable participation across gender and/or race/ethnic groups for both mentees and mentors should accompany these figures. Included in this narrative can be a description of which elements of this section are a priority for the institution and why. Also describe the measures that will be used to determine progress and the management and evaluation systems that will be employed.

In addition, if the self-assessment identified a specific mentoring program that had more success with diversity, equity, and inclusion than others, the application might provide a brief explanation of that fact and the measures of its success. The institution should also either identify the reasons why the program has been particularly successful (based on its evaluation of the program) or outline what the institution plans to do to ascertain why the program is more effective – and how it may choose to scale up the program so that it can become a model for other STEM faculty mentoring programs.
OVERVIEW: CRITERIA AND REVIEWER GUIDANCE

GENERAL CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVIEW CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- Applications should be complete. If something is not addressed, the application should acknowledge that fact and briefly state what the institution is doing to be able to address the matter in the future, with a projected time line if possible. While the self-assessment guidance is meant to be flexible, applications should be holistic and meet the Bronze Award threshold.

- Applications should indicate the evidence-based workflow used to explore the information gathered about their institution. While exhaustive detail is *not* necessary in this 30,000-foot view, reviewers must be able to see the connection between awareness (information gathering) -> understanding (assessment of the meaning and impact of information in relation to SEA Change goals) -> action.

- Applicants should describe the rationale behind mechanisms used for assessment, decisions about communication of findings, and interpretation of findings throughout the application.

- Applicants should consistently describe the evidence base used to inform decisions (at the 30,000-foot level, not in detail).

- Assessment should provide a basis for the institution to move from awareness to understanding to action.
  - The narrative description of the assessment should be clearly derived from the data collected and evaluated (with a top line summary provided) and the suggested actions should be aligned to the findings—applicants are expected to demonstrate their consideration of all information collected and that they’ve tied their actions to their understanding.
  - See the box above concerning internal legal advice (including associated data collection and evaluation) and legal evaluation areas which are outside the scope of SEA Change and are not required to be disclosed.

- Available data should be reasonably disaggregated in a manner that demonstrates understanding of the importance of addressing intersectionality.
  - Applicants should acknowledge work done to protect personally identifiable information (PII) and prevent its disclosure in the application. Applicants are prohibited from providing PII to SEA Change; see Confidentiality: Personally Identifiable Information in the Institutional Bronze Handbook.
  - Applicants should consistently disaggregate quantitative and qualitative data by both gender and race/ethnicity, as well as broad STEM fields, in order to better understand the experiences of, for example,
women of color in the physical sciences vs. the social sciences.

- Applicants should acknowledge the issues encountered that limit their ability to disaggregate data.

- Gaps in data should be identified and acknowledged, and the action plan should demonstrate that robust actions are being put in place to fill in the gaps before the next self-assessment.

- Metrics for progress, definitions of success and merit, and sustainable systems for evaluation should be included.

- While not required components of the application, excellent self-assessment will include:
  - Historical data from at least the past three years, if available.
  - Benchmarking against any available national data sets or peer institutions, or a discussion of attempts to do so.
  - Beginning exploration of one personal identity factor, in addition to race, ethnicity, and gender, within the self-assessment that is important for the institutional mission; e.g. disability status, identification with the LGBTQ+ community, first generation college student, age, veteran status, etc.

**BRONZE AWARD CRITERIA**

**REVIEW CRITERIA**

A successful SEA Change Institutional Bronze Award application demonstrates that the institution as a whole has completed a thorough, thoughtful, serious, and complete self-assessment of systems, policies, practices, and procedures affecting diversity, equity, and inclusion, and created a SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-oriented) action plan to address institutional priorities based on the findings of the self-assessment.

The submission should demonstrate an institution’s:

- preparation of a comprehensive, evidence-based action plan aligned with institutional priorities and a clear understanding of barriers, challenges, and opportunities—goals should be lofty and challenging but progress should be achievable within the action plan’s time frame, and include less challenging “low hanging fruit” goals that can be achieved relatively quickly; and

- institution-wide commitment, particularly from senior and middle administrators, to advancing equity, diversity, and inclusion in STEM, demonstrated via:
  - involvement in this work and ownership of actions;
o establishment, authorization, and acknowledgement of the value of an appropriate self-assessment team and key personnel to lead and engage (individually and collaboratively) in efforts to achieve action plan objectives, ensuring that accountability mechanisms are created; and

o allocation of **adequate resources**.

Bronze institutions will need to have:

- established a self-assessment team inclusive of a diverse array of members sharing the commitment to breaking down barriers within higher education and STEM;

- demonstrated that they’ve gone beyond collecting information and started to understand what their assessment is indicating (i.e. provided a 30,000-foot view and not a “data-dump” or list of programs);

- placed emphasis on qualitative (experience-based) *and* quantitative assessment;

- demonstrated a clear understanding of why disaggregating data is an important part of exploring intersectionality and examined intersectionality throughout the self-assessment (except where issues of protecting personally identifying information arise).

- acknowledged gaps in data/understanding and developed actions that will allow them to collect the information they need to progress within a defined, achievable timeframe;

- provided an application with a clear sense of the institution’s barriers, challenges, and opportunities, and corresponding aims, and priorities; and

- created a comprehensive, evidence-based action plan, with actions that are SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-oriented). The action plan should:

  - identify priorities (and describe why they are priorities—in relation to institutional mission, as well as barriers, challenges, and opportunities);

  - demonstrate understanding of underlying barriers, challenges, and opportunities identified in the self-assessment by clearly tying assessment to action; and

  - provide a logical flow describing: assessment results -> action -> rationale for the action (vs. other possibilities) -> ownership of action (with redundancy and accountability) -> adequate allocation of resources to implement action -> realistic timeline for implementation -> indicators of success -> metrics or assessments that will be used to monitor the action and progress.
KEY POINTS FOR REVIEWERS

REVIEW CRITERIA

Peer-review panels will be asked to consider the following over-arching criteria while assessing an application:

- Have applicants been careful to examine the existence and effectiveness of systems, processes, practices, policies, and criteria, qualitative *experience-based* information, as well as quantitative information?

- Is workflow described (rationale for methods used, for example) as well as results presented?

- Does the action plan include a formal governance and process management system to oversee and track progress of actions, and to make adjustments as warranted?

- **Hyperlinks may not be used to direct readers to more information.** Are hyperlinks present in the application? Reviewers will not review information provided via hyperlinks.

- If some important information is unavailable, has an explanation been given for this gap and are there provisions in the action plan to collect this information in the future, through a specified process on a defined and achievable schedule?

**Narrative presentation:**

- Does the team use tables when not appropriate, embedding responses to questions in “tables” to try to add in narrative without impacting the word count?

- Are actions embedded in each section or within the narrative as well as put in the action plan?

**Baseline data and analyses:**

- Is quantitative information (compositional demographics) correlated with qualitative experience information, i.e., used by the institution to determine effects on experience/climate rather than as a numerical goal in itself? In other words, are quantitative data used to determine the setting needed to foster full participation and provide opportunities for all students and faculty to have experiences engaging with a diversity of individuals, gaining the benefits of broad diversity? (See also *Appendix D: Legal Considerations and Neutral Strategies* in the SEA Change Institutional Bronze Handbook)

- Is quantitative information (compositional demographics) also reflective of the institution’s affirmative action plan for faculty, used to determine whether or not there is—and to make good faith efforts to remedy—any under-utilization of certain genders, races or ethnicities in certain disciplines and positions/levels at the institution, when compared with their representation in the available qualified pool from which the institution recruits? (See also...
Appendix D: Legal Considerations and Neutral Strategies in the SEA Change Institutional Bronze Handbook

- When graphical illustrations have been used, are these effective in showing positive and negative developments over time?

- Are qualitative (experience-based) and quantitative analyses embedded within the narrative instead of separated in appendices? Data (qualitative and quantitative) are requested under the appropriate headings throughout the application form and consequently data should be embedded within the text rather than separated in appendices.

- Are applicants thoughtful about what they’re including, or are they trying to “dazzle with data” by including more graphs and figures than necessary?

- Does the commentary provide a reflective analysis on what the data indicate, and not simply recount the findings? (The “30,000-foot view”)

- Are data disaggregated in a manner that demonstrates understanding of the importance of addressing intersectionality?

- How well have data and evidence been used to inform policies, systems, and activities/initiatives?

**Transparency:**

- Has the self-assessment team been honest and forthright about negative trends as well as positive?

- If institution is protecting confidential internal legal advice (including data compilation, evaluation, and findings on current and prior legal status and associated legal strategy) about a topic addressed for forward-looking action in the application (See Retaining Confidentiality: Internal Legal Advice And Legal Evaluation Areas in the SEA Change Institutional Bronze Handbook), does the self-assessment team still provide enough information about the reason the topic is a priority and appropriate forward-looking action to indicate seriousness and impact of the action? Does the action plan demonstrate challenging forward-looking goals on the relevant topic?
APPLICATION GUIDELINES

WORD COUNT

The overall word limit for the application is **17,000**. There are no specific word limits for individual sections, and you may distribute the words over each section as appropriate. **Excluded from word count:** tables & graphs with data that aren’t narrative (ex. titles, data labels); the full action plan; qualitative quotes (quotes cannot exceed 50 words, no more than four to five should be used in relevant sections). Institutions may request extended word limits, but this will only be granted in exceptional circumstances.

Please indicate word count for each subsection next to its title.

1. Section

   1.2 Subsection *(word count)*

APPLICATION CONTENT

1. Letter of endorsement from the head of institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVIEW CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the letter demonstrate genuine engagement and commitment to addressing issues, barriers, and inequities? Does it address the points discussed in the Bronze criteria in this document (“institution-wide commitment...; establishment, authorization, and acknowledgement of value of an appropriate self-assessment team and key personnel...; and allocation of adequate resources”)?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GUIDELINES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An accompanying letter of endorsement from the most senior administrator of the institution (Chancellor, President, etc.) must be included, along with the Institutional Applicant Submission Form. If the individual in this role is soon going to be replaced, applications should also include a short statement from the successor. The letter should be written by the individual. It should not be composed by the self-assessment team with the head of the institution serving only as signatory. The letter should include the head’s personal opinion about why SEA Change is important for the institution, a commitment to allocate adequate resources to the work, as well as a declaration that all data and self-assessment is accurate and correct (within reasonable limits). The declaration may be based on the review and assurance of professionals in institutional research, auditing or other knowledgeable staff. In addition, the letter should describe how the action plan connects to institution’s performance indicators or a strategic plan. While not required, an accompanying statement by the trustees or by Regents or the administrative head of a public system will strengthen the application.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Description of the institution

REVIEW CRITERIA

- Does the applicant provide enough context for the reviewers to best understand decisions made during self-assessment, or unique restrictions due to state laws?
- Does the description of the institution successfully place it in context within the US higher education landscape?

GUIDELINES AND IN THE APPLICATION

(Click for Legal Exclusions)

**NOTE**: in this case, the guidelines mirror what should be included in the application.

Please provide a brief description of the institution, placing it in context with the rest of the US higher education landscape. This should include:

a) relevant Carnegie Classifications
b) total number of academic faculty (see categories of faculty in 4.1 below)
c) total number of departments
d) total number of undergraduate students
e) total number of graduate students
f) degrees granted (overall, and within STEM)

g) total number of faculty, graduate students, and undergraduate majors for each STEM department, including: agricultural sciences, chemistry, computer and information technology science, engineering, Earth sciences, life sciences, mathematical sciences, physics and astronomy, social, behavioral, and economic sciences, and STEM education & learning. If desired, also include medical and health sciences.

i. Interdisciplinary or umbrella programs should be listed only once; grouping is at the institution’s discretion

ii. Large institutions are welcome to list schools or colleges instead of individual departments if the word count becomes too burdensome, as long as it provides a snapshot of the institution by broad STEM discipline.

iii. While medical and health sciences are not required to be included in a first-time Bronze application, they should be included in subsequent applications if an institution has these fields.

h) any applicable special-mission or minority-serving status (or efforts being made to receive that status, and why that is important to the institution)
i) current or prior institutional involvement in programs such as NSF ADVANCE, INCLUDES, AGEP, or LSAMP; NIH MARC, IMSD, RISE, Bridge2B, or Bridge2D; or similar

j) special historical or current challenges that inform needed institutional actions to enhance broad diversity
   i. This would include any state law or governing authority (e.g. Regents) restrictions on the use of demographic data, state rulings about affirmative action or DEI-related topics, and similar. Peer-reviewers need to know the environment, restrictions, and context for an institution’s assessment and action plan in order to better understand the decisions made by the self-assessment team.
   ii. This may also include a description of the local population, if applicable, as well as why the self-assessment team is taking that into consideration during their analyses.
   iii. An institution’s history of racial segregation and the course of desegregation may also be relevant.

3. Self-assessment

   REVIEW CRITERIA

   • Is it clear how the team was formed and why members were chosen? Does the team appropriately reflect a broad diversity across personal identities, institutional role, positional seniority, career stage, expertise? Does the team include legal counsel? Other roles recommended in the guidelines?

   • Is the breakdown of involvement, contribution, and person-hours worked available for each member of the team? Is the influence of—and burdens imposed on—each member equitable as compared to the others?

   • Does the institution have a plan in place to reward or recognize involvement in SEA Change self-assessment, and/or did it work to reduce the overall burden on the team members? Is there special attention to the extra burdens on people of color and women when they participate (both the emotional burden of focusing on issues of exclusion targeting themselves, and, the expended efforts shared with other team members)?

   • Is the future role of the self-assessment team explained, along with details on the positions who are responsible for participating in the formal governance and management system that will oversee, undertake and track progress in the implementation of the action plan overall, and whether they are appropriately authorized and resourced?

   • Did the team decide to focus on any other personal identify factors (besides gender and race/ethnicity) for this application? If so, is there a clear indication why those factors are important to the institution?

GUIDELINES

Self-assessment teams should be comprised of a diverse array of individuals, including team members with a strong commitment to breaking down barriers for people of color, native people, persons with disabilities, women, and those
of the LGBTQ+ identity or non-conforming gender expression. The self-assessment team should include individuals from a wide range of institutional roles, including:

- high-level administrators;
- full professors/tenured faculty;
- early career faculty;
- institutional data experts;
- enrollment management professionals (including those involved in outreach and bridging strategies, admissions, financial aid, mentoring);
- HR representative;
- social scientist(s) or others familiar with qualitative data assessment;
- student affairs professionals;
- staff involved with diversity & inclusion efforts; and
- knowledgeable legal leaders—e.g. the school’s legal counsel—to advise on legal sustainability of forward-looking strategies for improvement where self-assessment indicates a need.

In addition, institutions are strongly encouraged to include or specify how they will obtain input from undergraduate and graduate student representatives, alumni, as well as other key stakeholders such as governing board members.

We recommend engaging legal experts, institutional data experts, and HR experts from the beginning of this process along with the other team members in order to move the institution forward in a manner that is effective, legally sustainable, and ethical.

It is very important that the work load be distributed as equitably as possible across the members of the team. Each member should be involved, and the majority of the work should not rest on a handful of team members. It is in that light that we ask for the specifics in points b) and c) below.

It is up to the institution if it wishes to make the composition of their self-assessment team public; otherwise, SEA Change will consider the information confidential (to the extent possible).

---

INCLUDED IN APPLICATION

(Click for Legal Exclusions)

Please describe the self-assessment process for SEA Change. This should include:

a) a description of the self-assessment team and why each member was included
   1. we recommend a table detailing role/position in the institution, relevant personal identities (can be provided in summary figures instead of per person), expertise, and role on the self-assessment team
b) a brief account of the self-assessment process, including a breakdown of how each team member was involved and what they contributed

a) an estimated breakdown of person-hours each self-assessment team member contributed to application preparation, how their work will be rewarded or recognized, if at all, by the institution—including special attention to the burdens on people of color and women who participate, beyond the efforts expended by other team members

c) plans for oversight and support of progress under the action plan, including a succinct description of the formal governance and management system, any future role of the self-assessment team, whether any members will be added or removed, which tasks each individual will spearhead or contribute to going forward, and what additions or changes will be made to the team going forward and their roles and responsibilities

d) a description of a self-identity factor (besides gender and race/ethnicity) that the self-assessment team focused on for this application, or for parts of this application (if any), and why, within the overarching objective of achieving broadly defined diversity, equity, and inclusion and focusing on those aspects of broad diversity, equity, and inclusion that have been most elusive

4. Institutional composition

NOTE

Compositional data do not alone address the cause of levels of representation of different races, ethnicities, and genders at an institution. Their use to identify opportunities to advance diversity is not an acknowledgement of any wrongdoing; it reflects commitment to high standards of education, research, service, and equity, regardless of legal requirements.

4.1 Faculty

REVIEW CRITERIA

- Is faculty compositional data presented in a disaggregated way that makes it clear where there may be barriers, challenges, and opportunities? Have they taken care to examine the intersection of race/ethnicity and gender?

- Are faculty assessed across STEM fields so that discipline-specific distinctions can be identified? Are differences across faculty roles explored?

- Does the team examine trends in experience and representation? Discuss perceived and actual differences in overall faculty composition vs. chair or committee composition? Note how differences might impact institutional climate or culture? Has the institution determined whether there is underutilization of women and people of color at the institution in relation to the available and qualified pool; and if so, are there plans to remedy that? If there is not underutilization due to limited available and qualified pool, has the institution identified sustainable means of
increasing inclusion through barrier removal, neutral outreach and criteria, as well as potentially capacity building programs? How will progress and success be measured?

## GUIDELINES

### a) Referring back to the SEA Change Institutional Bronze Handbook for guidance, internally examine a disaggregated snapshot of STEM faculty overall and broken down by broad field including:

1. **Tenured and tenure-track:**
   a. Assistant professors
   b. Associate professors
   c. Full professors
   d. Emeritus (living)
2. **Non-tenure-track**
   a. Instructors and lecturers (FT & PT)
   b. Fixed term and adjuncts (FT & PT)
   c. Professional track faculty (FT & PT)

Depending on the institution, this breakdown will vary in name and grouping. The self-assessment team may wish to use the institutional [self-assessment template for faculty](#) provided by SEA Change to do the thorough internal review. It is strongly encouraged that self-assessment teams leverage work that has already been done—in particular, engage the individual(s) responsible for reporting on the institutional Affirmative Action plan or other reports.

### b) Consider these data as they relate to gender, race/ethnicity, and intersectionality, as well as any additional factors the institution has decided to focus on. Compare against historical data as available. Examine the makeup of each type of position (using the broad guidelines mentioned above) and compare across fields as well. For example, are more women of color better represented in one type of role than another? Are there variations across field? Finally, if possible, benchmark your findings using relevant national faculty data (see Appendix C: Data resources in the Handbook). Has the institution determined whether there is underutilization of women and people of color at the institution in relation to the available and qualified pool for particular faculty positions (in each discipline and type and level of position); and if so, are there plans to remedy that? If there is not underutilization due to a limited available and qualified pool, has the institution identified sustainable means of increasing inclusion through barrier removal, neutral outreach and criteria, as well as potentially capacity building programs where sustainable?

### c) Examine representation (in disaggregated form) among the following:

1. Department heads
2. Senior management committees
3. Influential institutional committees

Internally evaluate differences between the makeup of these committees and roles, compared to the pool of faculty overall. Consider the effect on, and status of, climate, culture, isolation of some individuals or ability of all
individuals to participate fully. Suggestions for initial internal review are available in several tabs in the available institutional [self-assessment template for faculty].

**INCLUDED IN APPLICATION**

(Click for Legal Exclusions)

Present the findings in whatever manner makes for the best understanding of faculty composition—the 30,000-foot view. If possible, disaggregation of any data used as evidence for prioritization should include separation by position, if possible without disclosing PII. Provide a brief rationale for why the data included in this section were selected. Based on your exploration of your data, what are some opportunities to advance diversity, equity, and inclusion that the institution will want to address? Include any actions being taken under the institution’s affirmative action plan to address underutilization or build capacity of women or people of color. If the institution does not have data on some of the factors, please note this, and explain whether and how the institution may obtain such data in the future.

Note any trends, based on the makeup of leadership committees and roles compared to the pool of faculty overall and the effect on, and status of and effects of the trends on status of, climate, culture, isolation of some individuals or ability of all individuals to participate fully. Based on these trends, what are some opportunities to advance diversity, equity, and inclusion that the institution will want to address? What actions will the institution pursue and why? Why are the actions priorities; what are their expected systemic and sustainable impacts? How will progress and success be measured?

### 4.2 Administrators

**REVIEW CRITERIA**

- Is administrator composition presented in a way that makes it clear where there may be challenges or barriers? Has the self-assessment team taken care to examine the intersection of race/ethnicity and gender?

- Has the institution determined whether there is underutilization of women and people of color at the institution in relation to the available and qualified pool for particular administrative positions; and if so, are there plans to remedy that? If there is not underutilization due to a limited available and qualified pool, has the institution identified sustainable means of increasing inclusion through barrier removal, neutral outreach and criteria, as well as potentially capacity building programs where sustainable?

- Does the team examine trends in experience and representation? Do they discuss perceived differences in faculty composition vs. that of the administration? Note how differences might impact institutional climate or culture? How will progress and success be measured?
GUIDELINES

a) Internally explore a disaggregated snapshot of institutional administrators. The self-assessment team may wish to use the available institutional [self-assessment template for faculty](#) to guide internal review.

b) Consider these data as they relate to gender, race/ethnicity, and intersectionality, as well as any additional factors the institution has decided to focus on.

c) Has the institution determined whether there is underutilization of women and people of color at the institution in relation to the available and qualified pool for particular administrative positions; and if so, are there plans to remedy that? If there is not underutilization due to a limited available and qualified pool, has the institution identified sustainable means of increasing inclusion through barrier removal, neutral outreach and criteria, as well as potentially capacity building programs where sustainable?

INCLUDED IN APPLICATION

(Click for Legal Exclusions)

Present data on administrator composition. Note any trends, based on the makeup of administrative roles compared to the pool of faculty overall and the effect on, and the trends effects on and the status of, climate, culture, isolation of some individuals or ability of all individuals to participate fully. Based on these trends, what are some opportunities to advance diversity, equity, and inclusion that the institution will want to address? Include any actions being taken under the institution’s affirmative action plan to address underutilization and build capacity of women or people of color. If the institution does not have data on some of the factors, please note this and explain whether and how the institution may obtain such data in the future. Why are these actions priorities; what are their expected systemic and sustainable effects? How will progress and success by measured?

4.3 Graduate students

REVIEW CRITERIA

- Did the team provide a well-balanced assessment of the experience and composition of graduate student populations such that there is a snapshot of those populations without sacrificing space for discussion of faculty, policies, practices, climate, etc.?

- When examining degrees conferred, has the team taken care to examine differences between STEM and the general graduate population? Between broad STEM fields? The intersection of race/ethnicity and gender?

- Do they identify trends that may indicate the presence of barriers to the success or inclusion of all students, and note issues they may want to address? How will progress and success by measured?
Graduate student focal populations: Institutional examination of graduate students will vary depending on which degrees are offered. If the institution is Master’s only, please include Master’s student data. If the institution grants both PhDs and Master’s, please distinguish between the two groups. If no advanced degrees are offered, please include a statement to that effect.

Note: There are many other components to explore as they relate to graduate students at the institution, including (but not limited to): teaching vs. research load, funding support, experiential learning opportunities, mentoring and community-building opportunities, successful transitions within programs, climate and culture, and years to degree completion. Given the field-specific variability of these data, much of this fine-grained exploration and assessment will occur as part of the departmental self-assessment process and should not be a priority in institutional award applications. If there is space and you would like to provide more information about equity barriers, challenges, and opportunities within the graduate student population, feel free to use the miscellaneous section of the application.

a) Please internally explore a disaggregated snapshot of degrees conferred to all graduate students, STEM graduate students overall, and STEM graduate students broken down by broad field. Compare Master’s and PhD degrees conferred. If desired, use the institutional self-assessment template for students to guide internal review.

The self-assessment team may also wish to consider any of the following, providing a broad overview of anything noteworthy as space allows:

1. PhD pre- and post-candidacy
2. Enrollment status (full-time vs. part-time)

b) Consider these data as they relate to gender, race/ethnicity, and intersectionality, as well as any additional factors the institution has decided to focus on. Compare against historical data as available. Examine the makeup of each category, compare STEM vs. the overall pool of graduate students, and compare across STEM fields as well if desired. Finally, if possible, benchmark your findings using relevant national graduate student data (see Appendix D: Data resources in the Handbook).

INCLUDED IN APPLICATION

Present key qualitative and quantitative data on graduate students. Note any trends within the graduate student population over time, between STEM fields, between Master’s and PhD students. Consider the effect of these trends on, and status of, climate, culture, isolation of some individuals or ability of all individuals to participate fully. Based on this assessment, address some opportunities to advance equity, diversity, and inclusion that the institution will want to explore? Why are these actions priorities; what are the expected systemic and sustainable effects? How will progress and success be measured?
4.4 Undergraduate students

**REVIEW CRITERIA**

- Did the team provide a well-balanced assessment of the experience and composition of undergraduate student populations such that there is a snapshot of those populations without sacrificing space for discussion of faculty, policies, practices, climate, etc.?

- When examining degrees conferred, has the team taken care to examine STEM undergraduates vs. the overall undergraduate population? Between broad STEM fields? The intersection of race/ethnicity and gender? Other factors?

- Do they identify trends that may indicate the presence of barriers to the success or inclusion of all students, and note issues they may want to address? How will progress and success be measured?

**GUIDELINES**

*Note:* There are many other components to explore as they relate to undergrads at the institution, including (but not limited to): international/citizenship status, federal aid and scholarships, experiential learning opportunities, mentoring and community-building opportunities, requirements for declaring majors, leakage from majors, successful transitions within and between programs, climate and culture, and years to degree completion. A limited number of questions about support for key transition points for undergraduate students are asked below. However, because of the variability across different fields, **much of this fine-grained exploration and assessment will occur as part of the departmental self-assessment process** and should not be a priority in the institutional award application. If there is space and you would like to provide more information about equity barriers, challenges, and opportunities within the undergraduate student population, feel free to use the miscellaneous section of the application.

a) Please internally explore a disaggregated snapshot of degrees conferred to all undergraduate students, STEM undergraduate students overall, and STEM undergraduate students broken down by broad field. If desired, use the institutional **self-assessment template for students** to guide internal review.

The self-assessment team may also wish to consider any of the following internally, and provide in the application a broad overview of anything noteworthy as space allows:

1. Undeclared vs. declared students, and declared students within STEM fields
2. Enrollment status (full-time vs. part-time)
3. Transfer status (have students transferred from 4-year or 2-year institutions)

b) Consider these data as they relate to gender, race/ethnicity, and intersectionality, as well as any additional factors the institution has decided to focus on. Compare against historical data as available. Examine the makeup of each category, compare STEM vs. the overall pool of undergraduate students, and compare across STEM fields as well. If possible, benchmark your findings using relevant national undergraduate student data (see **Appendix C: Data resources** in the Handbook).
Present key data on undergraduate students. Note any trends within the undergraduate student population over time, between STEM fields, or compared to the local or national population. Consider the causes of these trends and their effect on, and the status of, climate, culture, isolation of some individuals due to personal identity, or the ability of all individuals to participate fully. Based on the quantitative and qualitative data, identify some opportunities to advance equity, diversity, and inclusion that the institution will want to explore. Why are these actions priorities; what are the expected systemic and sustainable effects? How will progress and success by measured?

5. **Key transition points**
   (examine experience of individuals, and numbers correlated with that context, as well as process and criteria)

5.1 **Faculty: Recruitment to Hiring**

**REVIEW CRITERIA**

- Does the team demonstrate an understanding of potential biases that result in inequity in recruitment and hiring systems, policies, processes, and practices, particularly with regard to gender and race/ethnicity, and do they have appropriate actions in place guard against such inequities going forward?

- Does the team address barrier removal strategies, neutral outreach and criteria that may increase representation of women and people of color where that may be warranted? Does the team identify capacity-building opportunities (through training programs) if barrier removal, outreach and neutral criteria aren't adequate?

- Has the team identified specific ways to make recruitment & hiring more transparent and freer of bias and inequity?

- Is there a thorough analysis of the impact of systems, policies, processes, and practices on various groups, rather than simply a description of them? How will progress and success by measured?

**GUIDELINES**

a) Please explore your recruitment process for available positions across departments, including what the outreach, vetting/winnowing, assessment, and decision-making processes are, whether the process includes training (using what materials, training who and mandatory or voluntary), what positions are involved and what their roles are, advertisements, outreach, and other means of dissemination.

b) What is the process by which candidates are selected for interviews, interviewed, and selected? Consider the composition of search committees and how that is determined. Is awareness of and training on implicit bias fostered and is such bias actively addressed in the process? How? If training is available, for whom is it required?
c) How are excellence and promise (merit) defined? Beyond degree institutions, grant history, and publication record, what other factors are considered in hiring decisions? Is there recognition that, regardless of an individual’s own identity, a record of breaking down barriers for others and acting to include a broad range of individuals with talent is one aspect of excellence? How is this recognized in the search process (i.e. how is this assessed)? Are there measures to ensure the search committee is looking beyond a small number of known PhD programs for promise?

d) Are deviations from the “norm” of degree and career progression addressed to ensure other progression and barriers scaled are given due consideration? How?

e) Are hiring criteria vetted to eliminate unnecessarily restrictive criteria that limit consideration of qualified candidates? How?

f) How often are the job search policies reviewed? Are they assessed for effectiveness? For legal requirements? Who reviews them, and how are decisions made? Consider the process and its objectives.

g) What has the institution done to enhance equity, diversity, and inclusion in the faculty search process?

h) What is the process of negotiation after a job offer is made? How is compensation determined, negotiated, approved, evaluated for equity? Are policies underlying this process in place? Consider how often are they reviewed, and who reviews them.

i) We recommend internally exploring disaggregated data from the past 3 years of new hires across the institution and compare this to STEM faculty hires overall. The self-assessment team may wish to use the available institutional self-assessment template for faculty to guide internal review, though it is limited in scope, and the below criteria should also be considered.

j) Explore (internally) faculty compensation including consideration of disaggregated data on spousal/partner hires, the content and value of startup packages, starting and periodic adjustments to salaries, and start-up and continuing support for research; any differences in final offers, startup or continuing support, or flexibility with spousal hires (“dual career issues”); any differences as they relate to gender, race/ethnicity, the intersectionality of the two factors, and any additional factors the institution has decided to focus on going forward to sustainably meet the institution’s mission-driven objectives.

k) Consider any processes and policies currently in place to prevent salary and start-up inequities, recognizing that there may be different norms for different disciplines and differences based on the nature of the research (e.g. theoretical vs. experimental).

l) Are there mechanisms in place to ensure faculty are supported when they start their position, especially as early-career faculty? How are service requirements handled; is there a central pool for course release?
INSTITUTIONAL BRONZE: CRITERIA AND GUIDELINES

INCLUDED IN APPLICATION

(Click for Legal Exclusions)

- Describe any changes to recruitment and hiring policies that the institution wishes to prioritize (providing the level of detail first suggested at the start of this document);
- Detail previous efforts made to enhance diversity, equity, and inclusion in the hiring process;
- Provide a disaggregated snapshot from the past 3 years of new hires across the institution and compare this to STEM faculty hires overall;
- Describe any priorities for changing policies and processes addressing inequities in compensation; and
- Highlight efforts made (or that will be made) to ensure that newly hired faculty are supported in an equitable manner.

- Explain why these are priorities, what systemic and sustainable impacts are expected? How will progress and success by measured?

5.2 Faculty promotion & tenure

REVIEW CRITERIA

- Has the team explored differences in the composition of pools of all faculty vs. those getting promoted or receiving tenure? Have they identified potential breakdowns in the various career pathways, particularly noting differences in the experience of faculty based on gender and race/ethnicity, and committed to exploring changes in institutional systems, policy, procedures, and practices to support all faculty?

- Is there evidence that there is transparency in training, career development opportunities, and workload allocation?

- Is diversity being proactively engaged and are the positive impacts of diversity, where diversity has to some extent been achieved, being assessed and documented?

- Do the criteria advance mission-tied diversity, equity and inclusion interests? Do they address underutilization of women and people of color? How will progress and success by measured?

GUIDELINES

a) Please explore the promotion and tenure process, including (but not limited to) a timeline of review, criteria used during review, how criteria are weighted, etc. Is there central guidance for recognizing service in P&T?

b) As available, examine any other information related to promotion & tenure, including (but not limited to) the number of complaints made about decisions and how these complaints were addressed. Is there a process for challenging a promotion & tenure decision?
c) Consider a disaggregated snapshot from the past 3 years of promotion & tenure in STEM, and all institutional faculty to sustainably meet the institution’s mission-driven objectives. If desired, the institutional self-assessment template for faculty is an available resource for this internal review. Is underutilization of women or people of color for tenure and promotion indicated? What actions are included in the affirmative action plan, if so. In any event, is there a focus on barrier removal, effective communications and equitable mentoring about how to succeed in pursuit of tenure and promotion, examination of the appropriateness of criteria, and other factors that may affect diversity, equity and inclusion?

d) How often does the institution conduct a salary analysis? How are salaries adjusted, if at all?

e) Consider (internally) any salary inequities, how they have been identified and addressed in the past; salaries across disaggregated groups, taking into account factors such as field, length of time in a role, experience, and type of position; and comparisons to something like the AAUP Faculty Compensation Survey to assess any differences, to sustainably meet the institution’s mission-driven objectives.

f) Do faculty receive continual support for research beyond starting offers? This can include money for travel, support for research assistants or staff, internal grant competitions, and the like. If so, what is the process for determining who receives support?

g) Are there equitable opportunities for mentoring and community building? Are faculty of all races, ethnicities and genders equally aware of requirements and opportunities for advancement and success?

INCLUDED IN APPLICATION

(Click for Legal Exclusions)

- Provide an overview of analysis of different career pathways at the institution and describe priority areas the institution will address to explore breakdowns in career pathways, in particular if there is evidence for barriers to diversity, equity, and inclusion in progression in these pathways;
- Describe any priorities for changing criteria, policies, processes, and practices for identifying and addressing salary discrepancies; and
- Describe any opportunities the institution will want to pursue as related to advance diversity, equity, and inclusion in continual faculty support, mentoring, and community building.
- Explain why these actions are priorities, what systemic and sustainable impacts are expected? How will progress and success by measured?

5.3 Faculty retention

REVIEW CRITERIA

- Has retention been examined in a way that allows the team to identify indicators of potential issues in conduct, climate or culture within specific departments or schools in the institution? How will progress and success by
measured?

- Are the positive impacts of diversity, where diversity has to some extent been achieved, being assessed and documented?

**GUIDELINES**

a) Explore (internally) a disaggregated snapshot of faculty “leavers” in STEM compared to all institutional faculty. If desired, use the institutional self-assessment template for faculty to guide internal review. Are there higher rates of turnover in different faculty positions or across disaggregated groups? Note any patterns and include a description of how such patterns have been addressed in the past, if at all.

b) If possible, determine where “leavers” (excluding retirees) go after they have left the institution, and what issues may have prompted leaving.

c) Are exit surveys or interviews or other means of determining reasons for turnover conducted, and if so, what does the institution do to follow up on the information gathered? As possible, conduct an assessment of exit interviews, and relate any findings back to patterns of high turnover.

d) Does the institution have processes for matching offers in order to retain faculty, facilitating departmental transfers, or any other strategies? Please describe the processes and their objectives.

e) Consider whether there are discrepancies in employee retention based on race, ethnicity, or gender in how policies are applied to sustainably meet the institution’s goals and whether practices are aligned with institutional mission. What actions would have the greatest impact on addressing discrepancies? How will progress and success be measured?

**INCLUDED IN APPLICATION**

(Click for Legal Exclusions)

Note any trends within the population of faculty “leavers” over time, between STEM fields, or compared to any national faculty data. Consider the effect of these trends on, and status of, climate, culture, isolation of some individuals or ability of all individuals to participate fully and thrive. Based on the qualitative and quantitative data, identify some specific policies, programs, practices, and opportunities to advance equity, diversity, and inclusion in an effective and legally sustainable manner that the institution will want to pursue. Why are they priorities? What are the expected systemic and sustainable effects? How will progress and success be measured?

6. **Career & professional development**

(examine experience of individuals, and numbers correlated with that context, as well as process and criteria)
## 6.1 Faculty review

### REVIEW CRITERIA

- Has the team conducted a thorough assessment of review systems, policies, procedures, and practices?

- Are review processes transparent? Are policies applied equitably among faculty?

- Do review processes differ across distinct categories of faculty? How does the institution ensure equitable across categories?

- Are those engaged in the process provided training to identify implicit and explicit bias in themselves and others and to intervene and prevent the influences of bias from affecting evaluations?

- Do the criteria advance mission-tied diversity, equity and inclusion interests?

### GUIDELINES

a) Explore the process and criteria (measures of merit) for merit reviews, annual reviews, and post-tenure reviews. At what points of time are faculty reviewed? Who conducts the review(s) and how often?

b) Is feedback provided to the faculty being appraised? If so, how? Can faculty comment on the review process?

c) Is excellence defined in terms of high-quality teaching, research, and service as well as high standards of professional and ethical conduct (intolerance of harassment and exclusion on the basis of race, ethnicity and gender)? Do measures of merit include inclusive conduct and accomplishments to create an inclusive environment for all students, faculty, and other colleagues?

d) Are those engaged in the process provided training to identify implicit and explicit bias in themselves and others and to intervene and prevent the influences of bias from affecting evaluations? How will progress and success be measured?

### INCLUDED IN APPLICATION

(Click for Legal Exclusions)

Provide an overview of findings for faculty review—are there notable differences between fields? Are all faculty reviewed in an equitable manner? Were any opportunities for re-defining excellence, providing anti-bias training and support, or changing processes considered a priority for the institution? What actions will the institution pursue to address findings and seize opportunities? Why are they priorities? What are the expected systemic and sustainable effects? How will progress and success be measured?
### REVIEW CRITERIA

- Providing effective mentoring and advising at an institution is critical, especially as it relates to undergraduate and graduate students. Empirical research has shown that mentoring is beneficial to all students, but particularly for those from populations affected by bias and exclusion. Does the team’s assessment of advising and mentoring reflect that understanding?

- Has the team assessed their faculty mentoring policies and procedures in light of mission-driving equity, diversity, and inclusion, including whether mentoring is effective or beneficial, and if so, why? Are faculty trained to mentor a broadly diverse cohort of students and junior faculty, other instructors and staff? Are they rewarded for excellence in mentoring and is that part of overall excellence of faculty performance? How will progress and success by measured?

### GUIDELINES

#### a)
Examine institutional efforts to train and support faculty as they learn to become mentors and advisors. Things to consider include:

1. What training is provided to faculty to ensure they can effectively mentor students from diverse backgrounds? This includes the format and duration of any training provided.
2. Is it required?
3. When is it administered?
4. Is cultural competency and identifying and avoiding implicit bias & stereotyping included in that training?
5. How often, by whom (role, expertise, seniority), and through what process/means (collaborative, siloed, specific approach) is effectiveness assessed?
6. Who reviews the data (qualitative and quantitative) and how are they used? Are adjustments made to enhance effectiveness when data indicate the need?

#### b)
Are new faculty given formal opportunities to work with tenured faculty mentors? For example, are there any mentoring programs in place for matching tenured faculty with new faculty?

#### c)
Are all students and pre-tenure/early career faculty, including those from underserved groups, effectively given meaningful information on how to access mentors across the institution? How is effectiveness measured from the perspective of the mentor? The mentee?

#### d)
Are faculty rewarded for excellence in mentoring and is that part of overall excellence of faculty performance?

#### e)
Consider (internally) whether there are disparities based on race, ethnicity, and gender in how policies are applied, and what actions are needed to sustainably meet the institution’s mission-driven objectives. How will progress and success by measured?
INCLUDED IN APPLICATION
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Note any trends in mentor training, participation in mentoring programs, response to mentoring, or any other facet that the team identified as an opportunity to advance diversity, equity, and inclusion in STEM at the institution. Describe any mentoring and related training opportunities that the institution wishes to pursue (or scale up from existing programs), and why. What are the expected systemic and sustainable effects? How will progress and success be measured?

6.3 Faculty pedagogical support

REVIEW CRITERIA

- Does the team demonstrate an understanding of the importance of thoughtful, evidence-based pedagogical support for faculty? Have they inventoried departments or programs using best practices, and are there actions identified to scale up these practices? How will progress and success be measured?

- If there’s no notable pedagogical support in place, has the team put together a plan to develop such support?

- How inclusive is pedagogical practice and related support?

- What do students of different races, ethnicities, and genders say about their experience in relation to curriculum and pedagogy (also considering intersectionality)?

GUIDELINES

a) Is there a center for teaching and learning on campus? If yes, what role does it play on campus, and who accesses the center? Are there grants available for course improvement? Opportunities to observe teaching?

b) What, if any, online learning platforms are available for faculty to use to interact with classes virtually? Are accessibility and effectiveness for different audiences determined and deficiencies addressed? How often, by whom (role, expertise, seniority), and through what process/means (collaborative, siloed, specific approach) is effectiveness assessed? Who reviews the data (qualitative and quantitative) and how are they used? Are adjustments made to enhance effectiveness when data indicate the need? Describe learning platform trainings available for faculty.

c) Are there efforts to advocate for use of evidence-based, effective pedagogies? If so, which techniques are encouraged? Is active learning emphasized?

d) Does the institution offer awards for effective teaching? How are potential awardees selected, and by whom? Please explore the evaluation process.
e) Are culturally-responsive and historically accurate pedagogies encouraged and supported across STEM? Do STEM faculty do a systemic review of teaching materials and methods, looking for and eradicating bias and stereotyping and correcting omissions of contributions of women, people of color, and native people as well as historically inaccurate facts concerning such people? If so, please determine how this is carried out. What efforts are being made to support inclusive teaching by STEM faculty, determine and make adjustments for effectiveness, and what resources are available to support inclusive teaching? Are (internal or external) scholars/experts in the field engaged?

f) What faculty training is available focused on effective pedagogy? Who participates in the training? Does training focus on introductory courses (ex: Biology 101)? How is training encouraged or rewarded?

g) How often, by whom (role, expertise, seniority), and through what process/means (collaborative, siloed, specific approach) is effectiveness assessed? Who reviews the data (qualitative and quantitative) and how are they used? Are adjustments made to enhance effectiveness when data indicate the need?

h) Are students experiencing the curriculum and pedagogy offered to them in the same way? In other words, are there differences in student experience across different races, ethnicities, genders? What does the institution do to correlate student experience and pedagogical approach—for faculty trained in effective pedagogical approaches and those who are not?

i) Are any dashboards used at the institution to monitor student progress, including students from underserved groups? Describe how dashboards are used and dashboard training available for faculty.

j) How is effectiveness of training evaluated? What are the criteria, and do they align with institutional mission and objectives related to diversity, equity and inclusion? If available, please explore disaggregated data on the effectiveness of training. Does the institution have processes for shedding ineffective faculty training programs and allocating resources to effective ones? How often, by whom (role, expertise, seniority), and through what process/means (collaborative, siloed, specific approach) is effectiveness assessed? Who reviews the data (qualitative and quantitative) and how are they used? Are adjustments made to enhance effectiveness when data indicate the need?
7. Flexibility and career breaks

(examine experience of individuals, and numbers correlated with that context, as well as process and criteria)

**REVIEW CRITERIA**

- SEA Change expects institutions to self-assess their (faculty) caregiver leave, child care, and flexible work policies and procedures for mission-driven equity, diversity, and inclusion, including whether they are effective/beneficial and why.

- Does the team demonstrate an understanding of the importance of supporting flexible work opportunities as well as career breaks, in particular for faculty with caregiver responsibilities?

- Is there a thorough analysis of the impact of these systems, policies, procedures and practices (e.g. “effect on success”) instead of a list of them?

- Are systems, policies, procedures, and practices applied universally, or are there discrepancies that may be the result of bias and inequity on the basis of race, ethnicity, and gender (also considering intersectionality)? If bias has been identified, are there SMART actions in place to address the issue? How will progress and success by measured?

### 7.1 Family leave

**GUIDELINES**

**a) Parental & adoption leave**

1) What are the institutional policies in place to cover and support parental and adoption leave? Is there a difference between maternity leave and spousal parental leave? Between adoption leave and leave associated with giving birth? Consider support, including financial support, available before, during, and after returning to work.

2) Are faculty able to “stop the clock” on their tenure process? If so, is this optional, or regular practice (i.e. faculty need to opt-out instead of opting-in)?

3) Consider (internally) a disaggregated snapshot of retention after parental and adoption leave, across STEM and separated by field and whether there are discrepancies based on race, ethnicity, or gender in how policies are applied, and whether they are sustainably meeting the institution’s mission-driven objectives. How is effectiveness of the policies measured?

4) Within overall parental leave, what are the respective usage rates for parental leave by role, gender, race, and ethnicity?
5) Explore the availability of nursing/pumping/mother’s rooms, and availability of designated refrigerators for milk storage.

b) Other leave

Are other types of family leave available (e.g. leave to allow for the care of an aging parent)? If so, what are the usage rates disaggregated across role, gender, race, and ethnicity for these types of leave?

INCLUDED IN APPLICATION
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Provide a high-level overview of caregiver leave policies and practices. Describe any priority areas for the institution to address based on trends noted in usage rates, retention, and application of policies for parental and adoption leave, and other kinds of family leave. Identify some opportunities to advance equity, diversity, and inclusion that the institution will want to explore. What are the expected systemic and sustainable impacts of these actions; why are they priorities? How will progress and success be measured?

7.2 Flexible work

GUIDELINES

a) What are institutional policies in place, if any, to accommodate flexible working schedules? Are faculty allowed to telework/telecommute if needed? This could mean working outside of the geographical area of the institution or working from home while residing in the geographical area of the institution.

b) How many faculty use available flexible work arrangements? If available, provide disaggregated data on the use of these arrangements.

c) How is effectiveness of these policies measured?

INCLUDED IN APPLICATION
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Provide a high-level overview of flexible work policies and practices. Describe any priority areas for the institution to address based on trends noted in usage rates, retention, and application of policies for flexible working schedules, particularly in light of caregiver responsibilities. Identify some opportunities to advance equity, diversity, and inclusion that the institution will want to pursue. What are the expected systemic and sustainable impacts of these actions; why are they priorities? How will progress and success be measured?
### 7.3 Childcare

#### GUIDELINES

a) What policies are in place, if any, across STEM and within departments as related to childcare? Are subsidies provided? Can faculty apply for support for childcare when they are attending a professional conference or working in a similar way to advance their career? How is effectiveness of the policies measured?

b) Are full-time childcare or emergency/daily childcare programs made available to faculty at the institution? If so, are they free? Subsidized? Offered at market cost?

#### INCLUDED IN APPLICATION

(Click for Legal Exclusions)

Provide a high-level overview of childcare policies and practices, if any. Describe any priority areas for the institution to address based on trends noted in usage rates and retention and identify some opportunities to advance equity, diversity, and inclusion that the institution will want to pursue. What is the expected systemic and sustainable impacts of these actions; why are they priorities? How will progress and success be measured?

### 7.4 Effect on success & evaluation

#### GUIDELINES

a) For all the above programs, examine data on the relative timelines and promotion and tenure success rates for faculty who avail themselves of these benefits and those who don’t.

b) Any faculty success facilitated by these policies relies on transparency and awareness of their availability. How are faculty made aware of these programs?

c) Recognizing that pregnancy and infant care usually have effect on tenure/career timelines, how does the institution support the success of faculty who avail themselves of child-related benefits? For example, is information conveyed to participants about how to access to advice and support related to these policies? If so, how? Is the effectiveness of this advice and support assessed by the institution? If so, how?

d) Assess how often, by whom (role, expertise, seniority), and through what process/means (collaborative, siloed, specific approach) effectiveness is assessed for these programs. Who reviews the data (qualitative and quantitative) and how are they used? Are adjustments made to enhance effectiveness when data indicate the need? Assess the adequacy or opportunities for enhancement in all of these programs.
e) Explore (internally) whether there are discrepancies based on race, ethnicity, or gender in how leave and flexible work policies are applied and their effects on career, and whether policies are sustainably meeting the institution’s mission-driven objectives. How is effectiveness of the policies measured?

INCLUDED IN APPLICATION

(Click for Legal Exclusions)

Provide a high-level overview of policies and practices for assessment of flexible work programs. Describe any priority areas for the institution to address based on trends noted in the effect on success for those who avail themselves of these policies. Identify some opportunities to advance equity, diversity, and inclusion that the institution will want to pursue. What is the expected systemic and sustainable effects of these actions; why are they priorities? How will progress and success by measured?

8. Institutional policies for diversity and inclusion

REVIEW CRITERIA

• Does the self-assessment team make best efforts to understand policies in light of the goals and mission of the institution?

• Good, evidence-based policy should drive institutional diversity, equity, and inclusion objectives. However, law is a design parameter for sustainable design of strategies and programs. Were HR and legal representatives consulted, along with those responsible for monitoring or submitting compliance data, to assess and support development of action plans that can be successful because they reflect good policy and are also legally sustainable going forward?

• Is a legal expert part of the institution’s SEA Change team on an ongoing basis to support ongoing sustainable action in pursuing and achieving goals?

• Does the team investigate whether the institution has and documents management processes and its assessments regarding:

  1) Clear articulation of the institutional mission and goals related to diversity, equity and inclusion, with specific educational and workforce outcomes associated with them;
  2) Evidence that the goals are authentic—that diversity is proactively engaged in curricular, co-curricular, residential, workplace and social settings and that an equity-embracing, inclusive community is being proactively built?
  3) Related qualitative and quantitative data (including development of inventories) as a basis for design of systems, policies, processes and practices;
  4) Rationales, aligned with institutional mission and goals, for such systems, policies, practices, and processes;
  5) Their effectiveness and impact; and
6) Modification of goals, systems, policies, processes and practices when needed for effectiveness and impact?

- If no deliberative management process and coherent documentation is being kept, is there a plan in place for making sure there is in the future?

- Does the team work to understand if the institution goes beyond “checking the boxes” regarding policies and practices about diversity, equity, and inclusion? Are there actions in place, with a systems, sustainability and impact focus, to help the institution move beyond minimum effort to effect real change? How will progress and success be measured?

GUIDELINES

a) **Policy review:** What are the processes for, and who (role, seniority) is responsible for, developing and reviewing policies related to diversity, equity, and inclusion, including respecting race, ethnicity, and gender and nondiscrimination? What are the specific mission-tied outcomes—educational outcomes, contributions to society, building capacity, and advancing inclusion and equal opportunity—that are the objectives of the policies?

b) **Outcome:** How are the policies and their specific outcomes documented, evaluated, disseminated, communicated? How often, by whom, through what process and under what standards are they reviewed for effectiveness and legal sustainability? What are the consequences of violating a policy and are these well-understood by all audiences at the institution? What are the services and capacity building opportunities provided to those who are targeted or affected by harassment or other exclusionary conduct to support them and remedy the effects?

c) **Purpose:** Along with tying policies to compliance with anti-discrimination laws, how does the institution inspire commitment and ensure policies reflect its mission, ethics/equity/diversity/academic freedom values, and role in society? Ensure policies support its diversity-, equity- and inclusion- associated goals for its student body and faculty? How are free speech and inclusion interests valued, mutually reinforced, and coordinated?

d) **Engagement:** What are the roles and responsibilities of the Board, President, Senior Administration, deans, department heads, faculty, students and other stakeholders in development, implementation, resourcing and monitoring of goals, definitions of success, and effectiveness of progress under policies? What central and local organization structures and position roles and responsibilities support advancement and assessment of the policies? How involved are key stakeholders? How are policies and procedures promoted or disseminated? Are there comment periods for policy documents?

e) **Awareness:** What efforts are undertaken to communicate policies and determine and elevate awareness of the rationales underlying and importance of these policies across different institutional communities and to build communities that are actively intolerant to (i.e., intervene to stop) harassment and other exclusionary conduct targeting individuals on the basis of their race, ethnicity, or gender?
f) **Evaluation**: SEA Change expects institutions to self-assess their diversity and inclusion policies and procedures to advance their missions, including whether they are effective/beneficial and why. Assess the adequacy or opportunities for enhancement in all of these policies. Consider how often, by whom (role, expertise, seniority), under what criteria, and through what process/means (collaborative and aligned, siloed, specific approach) are effectiveness and enforcement assessed? Who reviews the data (qualitative and quantitative) and how are they used? Are adjustments made to enhance effectiveness when data indicate the need?

### INCLUDED IN APPLICATION

(Click for Legal Exclusions)

Considering the inquiries to be explored in the self-assessment process, the self-assessment team should address the following diversity, equity, and inclusion-related processes of the institution, including those respecting race, ethnicity, and gender and nondiscrimination. Also, determine which diversity, equity, and inclusion strategy(ies) to address according to the institution’s priorities for action and explain why they are priorities (what barriers, challenges and opportunities they address and what the institution will achieve systemically and sustainably).

- Respecting the institution’s objectives for, and processes for design, adoption, and approval, evidence-based evaluation, and periodic review and continuous improvement of, diversity, equity and inclusion and nondiscrimination objectives, policies and strategies:
  - Explain succinctly the objectives, design, and documentation of the objectives and processes and whether and how the processes can be enhanced or applied more broadly to achieve the institution’s diversity, equity, and inclusion-related mission in an effective and sustainable manner
  - Describe succinctly whether the process of identifying and articulating objectives and design, evaluation and documentation processes are aligned and collaborative or siloed, and the positions (and seniority and expertise of positions) involved in these processes
  - Explain succinctly whether and how identified stakeholders are or will be involved for authenticity of purpose, ownership, and high-impact outcomes
  - Describe succinctly governance of and accountability measures for the processes and the existence or planned enhancement of leadership commitment to, and chartering and resourcing of, the process and the objectives, policies, and strategies it addresses

- Identify and describe (at a 30,000-foot level) one or a few priority diversity, equity, and inclusion policies or strategies aligned with and advancing the institution’s mission that can (be enhanced or more broadly applied to) remove specific barrier(s) to diversity, equity and inclusion, including:
  - Why the policies and strategies chosen are a priority? What are the expected systemic and sustainable effects? How will progress and success be measured?
  - Whether the policies or strategies are effective (or can be enhanced to be effective) to not only achieve diversity but create a community that values, embraces, sustains and engages diversity for associated
beneficial outcomes, advances barrier removal and equity, and creates and sustains a welcoming climate and culture
- Whether the policies or strategies (can be enhanced to be, or are) effectively communicated to, well understood by, and implemented/adopted by the range of stakeholder audiences they are intended to affect.

9. Diversity in Leadership

**REVIEW CRITERIA**

- Does the team work to understand if the institution goes beyond “checking the boxes” regarding policies and practices about diversity, equity, and inclusion of leadership, particularly in light of organizational structure to support diversity, equity, and inclusion? If there is a dedicated office or administrator for diversity-tied objectives and what is the relationship of that office to the leadership and board of the institution?
- Does the team explore the support in place (funding, staff, authority, etc) to effect real change?
- Has the team noted any opportunities to enhance equity, diversity, and inclusion in the governing board and/or president’s cabinet?
- Do senior administration and the governing board regularly receive diversity reports? If so, is there evidence that the report is used to advance institutional commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion?

**GUIDELINES**

a) **Composition**: Consider the compositional diversity of the governing board and president’s cabinet. Correlate this compositional diversity with the experience of all members of the board and cabinet, as well as students, faculty, researchers and others at the institution (i.e., feelings of isolation, marginalization and tokenism, or full inclusion, welcome and individuality, and absence or presence of opportunities to engage with a broad diversity of individuals), if these qualitative data exist (e.g., through climate surveys, town hall meetings or focus groups). If experience data do not exist, consider how they might be developed in the future.

b) **Appointment process**: Does the institution have its own governing board? Is the institution only governed by a state board of regents or the like? Both? Who appoints the institution’s governing board and any state board of regents? Who appoints the President or Chancellor for this institution? Is the institution’s governing board self-sustaining, or appointed by the governor or other state authorities? Is appropriate consideration of the institution’s diversity-, equity-, and inclusion-associated interests part of the process in an effective and sustainable manner?

c) **Reports**: Are regular institutional diversity reports provided to the senior administration and governing board? To state authorities? If so, what does such a report contain?
d) **Dedicated office/administrator**: Has the institution considered what would be the most effective organizational structure, centrally and locally, and means of empowerment and enhanced engagement to achieve diversity-, equity-, and inclusion-tied objectives? Is there a separate administrator with responsibility for institutional diversity, equity, and inclusion? Within colleges, or within the institution? Is there a dedicated office?

e) **Faculty**: Are faculty who are doing related research engaged?

f) **Accountability**: Consider whether there is effective coordination and objectives-alignment among these administrators and/or offices across the institution. How is the accreditation process for the institution or particular functions within it (e.g., medical school) an influence or beneficiary of the policies and structures for achieving them? Does this role report to senior administration or to the board? What accountability and sustainability structures are in place? How is effectiveness measured?

---

**INCLUDED IN APPLICATION**

(Click for Legal Exclusions)

As possible, describe trends in composition of institutional leadership and any qualitative, experiential impacts the team discovered in self-assessment. Are there priorities in enhancements to policies or practices, or accountability and structures that would provide the institution with the opportunity to advance diversity, equity, and inclusion? Discuss any equity information provided to institutional leadership and how it is used. What actions to advance in this area will the institution pursue? What are the expected systemic and sustainable effects; why are these actions a priority? How will progress and success by measured?

---

**10. Institutional climate & culture**

10.1 **Education, encouragement, and open discussion**

**REVIEW CRITERIA**

- Is there a thorough analysis of available opportunities to assess, openly discuss, and address bias, harassment, marginalization, and other issues?

- Is there a focus on relationship- and community-building, with proactive engagement of diversity, in meaningful work, education (curricular and co-curricular), research, residential, and social experiences?

- Are orientation, training/professional development, and knowledge-experience enhancing programs, while checking the box on compliance with law, mostly focused on elevating understand of and valuing diversity, equity and inclusion as essential elements of excellence? Is the focus beyond on-line and one-time or episodic training, and instead designed to create ongoing and intentional opportunities to engage diversity in meaningful work, curricular,
co-curricular, residential and social experiences?

- Has the team documented the goals of and evidence undergirding any programs used to educate their communities about diversity, equity, inclusion, and discrimination? Has the effectiveness of any programs been assessed and adjusted as warranted? How and what was the follow up action taken? Are evaluation criteria and process part of a sustainable system, as opposed to a one-off or individual-dependent endeavor? How is effectiveness measured?

GUIDELINES

a) Programs and training (learning and development):

1) Please examine efforts from the institution to support respectful, evidence-backed, educational and meaningful experiential learning programs for—and dialogue among—the institutional community and stakeholders about bias, harassment, and other issues related to diversity, equity, inclusion, and discrimination—and the value and contributions of DEI.

2) Determine if there are any program(s) (curricular, co-curricular, residential, workplace, research, community-building, etc.) designed to raise awareness of issues affecting diversity, equity, inclusion, and addressing isolation and reducing inequity. Do these focus on proactively building a community, climate and culture that engages, embraces and values diversity? What are they, and how does the institution support them?

3) Are there diversity-enhancing and proactive diversity-engaging programs (curricular, co-curricular, workplace and overall institutional community building) that provide opportunities for dialog, curricular, co-curricular and experiential learning as part of undergraduate, graduate, and international student programs, beginning with orientation, but extending throughout the years? Are there corresponding programs for faculty and other employees, beginning with orientation, including professional development and training, but extending more systemically throughout the workplace experience and including community building experiences? Consider different types of programs and how systemic (vs. episodic or one-time) they are? What is the level of participation? Is there evidence that these efforts raise awareness of systems and structures that perpetuate privilege and inequity, cultural sensitivities, and the role of diversity, equity, and inclusion in excellence? Which efforts are most effective to build an inclusive and welcoming environment where all talent can thrive and why? How is effectiveness measured?

4) Are any of these programs required elements of education and workplace orientation, professional development/training, and everyday experiential learning opportunities in the workplace and educational settings (curricular and co-curricular)? Do they apply to undergraduate and graduate students, faculty as well as staff? How are these programs designed? Are they coordinated as part of a coherent learning plan to build a diverse, equitable and inclusive community? Were they crafted primarily to fulfill legal compliance and non-discrimination requirements or to advance relationships and community that are diverse, inclusive
5) Are there campus-wide programs or exercises related to diversity, equity, inclusion, harassment and/or discrimination? Consider any offered, and which audiences they target.

b) Identification and solutions: Does the institution have formal and informal systems, programs and opportunities for learning experiences for students and faculty to recognize and feel safe identifying circumstances that result in isolation, exclusion, and inequity, as well as acts of discrimination, and deal with them directly?

c) Discussion: Are there institutional efforts to ensure open discussion of sensitive/difficult topics? Have faculty scholars in relevant areas been engaged to contribute to these efforts and enhance fellow-faculty members’ awareness?

INCLUDED IN APPLICATION

(Click for Legal Exclusions)

Provide an overview of available opportunities to openly discuss and address bias, harassment, marginalization, and other issues, and to actively learn and experience the value of diversity, equity and inclusion, as a foundation for a community that values and models diversity, equity, and inclusion. Or is this an area of challenge? Did a review of effectiveness of programs or policies reveal any priority areas for advancement of diversity, equity, and inclusion at the institution? Are there any programs or practices that have been particularly successful and can be scaled for broader application? What actions will the institution pursue? What are the expected systemic and sustainable effects; why are these actions priorities? How will progress and success be measured?

10.2 Institutional climate

REVIEW CRITERIA

• Does the self-assessment team use multiple measures of institutional climate? If only one measure was used, such as surveys, is the rationale for this decision well-documented and is it well-supported by evidence?

• Does the application avoid use of labels (e.g., “discrimination,” “harassment”), and instead describe problematic behavior and conditions (e.g., “incivility,” “unwelcome,” “burdened in relation to others,” etc.)

• Were climate and culture assessed across different populations? Was the assessment disaggregated by race/ethnicity, gender, and their intersection to determine if groups were having different experiences? Was the assessment disaggregated by type and level of position and relationship to the institution (e.g., faculty status, discipline, and different faculty levels or student status, major discipline, and undergraduate or graduate student, as well as year within the program)?
Does the institution demonstrate efforts to be transparent about evidence/data-based decision-making, reporting results, evaluating their meaning, and taking action on findings? How are effectiveness of surveys and reporting measured?

GUIDELINES

Climate refers to a variety of indicators, including **behavioral climate** (how people treat each other, to include respect, civility, and collegiality or lack thereof), **psychological climate** (feelings, perceptions or attitudes referring to how chilly or welcoming the climate feels to individuals), **historical dimensions of climate** (including a legacy of inclusion/exclusion at the institution) and **compositional diversity** (who is represented) when correlated with the other aspects of climate and explored as a setting that may enhance or diminish other aspects.

There are many approaches to the assessment of culture and climate. Surveys of campus climate dominate, but there are more approaches to consider for a comprehensive assessment including: focus groups, town hall meetings, interviews, document analyses, observation, and environmental scans. Self-assessment teams should determine the best method(s) for assessing the climate for each focal population; most likely, this will begin with a survey and some additional approaches to follow up on the results of the survey. If an institution already regularly does climate assessment, leverage those findings and incorporate new approaches to drill down deeper into the exploration of institutional culture. Some instruments have been developed through research projects and many more are homegrown, institutionally developed tools (see University of Wisconsin-Madison, IUPUI, Loyola University, University of Maryland, University of Chicago, Washburn University, or Seattle University for examples), or a blend of consultant and commercially produced tools.

Some climate surveys (and focus group questions, etc.) focus on what makes the environment more inclusive. For example, the Diverse Learning Environments survey includes questions about faculty and staff investment in student development, and whether individuals report a sense of belonging.

Other surveys, including the Rankin & Associates survey, feature questions that pertain to exclusion, isolation, hostility. If a campus is looking to improve inclusive practices and/or reduce exclusionary practices, different instruments may lend themselves to their focus of inquiry.

**Following best practices:** The following qualities are associated with assessment of climate and culture of an institution and the self-assessment team should demonstrate if, and how, the institution is addressing each:

1. Implementation of a schedule for assessments of culture and climate for all members of college and university population (faculty & students for the purposes of this application)
2. Use of multiple measures (surveys, focus groups, town hall meetings, interviews etc.)
3. Disaggregation of data by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, age, gender identity and expression, sexual orientation, and other populations. Institutions need to determine what data are important for them to examine in a disaggregated manner, without compromising anonymity of respondents.
4. Demonstrated evidence of reporting results, evaluating them and taking action on climate and culture findings
5) Follow-up assessments to measure if action taken has made a difference on climate and culture.

a) **Climate assessments**: Please explore any climate studies conducted at the institution. Leverage activities already taking place at the institution, which may include any number of the assessments included in the Climate & Culture section of Appendix D: Data Resources in the SEA Change Institutional Bronze Award Handbook.

b) **Population**: Who is targeted in these efforts? Are faculty, graduate students, and undergraduates all asked about the institutional climate? Are the results disaggregated before assessment?

c) **Action**: How are findings from climate studies shared and used? When issues are identified, how are they addressed, and are follow-up assessments done? Does the institution share the findings? If so, how? How is the effectiveness of the studies, reporting and follow up actions determined?

---

**INCLUDED IN APPLICATION**

*(Click for Legal Exclusions)*

Succinctly recount the overall findings from publicly released summaries of climate studies related to the best practices listed above and provide a high-level overview of the types of studies, including specific surveys, and mixed methods including focus groups, town hall meetings, interviews, etc. and how often the studies are conducted. Is there a systemic and sustainable process to collectively assess information derived from multiple sources for a comprehensive picture of climate? From the meta-analysis of all available information about institutional climate, note any priority areas the institution wishes to address to advance equity and inclusion.

If no formal assessment of institutional climate has been conducted, relate what the institution plans to do to explore the climate over the five-year period of the award.

Include the actions the institution will pursue, why they are priorities, and what their expected systemic and sustainable impacts will be. How will progress and success be measured?

---

10.3 **Sexual harassment and assault**

**REVIEW CRITERIA**

- Did the team provide a thorough inventory of sexual and other harassment policies, training, and actions taken to address this issue? Did they also document the assessment of effectiveness and *impact* of these, instead of only listing what has been done? Is the institution’s focus mainly legal compliance—or have they gone beyond the law to focus on building a welcoming and inclusive diverse community where all talent can thrive, and which is actively intolerant of sexual and intersecting bases of harassment including race. How will progress and success be measured?
NOTE: Part of the guidelines for this section are reprinted with permission from Sexual Harassment of Women: Climate, Culture, and Consequences in Academic Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine 2018, by the National Academy of Sciences, Courtesy of the National Academies Press, Washington, D.C.

The recent 2018 report from the National Academies of Science, Engineering, and Medicine, Sexual Harassment of Women: Climate, Culture, and Consequences in Academic Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, concluded within their assessment of legal and policy mechanisms for addressing sexual harassment that:

1) “The legal system alone is not an adequate mechanism for reducing or preventing sexual harassment...
2) Judicial interpretation of Title IX and Title VII has incentivized organizations to create policies, procedures, and training on sexual harassment that focus on symbolic compliance with current law and avoiding liability, and not on preventing sexual harassment...
3) Title IX, Title VII, and case law reflect the inaccurate assumption that a target of sexual harassment will promptly report the harassment without worrying about retaliation...
4) Fears of legal liability may prevent institutions from being willing to effectively evaluate training for its measurable impact on reducing harassment...
5) The two characteristics of environments most associated with higher rates of sexual harassment are (a) male-dominated gender ratios and leadership and (b) an organization climate that communicates tolerance of sexual harassment...
6) Gender harassment (e.g., behaviors that communicate that women do not belong or do not merit respect) is by far the most common type of sexual harassment.”

Nine major recommendations emerged from the consensus study, with two being of particular relevance to SEA Change:

“RECOMMENDATION 4: Improve transparency and accountability.

a. Academic institutions need to develop—and readily share—clear, accessible, consistent policies on sexual harassment and standards of behavior...
b. Academic institutions should be as transparent as possible about how they are handling reports of sexual harassment...
c. Academic institutions should be accountable for the climate within their organization...
d. Academic institutions should consider sexual harassment equally important as research misconduct in terms of its effect on the integrity of research.”

“RECOMMENDATION 9: Incentivize change.

Academic institutions should work to apply for awards from the emerging STEM Equity Achievement (SEA) Change program. Federal agencies and private foundations should encourage and support institutions working to achieve SEA Change Awards.”
In this light, considering **mission alignment** (rather than analysis of legal compliance) we ask that the self-assessment team explore their policies using the following guidelines.

a) **Policies and Practices**: What are the institutional policies and practices to prevent and address on sexual harassment? Do they reflect the institution’s mission and role, and the character of community it seeks to create, including commitment to professional and equitable conduct, culture and climate to embrace inclusion and diversity, not only legal compliance? How often are these policies and practices reviewed? Who reviews the policies and practices? How are these policies disseminated to and how are they and supporting practices implemented by all individuals within the institution? Do the policies promote restorative remedies where appropriate (where those affected consent, understanding of the cause of harm is elevated, repetition of harm is prevented, and relationships are restored)? Do the policies avoid over-reliance on reporting? How is effectiveness measured?

b) **Excellence**: Does the definition of excellence include both high quality work output and high standards of professional and ethical conduct? Is it recognized that a person who produces exceptional research has an adverse effect on STEM fields if his or her conduct includes harassment that drives talent, including women, people of color and others, form the field?

c) **Transparency**: Is the institution reporting annually to its community and other stakeholders on the type and frequency of incidents of sexual and intersecting bases of harassment, including racial harassment, the status of their resolution, and the types of consequences/sanctions imposed on those found responsible (not naming individuals) to communicate effectively that the institution is intolerant of harassment?

d) **Training**: What sexual harassment prevention training is available? Is it aimed at supporting bystander and ally intervention as well as changing conduct and communicating and supporting institutional commitment to equity, inclusion and diversity, not just compliance and avoidance of legal liability? How is effectiveness of such training measured?

e) **Action**: Please consider the results of surveys and other information gathering to assess the status of conduct, climate and culture relating to sexual and intersecting bases of harassment, as well as evaluation of the results and any follow-up actions taken. How is effectiveness of the information gathering, evaluation, reporting and follow up actions measured?

f) **Sexual harassment and assault services**: Are there services available to victims and those accused of sexual assault? Please specify what is included such as counseling, a designated office for sexual assault, harassment, and abuse, or other resources. Are protective measures in place to avoid re-traumatization of targets, recurrence of harm?

g) **Racial, ethnic and religious harassment services**: Are there interventions to address and services to those harmed by incidents of hate and hostility aimed at individuals on the basis of their race, ethnicity or religion?
h) **Academic freedom and free expression:** Has the institution grappled with the lines between harassment and academic freedom and freedom of expression? Has it achieved balance of inclusion and these interests? Has the institution implemented any programs to elevate understanding and dialogue among stakeholders in its community (faculty, students and others) about these intersecting issues?

### INCLUDED IN APPLICATION

*(Click for Legal Exclusions)*

Note any priority areas that the institution wishes to address in its sexual harassment policies and practices. Consider the effect of these current policies and practices on the status of, climate, culture, isolation of some individuals or ability of all individuals to participate fully. Based on the qualitative and quantitative data, identify some opportunities to advance equity, diversity, and inclusion that the institution will want to explore. What actions will the institution pursue? Why are they priorities; what are the expected systemic and sustainable impacts? How will they be measured?

10.4 **Faculty workload**

### REVIEW CRITERIA

- Is there a clear understanding of workload allocation and related systems and criteria? Is there a system in place to assign work and determine and adjust workload, with applicable criteria? Are there an evaluation system and criteria to assess the equity of the system? Have disparities related to race, ethnicity, and gender (and intersectionality) in workload allocation or service load been identified, and if so, are actions in place to remove them? How will progress and success be measured?

### GUIDELINES

a) **Service/committees:** Are there policies with criteria for making and rotating committee membership? Do these policies and criteria address committee workload/overload? Is there rotation in committee membership? Do any of these policies and criteria differ within STEM programs or departments? Are they aligned where appropriate in light of institutional mission related and institutional and departmental objectives? How are their effectiveness measured?

b) **Workload allocation:**

1) Does the institution have a workload allocation model with criteria? Do the model and criteria well-align with institutional mission, including diversity, equity and inclusion? How are their effectiveness measured?

2) Is there a system for coordination of workload systems with other initiatives that may affect diversity, equity and inclusion interests?

3) How are mentoring, advising, and other kinds of supports rewarded and honored?
4) How is workload, including service, considered and weighted during appraisals and promotion?

5) Is workload monitored for disparities and bias? If so, how, and what actions are taken to address and remove them? How are decisions made, reviewed, and backed by evidence?

6) Are all contributions recognized and the burdens associated with them equitably credited (e.g., when people of color and women are asked to address equity and inclusion issues affecting them, they bear emotional burdens on top of the effort burden that everyone engaged in the endeavor bears)?

**INCLUDED IN APPLICATION**

(Click for Legal Exclusions)

Note any priority areas that the institution wishes to address in its faculty workload policies and practices. Consider the effect of these current policies and practices on diversity, equity and inclusion objectives and the status of climate, culture, and isolation of some individuals or ability of all individuals to participate fully and thrive. Based on the qualitative and quantitative data, identify some opportunities to advance equity, diversity, and inclusion that the institution will want to pursue. Why are they priorities; what systemic and sustainable impacts are they expected to have? How will progress and success by measured?

10.5 Role models and diversity

**REVIEW CRITERIA**

- If there are no systems to assess or no clear policies to advance diversity, equity, and inclusion in institutional events (ex. lectures, panels, research symposia) or consider institutional diversity in publicity, are there actions in place to implement such assessment systems and policies, aligned with the institution’s mission? How will progress and success by measured?

**GUIDELINES**

a) **Equity in institutional events:**

1) How are diversity-, equity-, and inclusion-enhancing goals reflected in the subject matter and composition of invited speakers, invited guests, and event organizers for seminars and other events?

2) Is attention paid to including, among others’ accomplishments and perspectives, the accomplishments and perspectives of women and people of color whose accomplishments and perspectives have not been recognized or included?

3) How are the interests of marginalized groups represented and inputs invited in the planning and conduct of the events?
4) How are events effectively communicated to engender interest and attendance from a broadly diverse and inclusive audience?

5) Are event evaluation protocols sensitive to eliciting feedback on the breadth of inclusivity and the diversity of perspectives at events? Is there a sustainable system in place to undertake such evaluation and to make adjustments going forward when warranted?

6) Is it widely understood that including a diversity of individuals with a broad range of perspectives in planning and conducting events contributes to knowledge and excellence? What does the institution do to elevate this understanding?

b) Publicity:

1) Consider how institutional diversity, equity and inclusion is considered and communicated in publicity efforts.

2) Is the institutional website content inclusive? Is it an accurate picture of the makeup of the institution, or what the institution is striving to achieve? Does its content cover a range of perspectives and reflect participation by a broad diversity of individuals? Is there a welcoming and effective message for a broad diversity of individuals? Is there a sustainable system in place to periodically evaluate the effectiveness of the web site in these respects and to make adjustments when needed? Comment also on the accessibility of the website as well (use of universal design principles, captioned videos, making accommodations for the visually impaired, etc.).

INCLUDED IN APPLICATION

(Click for Legal Exclusions)

Note any priority areas that the institution wishes to address in its policies and practices for events and publicity. Consider the effect of these current policies and practices on the status of, climate, culture, isolation of some individuals or ability of all individuals to participate fully and thrive. Based on the qualitative and quantitative and qualitative data, identify some opportunities to advance equity, diversity, and inclusion that the institution will want to pursue. Why are these priorities; what are the expected systemic and sustainable impacts from such actions? How will progress and success by measured?

11. Miscellaneous

Please use this section to describe any other initiatives or effort related to the application that were not covered in the previous sections. Please limit the description to a maximum of 500 words.
ACTION PLAN

Once you have completed the scan of your institution through the self-assessment process, explored your findings to provide a 30,000-foot view that can address the criteria listed in this document, and determined the major challenges that you should address, it is time to develop an action plan. As mentioned in the Handbook, the plan should be based on addressing the institution-specific issues and priorities. This means that each action should have a clear tie to something discovered in your self-assessment that the institution wishes to address in order to advance systemic and sustainable diversity, equity, and inclusion. The team should demonstrate a clear, logical flow of Awareness -> Understanding -> Action. Institutions do not need to address all of the challenges identified in the self-assessment in the Bronze action plan and should prioritize actions in light of their impact and importance to mission, ensuring that hard challenges are included but that the plan is realistic—with commitment and resources—to make progress on the full range of actions identified during the plan’s timeframe. Institutions should explain why they have prioritized the actions they’ve included. In particular, institutions should explain why these actions are expected to advance (or are necessary as a foundation for) systemic and sustainable progress toward creating a welcoming community that embraces diversity, equity and inclusion, enables all talent to thrive, and recognizes these interests as inextricable elements of excellence.

Avoid forward-looking race- or gender-based numerical quotas, which cannot be legally supported. Instead, identify specific outcomes that you want to achieve (e.g., breaking down stereotypes, giving all students and faculty the experience of working in a robustly diverse community of people, eliminating isolation and marginalization, making good faith efforts to eliminate underutilization of women and people of color), and lay out a plan to gather both qualitative (experience-based) and quantitative historical and current data against which to measure progress and effectiveness of efforts. Do not include internal legal advice and legal evaluation areas, which are excluded from the scope of SEA Change (see Retaining Confidentiality: Internal Legal Advice and Legal Evaluation Areas).

REVIEW CRITERIA

• Are actions (and action plans) Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-oriented (SMART)?

• Does the action plan reflect a genuine and realistic intention to address and challenge inequities and barriers? In other words, is there a clear demonstration of understanding of the overall findings of their self-assessment, a clear tie to a reasonable strategy for addressing challenges, and a clear plan for implementation and evaluation? Does the plan advance systemic and sustainable change, not reliance on a particular individual, and evidence-based evaluation and decision-making on an ongoing basis?

• Internal legal advice and legal evaluation areas are outside the scope of SEA Change. Only forward-looking actions, a statement of the expected forward looking systemic and sustainable impacts of such actions, and the metrics that will be used to measure progress are required to be included in the action plan for distinct institutional priority topics, whose prior and current status, associated institutional strategies, related institutional readiness analyses, and/or privileges and confidentiality are within the scope of internal legal advice (and thereby become legal evaluation areas).
• Does the action plan have a high likelihood of advancing equity over the five-year duration of an award?
  
  o Are responsibilities for completing actions distributed across an appropriate range of staff, is collaboration encouraged, and are there accountability mechanisms? (Specific)
  
  o Are there specific indicators of success identified, with a description of how experience-based qualitative and quantitative data will be collected and analyzed as appropriate to support both evaluation and decision-making? (Measurable)
  
  o Is there evidence that the institution has given adequate resources to those with assignment of responsibilities to effectively carry out the plan? (Achievable)
  
  o Have the actions arisen from the priorities identified by the data and commentary in previous sections? (Relevant)
  
  o Are actions scheduled across the five years of the award? (Time-oriented)

GUIDELINES

There is no right or wrong number of actions, however, it is important to balance ambition with realism.

Specific- Be clear and precise when defining the action you will undertake; avoid generalities, anything vague or difficult to interpret; pay attention to whether the actions will support systemic and sustainable progress

Measurable- To progress in SEA Change, the institution will need to demonstrate progress. What would progress look like in addressing a particular issue? How would you measure that and are the structures in place to capture and report those progress indicators?

Achievable- Don’t overpromise; reviewers will likely recognize an over ambitious action item. A reasonable approach to your action plan will be more likely to be accomplished within the time-frame you’ve proposed with workloads adjusted for those assigned to the action, and resources directed appropriately.

Relevant- Actions should appropriately address the challenges identified in the self-assessment but also should be reasonable and sustainable, given system constraints and applicable law (e.g., not “we will double female faculty by 2020”—articulate the experience-based objective and any compositional underutilization that needs to be remedied by substantial increase in gender compositional diversity)

Time-oriented- Each action should have its own timeline for implementation. There should be target dates for completing each step within the implementation plan, there should be ways to benchmark progress, and there should be mechanisms in place to ensure the institution is holding itself accountable for meeting those deadlines.

Be sure to craft a narrative in your action plan. Reviewers need to see the clear progression of logic that lead to the action you’ve chosen – e.g., a documentation of workflow for the action itself. What is the issue or what is the information that is missing? Why is it important to address this? What would be indicators of success for where the institution wishes to be in 5 years in the context of this action? What strategy have you decided to implement to
Implementing an effective institutional plan involves not only selecting actions/interventions appropriate for each gap/challenge identified, but also putting the pieces together. Problems interact and intersect; so, too, do interventions. The implications of this intersection will need to be made transparent for the review panel assessing your application. It will be important to:

- **Prioritize actions**—Everything is not equally important, **but** there may be a logical reason for the order that you propose within the timeline of your action plan. It is critical to articulate a middle ground between being ambitious and realistic! It may not be possible to address some important issues immediately because the human and/or financial resources are not yet available, or because the political and communications work needed before launching an intervention has not been completed. The rationale for prioritization should be explicitly described early in the action plan. The action plan does not need to be organized in a way that mirrors the application—in fact, the reviewers will understand the vision for the institution better if the action plan is organized in order of priority and related to the institution’s overarching mission and diversity, equity, and inclusion objectives. If the institution is intentionally deferring some significant necessary actions that the self-assessment has revealed, explain why and how the actions that are included will set the stage for addressing these substantial actions later.

- **Provide a roll-out/staging plan**—Implementing an action plan will represent a major focus of climate and cultural change within the institution across all communities. As such, it is a significant endeavor needing project management, definitions of success, metrics for progress, monitoring, and reporting. Thus, some of the actions in the SMART action plan should detail how the whole plan will be staged and rolled out. It will be important to share how progress on the plan will be driven, managed, measured, and monitored within the institution’s core business reporting processes.

After a gap in information has been identified, or an issue has been highlighted that the self-assessment team wishes to address, it’s time to formulate an appropriate action. In general, these will fall into three categories:

1. **Adapting and improving your own initiatives**: Many institutions have been working on issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion for a long time. They may have data that demonstrate some effectiveness but where improvements can enhance their impact or roll out to other parts of the institution might be warranted. Gather a list of existing programs and examine which can be used or modified to address an issue identified in self-assessment. Demonstrating (and celebrating) the impact of past and current initiatives will be an important source of actions. Such efforts are likely to already be responsive to local context and adapting these may be more easily accomplished.

2. **Adapting initiatives used by others**: Often peer (or near peer) institutions have undertaken actions/interventions that address challenges similar to those you have identified in your institutional self-
assessment. Building on the work of others, these initiatives can be adapted based on the culture and context of your institution. You first want to look closely at the evaluation of these initiatives to assess their effectiveness and the conditions under which they have been deployed. Some may have been adopted by many different organizations because they have a positive impact, but it is also possible that an intervention has been implemented simply because everyone else is doing it. No intervention can be “borrowed” without thoughtful adaptation.

3. Innovation/Experimentation: In some cases, interventions may need to be “invented;” where pursuing this action, the proposed intervention should be based on evidence/best available research. They should be considered “experiments” with data collected and evaluated to demonstrate efficacy. Such efforts are often undertaken in response to complex issues and can best be devised by smaller working groups within the self-assessment team, adding in additional experts as-needed. These efforts can contribute to the research and practice base of “transforming institutions.”

Living document: action plans should be living documents, constantly reviewed and updated (not just prepared as part of an award submission). As such, SEA Change will ask for a progress report and update to the action plan 2.5 years after an award has been granted. This is intended to help the institution and self-assessment team stay on track.

INCLUDED IN APPLICATION

MAINTAINING EXCLUSION OF INTERNAL LEGAL ADVICE AND LEGAL EVALUATION AREAS

Affirm at the beginning of the Action Plan that the institution has self-assessed all general topics broadly referenced in Criteria & Guidelines from a good policy perspective.

Then, also affirm that those topics that the institution determined to be realistic and actionable priorities in the SEA Change program for the coming five years, are addressed in the institution’s action plan; but that this affirmation is made only on a going-forward basis for certain distinct topics where needed to maintain the exclusion from SEA Change of internal legal advice and legal evaluation areas. That exclusion from SEA Change overlays and modifies the requirements of the application and action plan. (Don’t disclose in the application or action plan specifically what was assessed, data gathered and analyzed, or findings included in internal legal advice and legal evaluation areas. See Retaining Confidentiality: Internal Legal Advice and Legal Evaluation Areas at the beginning of the Criteria & Guidelines and the Handbook.)

Include in the action plan for all topics that are priorities for the institution’s action, an explanation of why the topic is a priority (i.e., the specific forward-looking impact expected) and how future progress will be measured.

CROSS-REFERENCING WITHIN APPLICATION

For each section of the application, indicate which action plan items have been developed to address issues identified during self-assessment for that section. This means that any actions that have been determined via an understanding
garnered from that section should be embedded in the narrative to cross-reference to the full action plan. For example (note: this is only an example):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action ID</th>
<th>Barrier/gap in information</th>
<th>Strategy/action</th>
<th>Links to other actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action 2.5</strong></td>
<td>Proportion of women of color in adjunct faculty roles higher than national average but lower than other faculty roles</td>
<td>Bias training; change in hiring committee procedures; climate assessment of adjunct faculty</td>
<td>See also: Action 3.1 Action 4.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ACTION PLAN TEMPLATE (EXAMPLE)**

**Overall priority 1**

“A narrative briefly connecting the overarching theme of the following actions identified throughout the self-assessment, any necessary institutional, local, state, or federal context, a desired outcome, and a reason for the way this set of actions has been prioritized.”

**Action 1.1**

Statement of macro-level understanding of barrier or gap in necessary information identified.

Declaration of why removing the barrier or closing the gap is critical for the mission of the institution.

Description of chosen strategy/intervention/action to address the issue, and why it was selected/adapted/created.

Indicators of success that the self-assessment team hopes to see if the action is effective and how success will be measured.

Plans for assessment, monitoring, and/or recalibration of action or components of action

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeline (specific) for implementation</th>
<th>Main office/role leading the action</th>
<th>Secondary office/role (redundancy)</th>
<th>Resources committed to action (and by whom)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Action 1.2**

Statement of macro-level understanding of barrier or gap in necessary information identified.
Declaration of why removing the barrier or closing the gap is critical for the mission of the institution.

Description of chosen strategy/intervention/action to address the issue, and why it was selected/adapted/created.

Indicators of success that the self-assessment team hopes to see if the action is effective and how success will be measured.

Plans for assessment, monitoring, and/or recalibration of action or components of action

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeline (specific) for implementation</th>
<th>Main office/role leading the action</th>
<th>Secondary office/role (redundancy)</th>
<th>Resources committed to action (and by whom)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1 For any specific relevant topics that are NOT included in internal legal advice and are not legal evaluation areas, consider and briefly address the following inquiries in the application.