

ARTF: ILE Subcommittee Name:		Listen						
Recommendation Name	Description / Rationale	Necessary Actions	Responsible Division and/or Unit	Timeframe	Resources/ Funding	Progress Markers	Accountability	Other Considerations
1. Promote closer proximity between senior leaders and faculty/staff (e.g., flatten bureaucratic structure).	Senior leaders lack awareness (do not hear) relevant issues/concerns in a timely manner and therefore are not responsive to our students, community, faculty or staff concerns. Limited listening and sharing of information between the general population and senior leadership which impedes innovation, creativity, and thoroughness in our efforts to solve problems, engage in process improvement, and develop meaningful and pioneering initiatives. Mechanisms for listening sessions and input are critical at all levels of the organization to support leadership actions towards positioning Drexel as a premiere institution by better realizing our strategic plan. Senior leadership does not have access to the concerns, ideas, suggestions, or lived experience of lower ranked employees and therefore are not fully informed in their decision making. This leads to unrecognized problems that become stagnant because they are not addressed in full or at all. It also leads to missed opportunities for growth, innovation, and high quality output because the flow of feedback from people proximate to the problem to senior leadership is stunted and marred in a slow and unreliable system of passing the message up the chain of command. This appears to be by design, where senior leadership purposely excludes students, staff, community from giving input and participating in decision-making.	1. Create mechanisms for communication of ideas and concerns deemed important or of interest to travel from people proximate to the problem directly to senior leadership. Operationalize the mechanism created which will enhance understanding of the problem or idea and will ensure that the people who initiate are properly credited and valued.	1. Senior leadership in coordination with leadership at all levels of the organization and with the input of non-leaders from different sectors of the university.	1. Short Term = 6 months to establish mechanism Long Term = ongoing utilization of mechanism	1. Short Term = Time/buyout provided to those developing the mechanism (spanning leadership levels and non-leaders) Long Term = There may be communication resources needed pending the specifics of the mechanism developed	1. Month 1-2: Planning meetings occur within groups including senior leadership and team members who are proximate to the problem Month 3: Proposed expectations shared with Drexel community including all stakeholders, from students to board members, for open feedback, while concurrently test groups attempt to implement the proposed plan. Month 4: Feedback from community and from test groups incorporated Month 5-6: Mechanism implemented across all levels Ongoing: Communication from people proximate to the problem flows regularly up to leadership via established mechanism and leadership at all levels seeks input from people proximate to the problem as standard practice in problem solving	Reports should be shared with anti-racism advisory committee, faculty senate, and published in an open forum at the achievement of each progress marker. All of the information in the final version of this mechanism should be made public as soon as it is in final format so that the entire Drexel community can set their expectations and everyone is empowered to hold all levels of Drexel leadership accountable to these recommendations. All those evaluating leaders should inquire and assess the extent to which leaders accessed information from people proximate to the problem/content experts in their problem solving efforts. Leaders who perform inclusively in this area should be evaluated favorably and considered for promotion while leaders who consistently exclude voices proximate to the problem should not	
		2. Create clear and concrete expectations of managers. For example, create environments that encourage innovative ideas and creative problem solving where leaders are rewarded when they showcase the work of their employees as opposed to presenting work done by others and not fully acknowledge or credit them.	2. HR and all units responsible for evaluating leaders and creating leadership performance appraisal forms, procedures, and expectations.	2. Short Term = 6 months to include these expectations on leadership evaluation forms and in leadership evaluation procedures Long Term = Adherence to these values should be reflected on an ongoing basis via promotions and raises given to leaders based on this area of performance	2. This should be a funding and resource saving measure as it will help put effective leaders in power and should help the university and its subunits capitalize on all talent within the university	2. Month 1-2: Planning meetings occur within groups including senior leadership and team members who are proximate to the problem Month 3: Proposed expectations shared with Drexel community including all stakeholders, from students to board members, for open feedback, while concurrently test groups attempt to implement the proposed plan. Month 4: Feedback from community and from test groups incorporated Month 5-6: Mechanism implemented across all levels	Reports should be shared with anti-racism advisory committee, faculty senate, and published in an open forum at the achievement of each progress marker. All of the information in the final version of this evaluation form should be made public as soon as it is in final format so that the entire Drexel community can set their expectations and everyone is empowered to hold all levels of Drexel leadership accountable to these recommendations. Although the procedures will be defined in 6 months, the impact and cultural changes will be ongoing	
		3. Create a formalized process to seek and consider input from staff, students, faculty, and community stakeholders during planning and problem solving. Carry out processes that gain input which should use mixed methods approaches where qualitative input is valued equally to information gained via quantitative methods such as surveys. Qualitative data should be used to explain and contextualize quantitative data. One suggestion for this might be that instead of or in addition to town hall meetings after decisions have been made, that ideas session are conducted during the decision making process to engage the entire community in in the decision making process to create better investment and buy-in at all layers of the university and to better inform leadership lead by faculty, staff, and/or students around topics of interest, for example the strategic plan, anti racism, and other university initiatives.	3. All levels of leadership should be engaged to create an inclusive environment of input. Proposals at any level of the university that are created without inclusive input should be rejected until revisions are made adding input of people proximate to the problem.	3. Short Term = 6 months to model this process Long Term = Ongoing inclusivity and engagement in decision making	3. This would require additional meetings and/or other opportunities for input. Meetings could be virtual.	3. Month 1-2: Planning meetings occur within groups including senior leadership and team members who are proximate to the problem Month 3: Proposed expectations shared with Drexel community including all stakeholders, from students to board members, for open feedback, while concurrently test groups attempt to implement the proposed plan. Month 4: Feedback from community and from test groups incorporated Month 5-6: Mechanism implemented across all levels	Evaluations of all leaders within the university should include assessment of their inclusivity in problem solving. Leaders who excel and collecting and responding to suggestions and who engage those they lead in planning and decision making would be considered for positive evaluation and promotion.	
1a. Seek faculty and staff voices and learn from their experiences, involve them in decision-making	Faculty and staff feedback is not considered or sought out as part of leadership 360 evaluations and faculty and staff are not consulted in the process of problem identification and problem solving. We are not aware of any inquiry into faculty and staff perceptions of equity, discrimination, or favoritism in their department or at Drexel as a whole. Faculty and staff are often the people most proximate to a given problem and therefore should have a prominent role in both identification of issues and areas for improvement as well as during the problem solving process. Mechanisms to collect faculty and staff feedback, suggestions, and ideas is not integrated into either the culture or the procedures of our university. Important decisions that affect faculty and staff profoundly are often made in a top-down fashion, without seeking input or alternate perspectives. In order to practice true inclusion, faculty and staff should be allowed to participate in the decision-making that affects them.	1. Create learning academies for senior leadership lead by faculty, staff, and/or students around topics of interest, for example the strategic plan, anti racism, and other university initiatives.	1. Senior leadership responsible for putting out a formal request and invitation AND for participating as a learner. Students, staff, and faculty will be responsible to answer the call and develop the academies.	Short-term: start doing this immediately Long-term: ongoing Sr Level executives should get	1. This will cost time for presenters and learners. This can be built around leadership skill development & team building skills as part of coursework (students, credits earned; faculty, credits for teaching; and buy out time for staff). If outside speakers are used, there will be a fee for their participation. There will be cost in administrative time to schedule and organize these events.	1. Mont 1: SL publishes request for academies Month 2-3: Responses collected Month 4: Proposals reviewed by newly formed advisory committee Month 5: Selections Ongoing: Proposals implemented on rolling bases over 21/22 academic year and beyond;	Accountability should be double ended for this. Leader evaluations should include an assessment of their familiarity with the units they are in charge of with documented efforts to interact and learn about work done within those units. The other end of accountability here should be that units are assessed for how well they engage their leaders in their work. Faculty senate and especially tenured employees in their protected role are in a position of less risk and therefore should bear responsibility for holding our leaders accountable for adhering to and promoting the recommendations	
		2. Senior leaders should engage in field observation, shadowing work duties, meetings, classes, services activities, etc. In addition to direct observation this is an opportunity for senior leadership and lower ranked members of the Drexel community to learn more about each other. We believe this kind of person to person interaction improves communication, trust, and institutional wisdom.	2. With the formation of a new advisory anti-racism council, this group should be responsible for collecting requests and making suggestions about what observational experiences are important. Leadership at all levels is responsible for following through with observation recommendations and following up observations with feedback to the part of the organization observed and feedback back to own offices with recommendations based on observations.	3. The anti-racism task force is responsible for publishing and distributing clear and detailed recommendations, not just to senior leadership, but for all levels of university functioning. The faculty senate is responsible for discussing the recommendations, applying them to faculty work, and making faculty specific recommendations and resources. Faculty senate is also responsible for developing a mechanism for holding senior leadership accountable to the ARTF recommendations.	2. Leadership time	2. Month 1: SL publishes request for observations Month 2-3: Responses collected Month 4: Requests reviewed by advisory council and SL Month 5: Selections Ongoing: Observations executed on rolling bases over 21/22 academic year and beyond		
		3. Faculty senate and other faculty bodies should familiarize themselves with anti-racism task force recommendations and use their position of privilege with many having tenured status to elevate the voices of those with less protection, particularly those from minoritized groups, and to advocate for senior leadership's accountability to anti-racism recommendations.	3. The anti-racism task force is responsible for publishing and distributing clear and detailed recommendations, not just to senior leadership, but for all levels of university functioning. The faculty senate is responsible for discussing the recommendations, applying them to faculty work, and making faculty specific recommendations and resources. Faculty senate is also responsible for developing a mechanism for holding senior leadership accountable to the ARTF recommendations.		3. Faculty senate time, ARTF time	3. Month 1: Senate reviews ARTF recs Ongoing: Every other senate meeting will have a standing agenda item to discuss implementation progress among leadership and faculty		

<p>1b. Seek student voices and learn from their experiences, involve them in decision-making</p>	<p>Students are not asked to share their experiences or struggles during or after their education at Drexel. While they fill out course and program evaluations, these typically don't inquire about inclusivity, social aspects of the student experience, adverse events during their program of study, etc. We are not aware of any inquiry into student's perceptions of equity, discrimination, or favoritism in their programs or at Drexel as a whole. Additionally, important decisions that affect them profoundly are often made in a top-down fashion, without seeking input or alternate perspectives. In order to practice true inclusion, students should be allowed to participate in the decision-making that affects them.</p>	<p>1. A member of senior leadership should attend a class in each program annually and remain after class for dialog with those interested. They should intentionally attend classes where difficult topics are being discussed after permission/discussion with the professor and students to ensure discussion is not inhibited.</p> <p>2. Establish DEI standards and a method of evaluation relative to those standards for student placement sites and create a formalized mechanism for students to report and provide feedback on concerning practices during their placements. There should also be a formalized mechanism for responding to student feedback and formalized mechanisms for communicating our expectations and standards to sites working with our students.</p> <p>3. Listen to best practice approaches for student success. For example, develop bridge programs aimed at preparing students who identify as outside the majority culture of their areas of study to thrive within their chosen field. There should be particular emphasis placed on Black students as this group has historically been most marginalized.</p>	<p>1. Not sure what antiracist structure we will have in place permanently, but those structures should be responsible for collecting requests and making suggestions about what classes should be attended by senior leadership. Senior leadership is responsible for following through with recommendations and following up observations with feedback to the department observed and feedback back to own offices with recommendations based on observations.</p> <p>2. Antiracism council, HR, and all units responsible for contracts, clinical education, co-op, and other off non-drexel student experiences.</p> <p>3. Eventual anti-racism structure within the university. Underrepresented minority groups t/o the university structure including student, staff, and faculty groups.</p>	<p>This should be organized and set up during the 20/21 academic year so that it can be implemented for academic year 21/22</p>	<p>1 Leadership time and dedication to changing their mindset</p> <p>2. This will require time from multiple stakeholders and the extent to which those stakeholders will be compensated financially or via time buyout will need careful consideration and should be applied equitably.</p> <p>3 Funding for outside consultants may be helpful in this area.</p>	<p>1. Month 1: SL publishes request for observations Month 2-3: Responses collected Month 4: Requests reviewed by newly formed antiracism advisory council and SL Month 5: Selections Ongoing: Observations executed on rolling bases over 21/22 academic year and beyond.</p> <p>2. Month 1: Create a working group tasked with this project that includes representation from antiracism council, HR, community partners, students clinical coordinators, and others Month 2-3: Draft standards Month 4: Work group initial recs Month 5-6: Collect and incorporate feedback Month 9: Finalized standards sent to affiliated sites and entire Drexel community</p> <p>3. Month 1: Create a working group tasked with this project that includes ARTF, students faculty, clinical coordinators, and others Month 2-3: Develop best practice guidelines draft Month 4: Work group initial recs Month 5-6: Collect and incorporate feedback Month 7: Finalized recommendations sent to entire Drexel community Month 9: First offering implemented</p>	<p>URM students, faculty and staff in charge of placements, and other stakeholders should be surveyed regarding the effectiveness of these items</p> <p>Leadership should conduct this survey, publicly publish the results, identify plans to address issues, a regular reporting on progress with those plans</p>
<p>2. Effectively operationalize Drexel's stated values (Quality, Integrity, Diversity, Access, Stewardship, and Innovation/Entrepreneurship) and listen to and acknowledge contributions of lower ranked personnel and students.</p>	<p>Drexel espouses a set of values that are expressed in our mission, vision, and strategic plan, but when lower ranked employees contribute to and embody those values they are often not met with reward, acknowledgement, or resources unless they generate funding or outside recognition suggesting that those endpoints are more valued than realizing in earnest our strategic plan. This leads to a feeling of mistrust because stated values do not guide resource allocation. A lack of faith and trust in senior leadership greatly deteriorates the work environment, productivity, innovation, and overall quality of work. Specific to DEI and antiracism efforts, faculty and staff who engage in activities aimed at improving diversity, equity, and inclusion in the Drexel community are generally not given protected time to do so. Their efforts are above and beyond their usual duties and are often not weighted equitably during work load allocation and performance evaluation.</p>	<p>1. Short term- create a survey of students, staff, and faculty about the climate, culture, equity, and inclusivity of the Drexel experience. Long term- follow up with focus groups to provide a more in depth understanding of survey results to collect ideas for improvement.</p> <p>2. Reframe processes by listening to more equitable practices with regards to admissions, hiring, promotion, and all forms of recognition and award such that the value of "soft skills" and "doing good in the world" are weighted more equitably compared to hard metrics (grades, revenue, publications). An example might be that students with excellent academic performance can do poorly in field experiences while students struggling with academics can excel. Academic performance should be a good predictor of success in fieldwork and dissonance should cause us to reevaluate how we assess academic performance and how we rate hard metrics compared to "soft skills" and values like stewardship that often lead to excellence in the field.</p> <p>3. Listen to how decisions should be made regarding award buyout and other forms of protected time for faculty and staff engaging in activities, initiatives, and practices that meet diversity, access, and stewardship values equitably compared to other values. Bonus salary for work done above a beyond usual job duties should be distributed equitably and should be shared among those working on the project, not just given to the leader of the</p>	<p>1. Senior leadership, HR, and anti-racism advisory council</p> <p>2. Academic depts, faculty, and all leadership</p> <p>3. HR, leaders at all levels starting with senior leadership to set examples and expectations.</p>	<p>Short Term = 20-21 academic year to assess climate and identify areas for improvement and mechanisms to achieve improvement</p> <p>Long Term = 21-22 academic year to implement mechanisms</p>	<p>1. Buyout for those designing, conducting, and interpreting data</p> <p>Large buy-out for those involved in focus group qualitative data collection and reporting. Bonus here is that all this data should be publishable :)</p> <p>2 This will require an institutional shift in behavior, especially behaviors that are valued and rewarded. A major review of what projects and initiatives are funded with money and buyout versus those that are not. There needs to be more equitably buy out related to practices and Drexel's 5 stated values</p> <p>2 This will require an institutional shift in behavior, especially behaviors that are valued and rewarded. A major review of what projects and initiatives are funded with money and buyout versus those that are not and there needs to be a redistribution of money and out-buy more equitably between Drexel's 5 stated values</p>	<p>1 "Short Term = Winter quarter 2021 for climate survey</p> <p>Medium Term = Spring quarter 2021 for survey analysis and distribution of granular information to all units within the university</p> <p>Long Term = Sumer 2021 and t/o 21/22 academic year for qualitative follow up. Ideally baseline qualitative questions and procedures are distributed to all units within the university to which units can add unit specific questions. Someone outside each unit</p> <p>2. Examples of "soft skills" and "doing good in the world" successes published in newsletter highlighting students, faculty, staff, and leaders</p> <p>Admissions, hiring, and promotion evaluations reflect valuation and assessment of soft skills and stewardship</p> <p>2 Examples of diversity, access, and stewardship success published in newsletter highlighting students, faculty, staff, and leaders</p> <p>Admissions, hiring, and promotion evaluations reflect valuation and assessment of diversity, access, and stewardship</p>	<p>Drexel offers civic engagement time to employees with little support on finding opportunities to use this time (is this true? how does one get this time? how is it tracked and awarded?)</p> <p>Civic engagement office should be responsible for finding opportunities or making it easier for staff to use this time for their own civic interests.</p> <p>Civic engagement office should also provide opportunities for students and should pair students, faculty, and staff with similar interests for interdisciplinary experiences.</p> <p>Evaluations of students, faculty, staff, and leaders should assess civic engagement, stewardship, visibility, and access and should award those with extensive work in 2 areas or broad work across areas and should give less award to those who only excel in one area.</p>

<p>3. Promote trust in senior leadership since lack of trust stunts communication from people proximate to the problem.</p>	<p>Due to a general lack of trust, concerns and suggestions that would normally be brought to the attention of leadership are left uncommunicated. This can be due to a fear of retribution or a belief that nothing will be done.</p>	<p>1. Create a formal system to collect feedback from lower level employees and direct reports to be included and weighted during annual evaluation of all leadership roles, including senior leadership. Peer feedback should be formally collected and considered in annual evaluations for employees at all levels. Peer review would also be helpful. Require annual participation in 360 evaluation by different stakeholders. Currently leadership is evaluated, awarded, and promoted based only on evaluation from their boss, this process leave out essential information from peers and underlings (bad word help) and leads to incredibly stunted information. This practice greatly contributed to promotion of the wrong people and vast mistrust in leadership. Keba - surely there is some leadership data that can be pointed to here (Not entirely sure how widespread this is t/o the university, but I can say I have not evaluated any of my leaders in years).</p>	<p>1. HR and all units responsible for annual evaluations and creating performance appraisal forms, procedures and expectations.</p>	<p>Short Term = 20-21 academic year, all procedures should be planned</p> <p>Long Term = 21-22 academic year for implementation</p>	<p>1. This will cost some time to set up and organize, but should not add additional cost on an ongoing basis</p>	<p>1. No leader is ever given an annual review or promoted without input from those they lead. All assessments of leaders should include a summary of feedback from those they lead</p> <p>Leaders should be required to self reflect on areas for improvement based on feedback from those they lead and should be required to develop annual goals related to this assessment. They should be evaluated annually on how well they met those goals, much like faculty is required to reflect and make goals about their teaching.</p>	<p>No leader is ever promoted and given a raise without receiving and reflecting on feedback from those they lead</p> <p>Promotion and annual evaluations should contain mandatory feedback from supervisors for all leaders across the institution</p> <p>Peer review would also be helpful</p> <p>Outside auditor recommendations along with plans to address those recommendations and progress reports are made available to entire Drexel community and stakeholders. Faculty senate includes these recommendations in their broader discussion and accountability progress to the ARTF recs (see above)</p>
<p>4. Create ways to facilitate true empathy when Black and brown racialized colleagues share their experiences.</p>	<p>At Drexel, many people think they understand racism but really do not. Many "listen" to their Black & brown colleagues, their experiences, their everyday problems, but do not actually hear them. Without hearing the voices of Black & brown colleagues, and truly listening to what is happening, and without practicing empathy, how can we ever aspire to a model of shared power, and true inclusion and equity?</p>	<p>1. Integrate reading real-life student accounts of being Black at Drexel (eg, @blackatdrexel instagram account) into our regular everyday meetings, such as staff meetings, leadership meetings, board meetings - to prioritize valuing and listening to Black students, who should be our number one priority.</p>	<p>1. Each teaching department within the university should promote anonymous optional feedback mechanisms that ask specifically about culture, experience, bias, etc. It would be helpful for those who operate the black at drexel instagram to offer an end of quarter report that consolidated the into posted. Also, this group should be offered tech and administrative support to generate these reports. This should come from student life.</p>	<p>Short Term: Mechanisms and pilots should be completed academic year 20-21</p> <p>Long Term: Implementation academic year 21-22</p>	<p>1. This should not require substantive cost</p>	<p>1. Surveys, but they could be used to help track the change of students, faculty and staff experiences at Drexel</p> <p>Departments should be required to report on their climate annual as part of the department chair's evaluation, these reports should include evidence of climate assessment, plans for improvement to address concerns, and progress along those</p>	<p>Improvement in culture and experience should be reflected in climate assessments moving forward and good climate/experience rating (or at least improving ratings) should be included as part of leader assessments at all levels.</p>
<p>5. Enhance empathetic listening skills - we need to focus on essential or "soft skills" as much as technical skills in order to effectively perform our jobs</p>	<p>Empathetic listening can not be instilled when they are not modeled on a consistent basis. Empathetic listening when advancing anti racism means getting inside another person's frame of reference, seeing the world the way they see the world and trying to understand how they feel. What can we do about this? Enhancing an organization's senior leadership with empathetic listening and emotional intelligence can create a trickle down effect through the layers of hierarchy. If middle management is struggling to do their job without receiving needed support and empathetic listening from their leaders, how can they generate support and empathetic listening for the people who report to them?</p>	<p>1. Empathetic listening trainings, toolkits and workshops on empathy and EQ especially in the context of anti-racism - plenty of great resources exist such as https://projects.iq.harvard.edu/files/antiracismresources/files/whiteallytoolkitworkbook-advancededition.pdf ; can we make some existing trainings required along with annual CDI/phishing/Title IX?</p>	<p>1. Anti-racism advisory council with input from other stakeholders will curate resources and requirements. Senior leadership will fund and all leaders will enact requirements.</p>	<p>Short Term: immediately trainings could be offered as voluntary and online</p> <p>Long Term: Mandatory part of compliance/eval process academic year 21-22</p>	<p>1. There may be cost depending on resources ultimately selected</p>	<p>1. Trainings, toolkits, and workshops are made available to all Drexel community members on voluntary basis academic year 20-21</p> <p>Trainings, toolkits, and/or workshops are required as part of compliance process academic year 21-22</p>	<p>Antiracism advisory committee and compliance officers will be accountable for ensuring mandatory requirements</p> <p>Antiracism advisory committee, with input from stake holders at all levels of the university, to identify and make available resources</p> <p>All leaders within the university will reflect in their annual reviews, business plans, budgets, and unit level goals specific plans and metric to achieve these goals within their units.</p>
<p>2. Empathy - to set a baseline, we need a university-wide assessment like the IDI</p>	<p>https://idiinventory.com/#?text=The%20intercultural%20development%20inventory%20AE_and%20inclusion%20goals%20and%20outcomes</p>	<p>2. Anti-racism advisory council with input from other stakeholders will curate resources and requirements. Senior leadership will fund and all leaders will enact requirements.</p>			<p>2 IDI pricing https://idiinventory.com/products/</p>	<p>2 Empathy assessment completed</p> <p>Results compiled and assessed</p> <p>Action plan with progress reports</p>	

		<p>3. Focus on soft skills (essential skills)/emotional intelligence – necessary to operationalize in the fabric of our university in order to build empathy. Need to create value for being empathetic, emotionally intelligent, focused on students, rather than only technical skills. Need to teach more soft skills integrating with technical skills in classrooms and professional development training. An example of this would be teaching computer science majors examples of how bias has been programmed into algorithms and providing training on how to create algorithms that</p>	<p>3. Leaders, faculty</p>		<p>3. No cost, initial reprioritization may cost some time, but not long standing time cost</p>	<p>3. Short Term: Resources are available to students, faculty, staff, and leaders. Long Term: Requirements are integrated into course work for student and compliance and annual evaluation processes for faculty, staff, and leaders.</p>		
		<p>4. More of a focus on wellness/mindfulness - can build capacity empathy through mindfulness activities. https://www.apa.org/monitor/2012/07-08/corner-Meaningful-conversations-about-race (Jenee Johnson) https://staging.mindful.org/encouraging-meaningful-conversations-about-race-and-</p>	<p>4. Leaders, faculty, HR.</p>		<p>4. Some time and possible financial cost to curate and distribute resources. External experts/consultants Jenee Johnson, Dr Shelly P. Harrell, and Dr. Angela Black</p>	<p>4. Short Term: Resources for mindfulness and building empathy capacity are available to students, faculty, staff, and leaders. Long Term: Requirements are integrated into course work for student and compliance and annual evaluation processes for faculty, staff, and leaders.</p>		