

**PROJECT HERE (Higher Education Reparations Engagement)**  
**Institutional Assessment Tool**  
**Designed for Use by Campus and Community Teams**

**Introduction:**

“A key question is how we create the political conditions that will lead the U.S. Congress to enact a program of black reparations...Joining the charge for a national campaign for reparations would give these institutions an excellent opportunity to demonstrate both a recognition of their own complicity and the importance of mobilizing their considerable resources to compensate for harms.” (William Darity and Kristen Mullens, *From Here to Equality: Reparations for Black Americans in the Twenty-First Century*, 2020, p. 269-270)

In the present moment of reckoning with racial injustice and the challenges of reshaping American democracy and democratic institutions, PROJECT HERE offers an opportunity for institutions of higher education to attend to restorative and transformative justice on campus through creating a process for exploring how the legacies of slavery and colonialism are embedded in the institutional life of the campus, even if there is no formal relationship with slavery in the institution’s history. If there is a history of profiting from slavery and colonialism, the campus can be transparent about its past and move towards acknowledgement, repair, and healing. If exploration implicates the campus in the legacies of slavery and colonialism in the present, then there is an opportunity for the campus leaders to commit to implementing a process towards acknowledgement, repair, and healing. This may mean examining how racial injustice continues at present in campus policies and practices, from teaching and learning, to research practices, to admissions and assessment, to financial aid, to campus policing, to health and wellness, to community engagement, and all aspects of campus life.

PROJECT HERE also encourages campus leaders and other on campus to attend to restorative and transformative justice in the local community by collaborating with local civic and political leaders and with community-based organizations to support efforts to explore and enact local reparations or encourage the creation of such efforts.

There is a special role for campus leaders - Chancellors, President, Provosts - to attend to restorative and transformative justice nationally by supporting a national program of reparations. Specifically, this means a public statement on behalf of the campus in support of current congressional legislation, the bill HR 40. This bill calls for a “commission to study and consider a national apology and proposal for reparations for the institution of slavery.” HR 40 references educational disparities in explaining why a commission to study the persistent harms of slavery is necessary. It describes economic and educational hardships suffered by Black Americans since 1865 as “debilitating” and notes that differences in educational funding have perpetuated this inequality. Further, it calls for the proposed commission to study how slavery directly benefited certain “societal institutions, both public and private, including higher education” and the ways in which contemporary “instructional resources” are used “to deny the inhumanity of slavery and the crime against humanity of people of African descent.”

## **Purpose of the Tool and Institutional Assessment Process:**

The PROJECT HERE Institutional Assessment Tool was designed to help institutions in their ongoing work to be more diverse, inclusive, equitable, and supportive of the full participation and success of all their members. This tool is designed for use by a team of institutional and community stakeholders to assess the current infrastructure, alignment, and practice of the institution around its commitment to anti-racism and full participation. It is intended to help spur conversation, reflection, and further action by the institution to work towards being a fully inclusive, multicultural, and anti-racist institution. As a tool for self-assessment, using the tool may help the institution to identify concrete strategies that it might take to move further along the continuum to equity.

The tool is designed as a rubric. Each indicator has five levels which describe the current practice. Level one is intended to describe an institutional context that is resistant to inclusion. Level five is intended to describe an institution actively working (across levels and units) to practice full participation. At the highest levels, the institution may even be considering forms of reparations and reconciliation for historical wrongdoing. Because the tool is intended, however, to motivate productive change, we recommend that the team completing it be fair, comprehensive, and ethical in its use.

Additionally, the team of stakeholders should be diverse across many dimensions – including age, race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, viewpoints, position, role, status, rank, years of association, and so forth. The team should include students, staff, faculty, institutional partners, senior leaders, and community residents. While we recommend that senior leaders embrace the use of the tool and support the engagement of a team, a team may also form and use this as an exercise to identify areas for their own focus and work as change agents.

Some reparations principles that may be applied when assessing each indicator in the rubric. Is the indicator addressing:

- Closing the racial wealth gap?
- Preventing further harm (so future repair is not needed)?
- The changing of racist policies?
- The elements of ARC – Acknowledgement, Repair, and Closure – ie. history and current practices, corrective action, and healing.

## **Involving a Team in the Review Process:**

***Using a facilitative approach:*** We suggest that you use facilitative approaches and techniques to guide the entire process of reviewing and completing this tool. For instance, you may want to convene the team (in person or online) and pick one indicator to walk through together. While it may be easy for some to answer immediately, engage the group in thinking about how they might gather, review, and share related evidence to pick a level. Each indicator lists some of the types of evidence and data to consider.

***Create mixed sub-teams but ensure specific participation based on experience:*** Then, perhaps you want to delegate indicators to mixed sub-teams (by role) especially so that individuals with the most direct experience are involved. For instance, you may especially want students' perceptions of items 1, 2, 3, and 4. You may especially want faculty and staff perceptions' of items 6-10. There may be particular unit leaders whose input should be consulted for specific items that relate to their work. For instance, you may need to talk with a CFO about items 14 and 15 and with Admissions and Financial Aid about items 1 and 2. Review the items, and make a list of key people whose input can be sought.

***Specify a time frame for individuals to gather relevant evidence and data and complete the review:*** Depending on the pace you want to use, you may then want to specify a time (such as two weeks) for a later meeting. At that meeting, you may want to ask sub-teams to share their individual ratings of particular indicators. You'll want to facilitate a process that helps the sub-teams and the group, to arrive at a shared rating. (You will want to define the agreement process in a way that meshes with the culture of your team and institution. Use democratic processes. This may include a vote, if ratings are different. Some may choose to forge consensus or a compromise).

### ***Review and utilize different types of evidence, data, and artifacts:***

After each indicator, there are checklists of what types of policies, practices, and supports are in place. We encourage you to consider a range of qualitative, quantitative, and other forms of evidence. For instance, review the built environment and place from an open lens, making notes of what team members see, feel, hear, and experience. What images, messages, and values are encoded? Do the same for mission statements, rhetoric, strategic plans, printed materials, website pages, news stories, curriculum, reading lists, names of buildings, office placards, photographs, signs, demographic data, social media feeds, etc. Additionally, you may want to include interviews and focus groups, especially with students, staff, and faculty.

***Use dialogue techniques to elicit different viewpoints and spur conversation:*** As a group shares its reflections, notes, and rating, you may want to use some techniques that help individuals and groups, so that every person has a voice and you encourage honest conversation. For instance, you could invite people to write down their rating on a post-it and share them concurrently. Then, invite individuals (especially those whose ratings are different) to explain their choice. You can also do this through hand gestures (where people hold up a rating at one time). Such techniques can invite dialogue, sharing, and learning.

***Be strategic and focus on realistic goals for improvement:*** After your team completes the review, you may want to provide some time for individuals to reflect on, and even process, the emotions that come up. The process may be discouraging, especially if there are few areas where policies and practices point to institutional anti-racist and inclusive work. For the short term, and to build momentum, it may be helpful for your team to identify a few areas where you can promote movement and change, working with key allies. Then, identify medium-term and longer range goals.

***Identify areas of strength as well as areas for change:*** After completing the tool, you'll have a complete set of ratings across all areas. In many ways, those ratings will speak for themselves. In written and oral communication with stakeholders across the institution and community, be savvy about how you present this information. Highlight areas where progress is being made, even if by individuals or small units, as well as areas where diligent focus is needed.

**PROJECT HERE (Higher Education Reparations Engagement)**  
**Institutional Assessment Tool**  
**Designed for Use by Campus and Community Teams**

INDICATORS OF COMMITMENT TO DIVERSITY, EQUITY, INCLUSION, ANTI-RACIST AND  
ANTI-OPPRESSIVE PRACTICES

**Note:** There are a total of seventeen indicators. Your institution may choose to add others. Each indicator has five levels, with five signifying the commitment to full participation, inclusion, and liberators practices. Indicators are roughly organized around students, personnel (faculty and staff), campus-community relationships, and broader institutional operations. We suggest that your team be comprised of individual with diverse roles, backgrounds, levels of experience, and demographics. You may find it helpful to delegate particular indicators to sub-team members for first review.

Review the descriptions of the indicators on the pages that follow. Each indicator has a five-point level scale, which describe the current level of institutional practice. Use this worksheet to record the assessment level for each indicator. Your team can also record notes about its choice. The table will expand with your notes.

	AREA AND INDICATORS	LEVEL	NOTES
1	Admissions		
2	Financial Aid		
3	Student Support		
4	General Education Requirements		
5	Curriculum		
6	Faculty and Staff Recruitment and Hiring		
7	Faculty and Staff Advancement		
8	Faculty and Staff Professional Development		
9	Personnel Salary, Benefits, and Incentives		
10	Advancement, Development, and Fundraising		
11	Partnerships with Nonprofits and Civic Entities		
12	Place-Based Partnerships		
13	Land and Natural Resource Use		
14	Supplier and Vendor Diversity		
15	Budgetary Allocations		
16	Appropriate Acknowledgment of History		
17	Institutional Benchmarking and Policy Review		

1. **Admissions:** This indicator examines the institution's commitment to attracting and admitting a diverse student body as reflected in its policies, practices, and results.

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
<b>Oppositional/ Lack of Commitment</b>		<b>Working on Progress</b>		<b>Fully Inclusive/ Liberatory</b>
The institution does not intentionally recruit diverse students and offers little or no attention to issues of race, class, ethnicity, gender, religion, sexual orientation, and other dimensions of marginalized identity. Consequently, the institution's admitted and enrolled students are predominantly white (and often assumed to possess mainstream and/or privileged identity status).	The institution provides a minimal amount of attention to issues of race, class, ethnicity, gender, religion, sexual orientation, and other dimensions of marginalized identity in admissions. Consequently, there are pockets of "diversity," but these students often perceive themselves to be in the minority, tokens, and/or marginalized.	The institution provides some attention to issues of race, class, ethnicity, gender, religion, sexual orientation, and other dimensions of marginalized identity in admissions. The institution may have some targets for the demographic composition of the student body, resulting in some proportions of students of color and from other historically underrepresented backgrounds.	The institution is actively working on issues of race, class, ethnicity, gender, religion, sexual orientation, and other dimensions of marginalized identity in admissions. The institution is increasing the demographic diversity of the student body, with representation of students of color and from other historically underrepresented backgrounds that matches the state and region.	The institution intentionally addresses issues of race, class, ethnicity, gender, religion, sexual orientation, and other dimensions of marginalized identity in admissions. It can cite strategies, such as holistic review, testing policies, and recruitment pipelines, that support this work. As a result, the institution demonstrates demographic diversity of the student body, with representation of students of color and from other historically underrepresented backgrounds that exceed the state and region.

**Teams assessing this indicator may want to look for:**

- Holistic reviews
- Flexible/Optional Test Policies (SAT/ACT)
- Programs /pipelines for students of color and underrepresented students for admissions (early college high school, etc.)
- Students who are descendants of enslaved people or other historically marginalized communities connected to the institution's history

**Notes:**

2. **Financial Aid:** This indicator examines the institution's commitment to successfully enrolling and supporting a diverse student body as reflected in its financial aid policies, practices, scholarships, awards, and funding sources.

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
<b>Oppositional/ Lack of Commitment</b>		<b>Working on Progress</b>		<b>Fully Inclusive/ Liberatory</b>
The institution does not have or offer financial aid that intentionally addresses inequities or disparities in income and/or race. Financial aid is mostly merit-based with little attention to systemic inequities.	The institution has small pockets of financial aid that addresses inequities or disparities in income and/or race. These programs, often tied to specific units or departments, may help students of color from higher achieving academic backgrounds.	The institution is working to make financial aid (grants, scholarships, work study) intentionally available to students of color. Programs are sensitive to both race/ethnicity and income, so that students from different academic and other backgrounds, may access assistance.	The institution offers some financial aid (including scholarships, work study, grants) that is sensitive to and aims to intentionally address inequities and disparities in income and/or race. These programs support increasing enrollment and completion by students of color from multiple backgrounds.	The institution offers a range of financial aid (including scholarships, work study, grants) that is sensitive to and aims to intentionally address inequities and disparities in income and/or race. These programs support higher levels of enrollment and completion by students of color from multiple backgrounds.

Teams assessing this indicator may want to look for:

- Work Study (especially tied to community engagement and student success programs)
- Dedicated scholarships for students of color
- Need blind financial aid
- Financial aid for students (especially those of color) from low-income backgrounds

**Notes:**

3. **Student Support:** This indicator examines the institution's commitment to educating and supporting the full participation and success of a diverse student body as reflected in its services, centers, structures, and activities.

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
<b>Oppositional/ Lack of Commitment</b>		<b>Working on Progress</b>		<b>Fully Inclusive/ Liberatory</b>
The institution does not have formal, visible and functioning support services for students, especially students of color, such as centers or programs where students can access culturally sensitive and relevant resources. Additionally, mainstream programs and services, such as orientation, largely assume students' who are White identified.	The institution has a few informal support services for students, especially students of color, such as centers or programs where students can access culturally sensitive and relevant resources. There is token recognition of students from different racial, ethnic, and religious backgrounds in campus-wide programs and services, such as orientation.	The institution has several formal support services for students, especially students of color, such as centers or programs where students can access culturally sensitive and relevant resources. Student-facing programs are working to include and recognize students from different racial, ethnic, and religious backgrounds in campus-wide programs and services, such as orientation.	The institution has formal support services for most students, especially students of color with significant populations at the school, such as centers or programs where students can access culturally sensitive and relevant resources. Student-facing programs include and recognize students from different racial, ethnic, and religious backgrounds in campus-wide programs and services, such as orientation.	The institution has formal support services for all students, including an anti-racist and equity lens, such as centers or programs where students can access culturally sensitive and relevant resources. Student-facing programs support the full participation and recognition of students from different racial, ethnic, and religious backgrounds in campus-wide programs and services, such as orientation.

**Teams assessing this indicator may want to look for:**

- Cultural, ethnic, religious, and social identity centers
- Support services easy to access without stigmas
- Orientations that include attention to diverse student identities
- Anti-racist and anti-oppressive language present in mainstream institutional media and language

**Notes:**

4. **General Education Requirements:** This indicator examines the institution's commitment to curriculum that supports the full participation, education, and success of a diverse student body as reflected in its graduation requirements and degree programs.

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
<b>Oppositional/ Lack of Commitment</b>		<b>Working on Progress</b>		<b>Fully Inclusive/ Liberatory</b>
No general education requirements and limited availability of coursework on issues related to race, systemic racism, and reparations.	Conversations about including these topics in general education requirements are currently underway. There are a few individuals or an exploratory committee looking to begin work on reviewing the curriculum.	The institution's general education requirement contains one or a few optional courses that tangentially covers these topics. In general, the curriculum is perceived as mostly White with a few exceptions.	The institution's general education requirement contains one required course that covers these topics with some degree of inclusion and sensitivity.	The institution has general education requirement with several courses as part of the core curriculum including courses, seminars, orientation modules, and a wide availability of resources for learning on issues related to race, systemic racism, and reparations.

**Teams assessing this indicator may want to look for:**

- General Education requirements with specific diversity components
- Thoughtful choices of readings, texts, and other curricular materials that represent full participation and inclusion, as well as perspectives
- Courses and degree programs addressing a wide variety of identities

**Notes:**



5. **Curriculum:** This indicator examines the institution's commitment to educating and supporting the full participation and success of a diverse student body as reflected in its curriculum, courses, textbooks and resources, majors and departments)

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
<b>Oppositional/ Lack of Commitment</b>		<b>Working on Progress</b>		<b>Fully Inclusive/ Liberatory</b>
No centralized institution wide or department level planning or goals related to curriculum about issues related to race, systemic racism, and reparations. Community members perceive the curriculum as exclusionary of important voices (curriculum is majority white male, euro-centric).	No centralized institution wide or department level planning or goals related to curriculum about issues related to race, systemic racism, and reparations. Some faculty or course syllabi include diverse perspectives as add-ons and in a tokenized way.	Some signaling from senior administration about importance of including issues of race, structural racism. Efforts to include issues related to race, systemic racism, and reparations are scattered with some faculty members who are taking this seriously.	Senior administration committed to including issues of race, structural racism in the curriculum. Efforts for implementation is issues related to race, systemic racism, and reparations in the curriculum are inconsistent across departments.	A specific set of institution wide goals, department level goals, and curricular design resources to support inclusion of issues related to race, systemic racism, and reparations in the curriculum. Community members perceive the curriculum as an inclusive and representative of experiences of historically marginalized voices and epistemologies.

Teams assessing this indicator may look for:

- Diversity, equity, and inclusion in first year experience courses and texts
- Diversity, equity, and inclusion in general education distribution requirements at upper levels
- Strategic plan goals related to curriculum and instruction

6. **Faculty and Staff (Personnel) Recruitment and Hiring:** This indicator examines the institution's commitment to educating and supporting the full participation and success of a diverse faculty and staff as reflected in recruitment, hiring, and retention.

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
<b>Oppositional/ Lack of Commitment</b>		<b>Working on Progress</b>		<b>Fully Inclusive/ Liberatory</b>
The institution has no or few faculty from historically marginalized and minoritized backgrounds. It also lacks a clear, intentional recruitment strategy to attract, hire, and retain faculty of color.	The institution has a few faculty from historically marginalized and minoritized backgrounds in some departments. A few administrators work to attract, hire, and retain faculty of color.	The institution has some faculty from historically marginalized and minoritized backgrounds in many (but not a majority of) departments. Some key departments have made efforts to attract, hire, and retain faculty of color, and the institution is working on a more systematic plan.	The institution has faculty from historically marginalized and minoritized backgrounds in a majority of departments, and some are in leadership roles. Most departments have made efforts to attract, hire, and retain faculty of color. The institution also has a clear intentional recruitment strategy, with some success.	Historically marginalized and minoritized backgrounds are found in most or all departments, and many are tenured and in leadership roles. The institution can demonstrate a clear intentional recruitment strategy and its implementation, with cross-departmental support and action.

Teams assessing this indicator may want to look for:

- Using IPEDS data to examine diversity and demographics of faculty, including by department and rank
- Faculty of color and from other historically marginalized backgrounds in leadership roles across a number of departments
- A visible strategy and plan for attracting, hiring, and retaining faculty of color and from historically marginalized backgrounds, in written documents and supported by data

**Notes:**

7. **Faculty and Staff (Personnel) Advancement:** This indicator examines the institution's commitment to educating and supporting the full participation and success of a diverse faculty and staff as reflected in its policies and practices related to advancement, tenure, rewards, and activities supported by its culture.

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
<b>Oppositional/ Lack of Commitment</b>		<b>Working on Progress</b>		<b>Fully Inclusive/ Liberatory</b>
Institutional policies pose significant barriers to the advancement of faculty and staff of color. Faculty are discouraged from being involved in service and activism to promote greater institutional diversity, equity, and accountability, or their participation may hurt their advancement. Faculty and staff are discouraged from pursuing research, teaching, or scholarship addressing issues related to race, systemic racism, and reparations. Institutional policies and practices, including funding, signal these barriers.	Institutional policies pose some barriers to the advancement of faculty and staff of color. Some faculty and staff promote institutional diversity and pursue research, teaching, or scholarship addressing issues of race, systemic racism, and reparations, but some are discouraged from doing so fearing it will hurt their advancement. Institutional policies and practices, including funding, are vague and not clearly supportive.	Some institutional policies pose barriers to the advancement of faculty and staff of color, but this varies by unit. Some faculty and staff promote institutional diversity and pursue research, teaching, or scholarship addressing issues of race, systemic racism, and reparations. Still, others report subtle ways in which they are discouraged from doing so. Some institutional policies and practices, including funding, support individual actions, but not across the institution.	Institutional policies support the advancement of faculty and staff of color, but this varies by unit. Some faculty and staff promote institutional diversity and pursue research, teaching, or scholarship addressing issues of race, systemic racism, and reparations and are rewarded for doing so with advancement and leadership. Many institutional policies and practices, including funding, support individual and collective work in many units across the institution.	Institutional policies support the advancement of faculty and staff of color in most units and across the institution. Many faculty and staff promote institutional diversity and pursue research, teaching, or scholarship addressing issues of race, systemic racism, and reparations and are rewarded for doing so with advancement and leadership. Institutional policies and practices, including funding, support individual and collective work in most units across the institution.

Teams assessing this indicator may want to look for:

- Faculty and student research agendas around diversity, equity, racism, reparations, etc. that are visibly supported by departments and institution
- Cross-functional teams of staff, faculty, and students working on task forces or committees to promote institutional change, including in policies and funding
- Advancement and rewards policies, such as for tenure for faculty or promotions for staff, that reward competencies in diversity, equity, intercultural competence, and other areas (see, for instance, Pomona College faculty tenure policy)

**Notes:**

8. **Faculty and Staff (Personnel) Professional Development:** This indicator examines the institution's commitment to educating and supporting the full participation and success of a diverse faculty and staff as reflected in its training, professional development, and education of its employees and members.

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
<b>Oppositional/ Lack of Commitment</b>		<b>Working on Progress</b>		<b>Fully Inclusive/ Liberatory</b>
The institution does not intentionally support diverse staff and faculty. It offers little or no attention to issues of race, class, ethnicity, gender, religion, sexual orientation, and other dimensions of marginalized identity in its training and professional development. Consequently, the institution often experiences challenges around personnel issues related to race, ethnicity, gender, and identity.	A few units work to intentionally support diverse staff and faculty. These units may be attempting to support professional development around issues of race, class, ethnicity, gender, religion, sexual orientation, and other dimensions of marginalized identity, but these efforts are not institution-wide. Many departments and units experience ongoing challenges around personnel issues related to race, ethnicity, gender, and identity.	Several units, including Human Resources, work to intentionally support diverse staff and faculty. These units work to support professional development around issues of race, class, ethnicity, gender, religion, sexual orientation, and other dimensions of marginalized identity, but employees perceive that this support is missing in many key departments and units experience. BIPOC and other historically marginalized employees report a climate and culture of ongoing challenge around race, ethnicity, gender, and identity.	Several units, including Human Resources and the President's Office, work to intentionally support diverse staff and faculty. These units work to support professional development around issues of race, class, ethnicity, gender, religion, sexual orientation, and other dimensions of marginalized identity. BIPOC and other historically marginalized employees report support in many units, but may experience challenges in others.	Several units, including Human Resources, the President's Office, and Academic Affairs work to intentionally support diverse staff and faculty. These units work to support professional development around issues of race, class, ethnicity, gender, religion, sexual orientation, and other dimensions of marginalized identity. BIPOC and other historically marginalized employees report support in most units. The institution can point to clear and effective training and professional development across the institution.

Teams assessing this indicator may want to look for:

- Campus-wide and broader orientation, training, and professional development around race, class, ethnicity, gender, religion, sexual orientation, and other dimensions of marginalized identity.
- Written and verbal support by institutional leadership, including in strategic plans, with data and assessment that examines campus climate
- Few incidences of employee or student claims, exits, resignations, etc. related to tensions around race, class, ethnicity, gender, religion, sexual orientation, and other dimensions of marginalized identity; or those that occur are resolved

**Notes:**

**9. Personnel Salary, Benefits, and Incentives:** This indicator examines the institution's commitment to educating and supporting the full participation and success of a diverse faculty and staff as reflected in its pay and salary structure, benefits, advancement opportunities, and other incentives.

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
<b>Oppositional/ Lack of Commitment</b>		<b>Working on Progress</b>		<b>Fully Inclusive/ Liberatory</b>
The salary, benefit, and incentive structure at the institution pays little or no attention to issues of race, class, ethnicity, gender, religion, sexual orientation, and other dimensions of marginalized identity. Analysis (such as of financial statements and budget) points to clear inequities in pay structure around race, ethnicity, gender, and other dimensions of identity.	The salary, benefit, and incentive structure at the institution shows inconsistent attention to issues of race, class, ethnicity, gender, religion, sexual orientation, and other dimensions of marginalized identity. While there may be a few individuals who are paid equitably, analysis (such as of financial statements and budget) points to inequities in pay structure around race, ethnicity, gender, and other dimensions of identity.	The salary, benefit, and incentive structure at the institution is working to address race, class, ethnicity, gender, religion, sexual orientation, and other dimensions of marginalized identity. There are some visible structures and initiatives, such as reports, to analyze and address inequities in pay and benefits structure around race, ethnicity, and gender.	The salary, benefit, and incentive structure at the institution is consistently addressing race, class, ethnicity, gender, religion, sexual orientation, and other dimensions of marginalized identity. There are visible structures and initiatives, such as reports, HR and labor policies, and review systems that analyze and address inequities in pay structure around race, ethnicity, and gender.	The salary, benefit, and incentive structure at the institution is inclusive and equitable around issues of race, class, ethnicity, gender, religion, sexual orientation, and other dimensions of marginalized identity. There are visible structures and initiatives, such as reports, HR and labor policies, and review systems that analyze and address inequities in pay structure. Moreover, a review of financial data does not find typical gaps.

Teams assessing this indicator may want to look for:

- Reports on salaries and benefits indicating analysis of equity
- Incentive programs that are open, accessible, and widely used (i.e., home loans, tuition help, etc.) to retain, develop, and reward diverse members
- Unique programs that provide employees with rewards, such as Rutgers University union work share program

**Notes:**

- 10. Advancement, Development, and Fundraising:** This indicator examines the institution's commitment to educating and supporting the full participation and success of its members as reflected in its funding strategies, sources, and approaches.

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
<b>Oppositional/ Lack of Commitment</b>		<b>Working on Progress</b>		<b>Fully Inclusive/ Liberatory</b>
The institution has not examined its funding sources and appears to have some that are actively contradictory to DEI values. There is a lack of commitment towards raising or using funds to address campus climate, learning opportunities, or strategic initiatives related to DEI.	The institution can point to a small number of gifts dedicated to advancing DEI work. However, there are no or few fundraising goals on the institutional level to support greater equity or an examination of DEI issues related to funding.	DEI is a tangential goal in institutional fundraising strategy. DEI is incorporated in asks to some donors and in pockets of departments historically active in doing work on race and racism.	DEI is incorporated in asks to donors across most departments. The institution engages a group of actively cultivated donors that are willing and interested in DEI issues. There is examination of historically problematic issues.	The institution has dedicated fundraising campaigns including short-, medium-, and long-term goals focused on DEI. DEI is embedded in strategic planning and development efforts. Members of the Advancement Office and key leaders are actively working to connect their fundraising, grant, and other efforts with DEI issues, possibly including reparations.

Teams assessing this indicator may want to look for:

- Diversified access to alumni of color and involvement of these alumni in fundraising and advancement efforts
- Board involvement, including by trustees of color, in linked DEI planning and strategies with advancement
- Examination of problematic historical funding sources and issues (foundations, donors, divestment, etc.)

**Notes:**

- 11. Partnerships with Nonprofits and Civic Entities:** This indicator examines the institution's commitment to educating and supporting the full participation and success of its members as reflected in its sustained partnerships, community and civic engagement, collaborative research, and social action.

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
<b>Oppositional/ Lack of Commitment</b>		<b>Working on Progress</b>		<b>Fully Inclusive/ Liberatory</b>
The institution does not have sustained, visible partnerships with nonprofit, educational, and governmental agencies working to address social inequities. There may be some efforts by groups of students, staff, and faculty, but these are often confined to volunteerism and not tracked, rewarded, or recognized through institutional policies and resources.	The institution has some visible partnerships with nonprofit, educational, and governmental agencies working to address social inequities. These partnerships and projects involve some students, staff, and faculty, but they are not strategic, sustained, or designed to provide systemic solutions. Moreover, they are not tracked, rewarded or recognized through institutional policies and resources.	The institution has visible partnerships with nonprofit, educational, and governmental agencies working to address social inequities. These partnerships and projects involve many students, staff, and faculty. Additionally, some are strategic, sustained, and designed to provide systemic solutions. There are some incentives, rewards and institutional policies and tracking that signify the value of this work.	The institution has visible partnerships with nonprofit, educational, and governmental agencies working to address social inequities. These partnerships and projects involve many students, staff, and faculty. The institution is working to develop campus-wide strategic, sustained, and systemic approaches including systematized assessment. There are clear incentives, rewards and institutional policies that signify the value of this work.	The institution has visible partnerships with nonprofit, educational, and governmental agencies working to address social inequities. These partnerships and projects involve a majority of students, staff, and faculty. The institution is working to develop campus-wide strategic, sustained, and systemic approaches. There are clear tracking and incentives, rewards and institutional policies that signify the value of this work, including external recognition (such as Carnegie or grants).

Teams assessing this indicator may want to look for:

- Sustained, multiyear partnerships with organizations and agencies
- Programs that engage students across multiple terms and semesters in meaningful, reciprocal work and community engagement
- Student incentives like Work Study, scholarships, paid internships, and aid
- Faculty incentives and supportive policies, such recognition of work around DEI/anti-racism, racial justice, and community engagement directed at social justice, for tenure
- Staff incentives such as paid time and recognition

**Notes:**

- 12. Place-Based Partnerships:** This indicator examines the institution's commitment to educating and supporting the full participation and success of its members and surrounding community as reflected in its place-based commitments with surrounding neighborhoods and municipalities, strategic partnerships, and collaborative projects in which the institution is a partner.

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
<b>Oppositional/ Lack of Commitment</b>		<b>Working on Progress</b>		<b>Fully Inclusive/ Liberatory</b>
The institution does not consistently participate in civic and/or community associations to address racial and social injustice (such as city/town reparations initiatives). The institution is not identified as a steward of place. Moreover, there are visible tensions between campus and community, evident in events, news, commentary, etc.	Some members of the institution are working within larger civic and/or community associations and collaboratives working to intentionally address racial and social injustice (such as city/town reparations initiatives). The institution and its senior leadership is not yet identified with these efforts. There are unresolved and visible tensions between campus and community, but some are working to repair community relationships.	Some members of the institution are working within larger civic and/or community associations and collaboratives working to intentionally address racial and social injustice (such as city/town reparations initiatives). However, the institution as a whole, including at its senior leadership levels, is not yet visibly aligned and partnered in these efforts. The institution may be working to repair community relationships.	The institution is working to create larger civic and/or community associations and collaboratives working to intentionally address racial and social injustice (such as city/town reparations initiatives). The institution identifies as a steward of place, responsible for contributing to the well-being and equity of its surrounding community, including the responsible use of its own assets and resources.	The institution is part of larger civic and/or community associations and collaboratives working to intentionally address racial and social injustice (such as city/town reparations initiatives). The institution identifies as a steward of place, responsible for contributing to the well-being and equity of its surrounding community, including through the responsible use of its own assets and resources. There is community evidence that the institution is seen in this way.

Teams assessing this indicator may want to look for:

- Town or city projects focusing on anti-racism, DEI, and/or reparations (such as Kellogg Foundation 2040 grants)
- Visible, funded, ongoing offices within the neighborhoods and/or municipality where community residents and partners may join in activities and projects or access resources
- Stories, publications, and annual reports of place-based work, such as those published by related centers or in a Carnegie Community Engagement Classification application

**Notes:**



13. **Land and Natural Resource Use:** This indicator examines the institution's commitment to educating and supporting the full participation and success of its surrounding community as reflected in its proper use of land, natural resources, and space.

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
<b>Oppositional/ Lack of Commitment</b>		<b>Working on Progress</b>		<b>Fully Inclusive/ Liberatory</b>
There are clear, visible issues of land and natural resource use (misuse) by the institution that have aggravated place-based relationships and communities. There is an unacknowledged history of inequitable power dynamics and policies (i.e., such as usurpation of Native lands, mining, ownership and control of energy, etc.)	There may have been issues or still be issues concerning equitable land and natural resource use by the institution. The institution has acknowledged and begun to address these issues with fair and equitable policies and practices. Still, there are questions of fair resource distribution and financial assets to address.	There institution is not engaged in any inequitable use of local land and natural resources. Furthermore, there have been clear, visible efforts to right any past mistakes. However, there may still be significant economic inequities that resulted from past inequities.	There institution is not engaged in any inequitable use of local land and natural resources. Furthermore, there have been clear, visible efforts to right any past mistakes. Additionally, the institution has made and/or is making clear investments and strategies to rectify economic, racial, and social inequities.	There institution is not engaged in any inequitable use of local land and natural resources. Clear, visible efforts have been implemented to rectify past inequities, including through the fair and equitable allocation of resources and assets. The institution maintains clear investments and strategies to rectify economic, racial, and social inequities (possibly including payments for reparations) and embraces its role in educating its members about social jus-

Teams assessing this indicator may want to look for:

- Land acknowledgments
- Reports and documents addressing past and current use of land and natural resources
- Payments and reparations
- Resource sharing MOUs and agreements

**Notes:**

14. **Supplier and Vendor Diversity:** This indicator examines the institution's commitment to educating and supporting the full participation and success of its members and surrounding community as reflected in its selection of vendors, suppliers, and operational partners.

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
<b>Oppositional/ Lack of Commitment</b>		<b>Working on Progress</b>		<b>Fully Inclusive/ Liberatory</b>
The institution does not have goals or institution-wide policy, practice, or initiatives to work with MBE (or WBE) suppliers. An analysis of the existing roster of suppliers points to predominantly White, Male owned enterprises.	The institution does not have goals or institution-wide policy, practice, or initiatives to diversity existing suppliers. However, some units have taken initiative to seek and form contracts with vendors who are MBE (WBE).	There is some signaling from senior administration about supplier diversity. Efforts to diversify suppliers are scattered with some units on campus taking the goal seriously (ex: Dining Services has a contract with MBE Farmer Cooperative).	The institution has a clear commitment from the senior administration to engaging with historically minoritized and marginalized suppliers. Efforts are still inconsistent across strategic purchasing types, but new tracking and accountability mechanisms are emerging.	The institution has a specific set of well tracked goals and a solidly enforced institution-wide policy for partnering with MBE (WBE) suppliers in strategic purchasing and contracts across all levels of the institution (construction, catering, lab supplies, office supplies, electronic and computer equipment, furniture..). These efforts are clearly connected to correcting historical exclusion of MBE suppliers.

Teams assessing this indicator may want to look for:

- Ways to count and track registered MBES as well as other fledgling community-based businesses and suppliers
- Note that the costs and barriers for small businesses to register as an MBE may make it necessary to broaden definition. It may be important to examine policies at various levels.
- Clear procedure of seeking MBEs and WBEs in bidding and consideration of contracts

**Notes:**

- 15. Budgetary Allocations:** This indicator examines the institution's commitment to educating and supporting the full participation and success of its members and surrounding community as reflected in its appropriate funding for relevant units, projects, and personnel.

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
<b>Oppositional/ Lack of Commitment</b>		<b>Working on Progress</b>		<b>Fully Inclusive/ Liberatory</b>
The institution does not appear to have adequately created the positions, units, and/or structures that are needed to support the ongoing work of DEI and anti-racism.	The institution has created a few positions, units, and/or structures to support the ongoing work of DEI and anti-racism, but these allocations are underfunded and understaffed.	The institution has created key positions, units, and/or structures to support the ongoing work of DEI and anti-racism. A few of these are adequately funded and staffed, but there is concern that resources are insufficient.	The institution has created and sustained key positions, units, and/or structures to support the ongoing work of DEI and anti-racism. These allocations are appropriately funded and staffed, without taxing a few individuals.	The institution has created and sustained key positions, units, and/or structures to support the ongoing work of DEI and anti-racism. These allocations are fully funded and staffed. Moreover, they are clearly valued, connected with ongoing strategic plans, review, and improvement.

Teams assessing this indicator may want to look for:

- Sufficient positions focused on DEI
- Units clearly focused on DEI
- Integration of DEI across campus units
- Budgetary allocations
- Adequate compensation of key personnel (including personnel who may play other roles)

**Notes:**

- 16. Appropriate Acknowledgment of History:** This indicator examines the institution's commitment to educating and supporting the full participation and success of its members and surrounding community as reflected in its truthful inquiry and acknowledgment of historical roles, connections with slavery or oppression, and/or need for truth and reconciliation.

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
<b>Oppositional/ Lack of Commitment</b>		<b>Working on Progress</b>		<b>Fully Inclusive/ Liberatory</b>
The institution has not examined its historical legacy, including its connection with slavery, racism, or other forms of oppression. Moreover, the institution is failing to respond appropriately to calls by its members, such as students, staff, and/or faculty, to examine this history and rectify past wrongdoing.	A few individuals and/or units within the institution have begun to examine the historical legacy, including its connection with slavery, racism, or other forms of oppression of the institution or its members. The actions of these individuals and/or units, however, are being met with resistance.	Several individuals and/or units within the institution have begun to examine the historical legacy, including its connection with slavery, racism, or other forms of oppression of the institution or its members. The actions of these individuals and/or units are being met with some level of support.	A cross-functional team has been (or was) established within the institution to examine the historical legacy, including its connection with slavery, racism, or other forms of oppression of the institution or its members. The actions of these individuals, units, and team are being met with support, including by senior leaders.	A cross-functional team has been (or was) established within the institution to examine the historical legacy, including its connection with slavery, racism, or other forms of oppression of the institution or its members. The institution has actively sought to learn from and respond to this inquiry, including in ways that demonstrate its willingness to rectify past

**Teams assessing this indicator may want to look for:**

- Protests and how they are responded to by senior leaders including Presidents, Provosts, and Boards
- Task forces or working groups to examine the historical legacy of the institution
- Related articles and publications
- Follow-up reports, policies, and practices
- Naming (and renaming) of programs and buildings

**Notes:**

17. **Institutional Benchmarking and Policy Review:** This indicator examines the institution's commitment to educating and supporting the full participation and success of its members and surrounding community as reflected in its use of related structures, assessment tools, and external reviews.

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
<b>Oppositional/ Lack of Commitment</b>		<b>Working on Progress</b>		<b>Fully Inclusive/ Liberatory</b>
The institution has not examined its current climate, policies, and practices, including from the point of view of external auditors. Moreover, there have been clear, visible incidences that suggest a climate of tension, intolerance, racism, bigotry, and/or other conditions of ongoing oppression to members of the institution's community and/or its surrounding community.	A few actors within the institution are or have examined its current climate, policies, and practices, including from the point of view of external auditors. When there have been clear, visible incidences that suggest a climate of tension, racism, and/or oppression to members of the institution's community and/or its surrounding community, there are some units that respond.	Several units/departments within the institution are or have examined its current climate, policies, and practices, including from the point of view of external auditors. When there have been clear, visible incidences that suggest a climate of tension, racism, and/or oppression to members of the institution's community and/or its surrounding community, members attempt to respond with campus-wide actions.	Institutional leadership, including a multitude of units/departments, are or have examined its current climate, policies, and practices, including from the point of view of external auditors. There are campus-wide actions to address incidences of tension, racism, and/or oppression, and these are supported through the alignment of time, resources, and policies.	Institutional leadership, including a multitude of units/departments, are or have examined its current climate, policies, and practices, including from the point of view of external auditors. There are campus-wide actions to prevent incidences of tension, racism, and/or oppression. The institution can point to policies, practices, education, and other ongoing activities to create and sustain a climate of full participation and equity.

**Teams assessing this indicator may want to look for:**

- Campus Climate studies and reviews
- Use of outside auditors, tools, and reviewers, such as the Equity Scorecard or this Project HERE Tool
- Benchmarking and other studies to assess institutional policies, practices, and activities
- How institutional members, including senior leaders and trustees, respond to press and incidences that appear in news

**Notes:**

## **Credits and to Learn More:**

This tool was developed by the national task force for PROJECT HERE. The task force is a group of scholars and activists from local communities and campuses creating a resource hub that assembles curricular and co-curricular resources, programs, and syllabi to dig deep into our country's history of racism and discrimination and acknowledge the role and responsibility of higher education institutions to enact racial justice and healing. Task Force Members, convened by George Luc, John Saltmarsh, and Tammy Tai, include: Gregory Ball, Jabari Bodrick, Adam Bush, Joseph Cooper, Jessica Cruz, Timothy Eatman, Kristina Hall-Michel, Rebecca Herst, Ariane Hoy, April Inness, Oscar Lanza Galindo, John Loggins, Georgina Manok, Ana Martinez, Na'tisha Mills, Marisol Morales, Sage Morgan-Hubbard, Chris Navye, Steven Neville, Imari Paris Jeffries, Kevin Peterson, Marie-Frances Rivera, Sylvia Spears, Danielle Wheeler, and Rachel Winters. The policies and practices sub-group of the task force especially worked on this tool and involved Adam Bush, Timothy K. Eatman, Ariane Hoy, Georgina Manok, and John Saltmarsh. You can learn more about PROJECT HERE and find literature, news, articles, resources, and models at the website at: <https://projecthere.givepulse.com/>

## **For additional tools and supports, especially consult:**

*Achieving Equitable Educational Outcomes with All Students – The Institution's Roles and Responsibilities:* This handbook, available from the *Association of American Colleges and Universities Making Excellence Inclusive* initiative, discusses the achievement gap, diversity, equity, and related issues. This article discusses the *Diversity Scorecard*, a mechanism to help campuses put existing institutional data to good use by using them to identify inequities in educational outcomes by race and ethnicity. The Scorecard can help campus leaders to establish indicators to assess their institution's effectiveness in improving access, retention, institutional receptivity, and excellence for these historically underrepresented students.

*Anti-Racist Continuum:* This continuum presents a six level rubric for assessing an organizational or institutional climate, with being a fully inclusive anti-racist multicultural organization in a transformed society as the highest level. It was developed by Crossroads Ministry in Chicago, Illinois, an organization that works actively on these issues. It adapts from original concept by Bailey Jackson and Rita Hardiman, and further developed by Andrea Avazian and Ronice Branding.

*Center for Urban Education (CUE) at University of Southern California and the Equity Scorecard:* Some campuses may wish to engage an outside review team. Consider CUE, which uses the Equity Scorecard™ as a process and a data tool. As a process, the Equity Scorecard combines a theoretical framework with practical strategies to initiate institutional change that will lead to equitable outcomes for students of color. The process engages individuals from different departments and divisions in an evidence team which investigates campus data, practices and policies, resulting in a report and action plans. See *The Equity Scorecard: A Collaborative Approach to Assess and Respond to Racial/Ethnic Disparities in Student Outcomes* by Frank Harris III and Estela Mara Bensimon.

*Full Participation: Building the Architecture for Diversity and Public Engagement in Higher Education* by Susan Sturm, Tim Eatman, John Saltmarsh, & Adam Bush: This catalyst paper offers a conceptual framework for connecting a set of conversations about change in higher education to include access, diversity, equity, inclusion, community engagement, and institutional policies and practices, especially regarding hiring, retention, and support of diverse faculty and staff. See questions and case studies in article designed for all employees of the college.

*New England Resource Center for Higher Education (NERCHE) Self-Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Diversity, Inclusion and Equity in Higher Education:* NERCHE's Self-Assessment Rubric was designed to assist members of the higher education community in gauging the progress of their diversity, inclusion, and equity efforts on their campus. The rubric was developed by a project work team that emerged from NERCHE's former Multicultural Affairs Think Tank. The format was adapted from Furco's *Self-Assessment Rubric for the Institutionalization of Service Learning in Higher Education*, which was in turn based on the *Continuums of Service Benchmark Worksheet*. The tool addresses dimensions of campus activities, including leadership, mission, faculty support, curriculum, staff support, and student support.