Designing in Color
Final Report

College of Built Environments
Diversity Council
June 3, 2024

Outline

Acknowledgments

The CBE Diversity Council would like to thank the *Designing in Color* team for their partnership and guidance in the planning and facilitation of these workshops and for the overall work that they do to bring equity and justice to the teaching and practice of the built environment professions.

We want to express our appreciation for the many students, staff, and faculty who participated in these workshops. We are grateful for your participation to make the colleges a better, more inclusive environment. We have work to do, but together, through dialogue and action we can change our culture.

We would also like to thank Dean Renee Cheng for her support of this initiative and the willingness to open up spaces for sometimes difficult conversations, and to Laura Barrera and Lynne Manzo who, as co-chairs of the Diversity Council at the time, spearheaded the development of these workshops. Members of the 2022-23 Diversity Council provided valuable input in the workshop planning phase, while the Diversity Council members in this current 2023-24 academic year helped to prepare the report. Special thanks to Carrie Sturts Dossick and Lynne Manzo for synthesizing and editing this final report and for Megan Brown and Ken-Yu Lin for their leadership as the current Diversity Council co-chairs.

2022-23 Diversity Council Members	**2023-24 Diversity Council Members**
Dana Austin Bass	Shannon Affholter
Laura Barrera, Co-Chair	Jori Bercier
Melissa Best	Melissa Best
Kakai Bojang	Kakai Bojang
Branden Born	Megan Brown, Co-Chair
Jen Davison	Manish Chalana
Rachel Faber Machacha	Catherine Dang
Kat Golladay	Rachel Faber Machacha
Megan Herzog	Linnea Gerecke
Allen Jennings	Ulises Herrera
Mingrui (Ray) Jia	Moegi Koyama
Donald King	Roushan Kwatra
Ciara Laney	Ken-Yu Lin, Co-Chair
Claudine Manio	Claudine Manio
Lynne Manzo, Co-Chair	Lynne Manzo
Ivy Singh	Carrie Sturts Dossick
Carrie Sturts Dossick	Steve Withycombe
Shanna Sukol	
Kana Takagi	
Vince Wang	

Executive Summary

The purpose of this report is to summarize the findings of a series of three workshops conducted in the College of Built Environments from October 2023 to January 2024. These workshops were developed and facilitated by a group called *Designing in Color* to open a dialogue with faculty, staff, and students about diversity and belonging in the college. This has been an initiative of the CBE Diversity Council and its ongoing efforts to build more equitable and inclusive college experiences for CBE members.

The first workshop was offered in October 2023 and involved two separate discussions on zoom - one for students only and one for faculty. This workshop revealed that students and faculty had shared concerns about overwork, lack of support, and communication. The student discussion focused on the student experiences of racism, misgendering, and toxic cultures. Faculty discussion focused on ways they want to support and connect with students.

The second workshop was conducted in November 2023 and included faculty and staff. The discussions underscored the importance of proactive measures, such as enhanced communication and coordination among faculty and staff, and the recognition that navigating challenging conversations requires ongoing support and professional development. These insights provide valuable starting points for implementation and ongoing improvement in faculty-staff-student interactions.

The third workshop took place in January 2024 in person in Gould Court. In this culminating workshop, participants reflected on the need for more financial support and opportunities for BIPOC and marginalized students, staff, and faculty; the need for more transparency and accountability in EDI efforts and budgets; the need for more trust and communication between students, staff, and faculty; the need for more diverse and inclusive representation in leadership, curriculum, and events; and the need for more collaboration and engagement with local BIPOC-led organizations and communities.

Together, these workshops provide insight into the student, staff, and faculty experiences. They helped us understand the priorities of workshop participants and identify actions CBE can take to improve our climate and culture.

This report summarizes the results of these workshops and concludes with a reflection on the themes identified by workshop participants, the strategies recommended by *Designing in Color* and how these connect with ongoing work in the college and the departments. It also identifies where new initiatives and endeavors are needed. Suggested action Items include establishing a publicly stated CBE budget for EDI work, hosting an annual EDI training for CBE faculty, staff, and students, providing more financial support for student workers and more scholarships, establishing a student-led, compensated curriculum review committee, identifying rosters of reviewers, lecturers, and organizations to prioritize diverse and marginalized voices, cultivating further connections with local BIPOC-led organizations, establishing metrics and conducting reviews of EDI efforts in the college, and gathering info from EDI efforts in other colleges to benchmark CBE's progress.

Introduction

This report summarizes the results of a series of workshops that the College of Built Environments offered during the 2023-24 academic year. The group *Designing in Color*[1] (DCo) facilitated these workshops. This Introduction provides the context for this workshop series. This is followed by a summary of the findings from each of the three workshops offered in the series. The report concludes with a reflection on the overarching lessons learned through the workshop series.

Background for this Report

The CBE Strategic Framework released in 2021 articulated the College of Built Environments' mission, vision, and the pillars that guide our work. The framework specifically identifies the pillars of collaboration and impact, bold thought leadership, and equitable and just practices. With the third pillar, the college recognizes that the physical environment powerfully affects individual and community well-being and that we must shift historical patterns of oppression that have resulted in underrepresentation of people in both the built environment professions and in society at large based on their identity. With this Framework, the college articulated its commitment to strive to engage in more equitable practices within the college and in our partnerships with others.

At the same time that the Strategic Framework was being written, the college revitalized the previously existing diversity committee into a new CBE Diversity Council with representation of students, faculty, and staff from all five departments as well as the non-departmentalized offices in the college (e.g. Advancement, the Digital Commons, etc). This revamped CBE Diversity Council sought to extend and expound upon the pillar of equitable and just practices with the creation of an EDI Strategic Plan for the college. This EDI Strategic Plan, released in 2023, was the first college-wide effort to articulate aspirations and commitment to greater equity, diversity, and inclusion (EDI) within CBE, and to provide a roadmap to enact those values. The Plan identified the following key goals:

1. Cultivate an inclusive CBE culture
2. Model and embody equity and inclusion
3. Establish inclusive pedagogy
4. Use equity as a research lens

As the EDI Strategic Plan was being developed, the college formed new student affinity groups and these groups began organizing activities in an effort to learn how to build a sense of belonging for students with a range of identities. Further, in January 2023, NOMAS (the National Organization of Minority Architecture Student Chapter) launched a project to gather input from students on whether they felt included in the college. To do this, they posted a bulletin board poster with the prompt, "*Do you feel represented in the college?*" in Gould Court and invited people to leave comments on post-its. The range

---

[1] *Designing in Color* (DCo) is a collective of architects and designers of culture who work to diversify the way architecture and the built environments professions are taught and practiced, and to amplify the voices of marginalized communities who face systematic oppression.

and content of the responses to that prompt indicated that some students felt alienated and not well-represented in the college. Some postings expressed hurt and anger as painful experiences were revealed. Based on additional feedback during and after the NOMAS board project, it became evident that some responses on the board catalyzed additional hurt across faculty and staff, revealing that we had a lot to reflect on and learn from one another, and still more work to do to create safer spaces for each other. While there might be different views on the comments posted, one thing became quite clear - there was a need for direct and honest dialogue about people's experiences around equity, diversity and inclusion in the college and the need to have better tools and structured opportunities to have a more constructive dialogue. To do this, CBE Diversity Council reached out to *Designing in Color* to map out a plan for a series of workshops to support this dialog.

Purpose of Workshops & Report

To work towards goals of the college's [EDI Strategic Plan](#) and to better understand and address the experiences of students and faculty that were revealed through the NOMAS project, the Diversity Council sought additional opportunities to open a dialogue around difference and equity. One key way to do this was to offer a set of workshops with an external facilitator to provide space for CBE community members to come together and learn from each other about their experiences in the college related to equity, diversity and inclusion. The workshops were also a way to identify key issues that needed to be addressed to support equity, diversity and inclusion in the college. The college enlisted the support of DCo to organize and facilitate the workshops.

This report summarizes the findings of a series of three workshops conducted in the College of Built Environments from October 2023 to January 2024. The workshops were developed in an intentional sequence. The first workshop was designed to offer role-specific safe spaces separately for faculty and for students to engage in candid dialog, so two distinct online discussions were hosted by DCo via zoom. The second workshop was designed to build off the themes and issues identified in the first workshop but provide enough openness and flexibility to allow new issues to emerge. The third workshop was intended to identify actionable steps for positive change centered around the themes that were identified in the previous two workshops. This third workshop was open to all members of the CBE community - students, staff, and faculty. To maximize participation, each workshop was open to newcomers; it was not required that people attend all three workshops.

Workshop 1 Findings

In this first workshop, on October 10, 2023 we convened two groups over zoom. Students and faculty met separately and were asked to reflect on the educational experiences in our college, expectations for leadership, equity, diversity, and inclusion, and discussed the NOMAS board posts. Themes from these discussions included frustration, overwork, lack of support, lack of communication, and lack of clarity about the grievance and concern procedure.

Short summary

Students: Many of the problems raised by students were related to microaggressions, overwork, and a lack of clarity about who to go to for genuine support. For example, students reported experiencing microaggressions, including misgendering, toxicity, and racism from faculty members, and note that coursework is often overwhelmingly Eurocentric. Regarding overwork, students are required to do a "toxic and overwhelming" amount of work, and they are feeling exhausted at the additional expectation of having to advocate for themselves by being asked to make changes happen without faculty support. Students feel they are working for changes that will not happen, and they experience frustration and helplessness.

Faculty: Issues raised by the faculty, on the other hand, were lack of support, demands of the profession, and frustration with the NOMAS board. When faculty members needed support, it is unclear who to go for it. A lot of them also expressed that it is difficult to balance being an educator and a researcher, and faculty are expected to do many things from publishing, research, fundraising, committees, and one-on-one education. In addition, faculty members were sometimes named and put on the front page of criticism as seen on the NOMAS board, and it made painful experiences for many participants. To sum it up, the overall opinion of the participants was that there is a heavy workload for both students and faculty, and a lack of a system where they can consult and expect support.

Student Workshop

Students reported feeling unheard and unseen. Student experiences were marked with incidents of microaggressions, overwork, lack of clarity for support. Specific examples cited in the report on these issues include microaggressions such as repeated incidents of misgendering, toxicity, and perceived racism towards students from faculty.

Students feel overworked and describe a culture that is "hazing," "toxic," and "overwhelming." They also reported feeling a lack of genuine support from faculty on student issues even though faculty acknowledge and empathize with issues brought to their attention**.** While faculty expressed surprise by comments on the NOMAS board,students, in turn, were "surprised that faculty were surprised" by the comments.

Students feel exhausted about having to advocate for themselves while also juggling long hours in the studio. Students feel their efforts at helping to change this culture have resulted in painstaking efforts that ultimately amount to nothing. Students feel skeptical about effecting change; they feel frustrated and helpless.

Faculty Workshop

Faculty expressed frustration, lack of support, and a desire to do more for students. The general sentiment of faculty is that the NOMAS board was not the best way to air concerns. However, one faculty member hinted that students may have felt other systems of communication were not perceived as effective.

A common refrain from faculty was a call for better support but there remained an unclear understanding of who to go for support. A desire for peer support groups and mental health counseling was mentioned, and mentorship for faculty was noted several times as a critical need.

Faculty mentioned difficulties balancing being an educator, and personal responsibilities also. The demands on faculty range from publishing, tenure, proposals, research and fundraising, service, and committees, in addition to teaching.

The NOMAS board triggered strong responses from faculty, with many describing it as painful, devastating, and disheartening. Some described how hurtful the experience was coupled with the lack of support for named faculty. An attendee of the workshop expressed surprise at how long it had taken to address the board saying "it is highly problematic that we are only addressing this 10 months after the fact."

Priorities

Taking the results of the workshop, DCo identified priorities from the discussion for the college to focus our work going forward. Some of these frame DCo's Workshops 2 and 3, while others suggest longer-term possible actions we can take:

- Expectations from Faculty: Students expect clear, measured, and reasonable course load and academic expectations from faculty and staff.
- Curriculum Reviews: Curriculum reviews should be conducted for all programs to address issues such as excessive coursework and Eurocentrism.
- Priorities and Tangible Actions: Students need CBE to establish priorities and take tangible actions to promote EDI. They expect a clear plan forward, with a show of commitment from campus leadership.
- Support Systems: Faculty are in need of more spaces to confide their struggles, as well as mentorship opportunities to cope with their demanding work.
- Expectations and Best Practices: Faculty generally reacted negatively to the public nature of the NOMAS board. They want to establish a better means of issue resolution with students, along with a sense of support from CBE leadership.
- Balance and Communication: The workload of the faculty makes it difficult to more actively respond to the needs of students. It would be helpful for faculty to learn ways to stay more in tune with students' needs and build skills around effective communication with students around expectations and needs, particularly related to equity, diversity, and inclusion.

Workshop 2 Findings

The second workshop was held on November 2, 2023 via zoom and involved a discussion among CBE faculty and staff. This workshop involved a training component as participants were asked to watch a 45-minute long video prepared by the DCo team in advance of the workshop. This video described the concept of racialized architecture and its effects on the built environment, education, and culture. It touched on the power of the built environment to impose systems and psychologies of control and oppression on marginalized communities.

Participants of Workshop 2 were advisors, part-time faculty, full-time faculty, and staff, for about 12 total members of varying demographics. The workshop began with the DCo facilitators offering participants space to discuss the video and their reactions with one another. This initial discussion was framed around two questions:

1. What are some other examples of racist policy that you have witnessed or learned about in your career?
2. What information about racialized architecture has been the most informative or revealing during this process for you thus far?

Workshop participants had the opportunity to post their written responses to these questions on a shared Miro board (shared digital workspace). Facilitators allowed time for people to review each other's responses and discuss them in greater detail.

Part I: Discussion of Racialized Architecture Video & Prompts

In response to the first question, "*What are some other examples of racist policy that you have witnessed or learned about in your career?,*" participants presented several examples of racist policy, quickly filling the Miro board with comments. While not specifically a policy, one practice was identified as problematic. This was the "backchannel requests" made by students with connections. Some remarked that students are able to gain a great deal of advantages, ranging from waived requirements to prioritized internship opportunities in a method another participant called "networkpostism."

In contrast, faculty and staff recognized that there were vital resources such as networks that are not available for international and undocumented students, whose access to scholarships are often imperiled in an already very competitive system.

Other remarks called attention to the pressures of students of color to give back to others, serving as models by virtue of the scarcity of others who share their background at the university. This perceived expectation of giving back is connected to feeling like one has to amplify others of their ethnicity. This was noted by another participant as being prevalent in EDI committees. There is a tendency for EDI initiatives to be conducted by BIPOC colleagues. This highlights how the oppression stemming from white supremacy is often treated as the burden of people of color to challenge. Instead, this must be the

work of all people, including those with white privilege who must participate in dismantling that privilege, even if they may lack the motivation to do so.

In response to the second question, "*What information about racialized architecture has been the most informative or revealing during this process for you thus far*?" workshop participants shared their learning lessons from the video that helped them to understand and navigate in their efforts to support equity, diversity and inclusion. One participant was surprised by the harmful effects that conventional architectural precedents can have on students. Another had never realized the visual cues that signal oppression in the built environment to BIPOC people.

Part 2: Breakout Group Discussions

The latter portion of Workshop 2 involved discussions among participants who self-selected into one of three possible discussion groups:

1. Balance and Communication
2. Expectations and Responsibility Pressure
3. Support Systems

This section of the report summarizes the content of those discussions and identifies priorities and recommendations offered by DCo as a result. Overall, the DCo team noted that the tone of the discussion was frank and vulnerable.

Balance and Communication: Breakout Group 1 focused on the theme of balance and communication. This discussion mainly focused on commonalities in the feedback gathered during Workshop 1 between the student group and the faculty group because it was discovered that there were remarkable parallels in the content that the student and the faculty group discussed. Concerns shared by faculty and staff in Breakout Group 1 included the need for humility, and challenges of overwork, burn-out, fatigue and a perceived lack of support. The participants in this group expressed a desire to share these findings with the broader CBE community to foster a collective awareness that could serve as a foundation for more collaborative efforts, a sense of shared purpose, and greater understanding and compassion moving forward.

Expectations: Breakout Group 2 focused on expectations and identifying all types of responsibilities and how to manage them. Participants made a distinction between explicit responsibilities (spoken/written formally), implied responsibilities (encouraged as part of cultural norms), and informal responsibilities (sense of duty and personality). Discussion included the emotional labor of student-facing roles like advisors. The issue of boundary maintenance was also discussed. It was noted that placing boundaries around one's efforts was challenging for both student-facing staff and faculty. Students' needs created challenges in "effort creep" if people wanted to do a good job. Participants also discussed challenges around systemic expectations and a sense of helplessness to change to the system. There appear to be real gaps in expectations and misconceptions among students, faculty, and staff especially in a context of uneven power.

Support Systems: Breakout Group 3 addressed the need for more support systems at the University. Facilitators asked participants how they could prevent support systems from becoming racialized spaces as well as what makes spaces such as those feel safe for sharing and confiding. Some advocated for more diverse faculty and advisors. Others expressed concern that the current practice of leadership asking faculty and staff what they can do to help and even what they need to reach their goals was problematic in that it prioritized the goals and needs of the university over what faculty themselves need for their well-being. Participants identified silos and hierarchy (real and perceived) as impediments to building support systems.

Priorities

Based on the discussions in Workshop 2, *Designing in Color* identified the following as priorities for CBE:

Creating Moments of Vulnerability: Participants noted that both students and faculty expressed a desire for increased opportunities to express vulnerability and foster greater connection between faculty and students. Some faculty who expressed a desire to connect to students described difficulty in establishing one-on-one connections with students outside of studio courses. Long commutes, long work hours, and family responsibilities also make it challenging to connect with students. But as one noted, the continued effort is to "Be kind and reach out to others to offer at least a moment of understanding."

One participant shared an insightful experience, recounting that meaningful feedback and conversation with students only emerged after a core group had consistently attended multiple office hour sessions. This repeat engagement cultivated a deeper sense of trust and openness in communication. This anecdote prompted a suggestion to create more avenues for dialogues encompassing lived experiences and the expectations faced by both students and faculty/staff. The underlying idea is that fostering empathy becomes more achievable when we create time to immerse ourselves in the perspectives and challenges of others.

Strengthening Communication Amongst Faculty: Participants talked about the value of sharing information on coursework (syllabi, deadlines) with each other to prevent or alleviate some of the overwork experienced by students. Avoid overlapping deadlines and deliverables.

Comfortability and Training around Sensitive Subjects: Faculty expressed a desire to be better for students when it comes to sensitive topics, but they noted a lack of experience and training in having those discussions. Workshop participants noted it was important yet challenging to call out microaggressions.

'The System does not reward you to do so': There is a perceived lack of systemic support for having challenging conversations and doing EDI related work, especially the emotional labor that it involves. It is important to critique, interrogate and improve the existing academic system to foster a more equitable environment for all. It is equally important that the system support its own renovation.

<u>Support Systems are Racialized Spaces:</u> Examples of this include reliance on white expertise; correct name pronunciation in class and at graduation; information sharing that rewards back channel communication rather than transparency; need for a trusted neutral advocate for a grievance process.
- "This is so hard to quantify (and feels like it may be weaponized against me if it is quantified) because some of the support I have to provide consists of emotional labor, crisis management, so this follow me home even during 'off hours'"

<u>Varied Expectations of Employment:</u> Faculty vs. staff roles have different roles, responsibilities expectations, and proximity to power. Staff work "behind the scenes" without recognition of the time it takes to respond to requests from faculty and students. Student expectations may not align with job descriptions or organizational leadership expectations, leading to emotional labor overload and burnout.
- "I felt like that staff members are more integrated and accessible both vertically and horizontally. So that helps with bridge-building."
- High percentage of affiliate or part-time faculty adds to a sense of change and inconsistency

<u>Align Demands and Tasks:</u> A wide range of day- to-day tasks and responsibilities can create a fearful atmosphere nervous of misstep or misplaced focus. For example, one participant talked about the emotional labor" they do that is not part of any formal job description but is what they felt was an essential part of their role, suggesting a misalignment between activity-based tasks and the actual demands of their role:
- "Some of the support I have to provide consists of emotional labor, crisis management, so these follow me home even during off hours."

<u>The Practice of Asking:</u> The school must practice asking, "What are the needs of the educators and staff?" rather than, "What does the school need of its educators and staff?" This is a way for the Practice of Asking to become an avenue for change.
- Humility in our interactions
- Transformational advising for faculty and staff so that people are set up to grow and flourish

<u>Lack of Transparency:</u> Information is not being distributed equally and freely, and it creates a perceived "caste system." Vulnerability and openness should be a guiding sentiment to build trust. Faculty expressed desire for greater clarity in how the administration functions, but expressed limited capacity to seek out that information. Without that clarity administration may be perceived as having more power and authority over faulty than may be true.
- People need to feel heard and that action is being taken in response to issues raised.
- Some undertakings, like the work of the Diversity Council seem an even bigger undertaking without clarity and a timeline

Recommendations

- The faculty is in need of diversity training to better equip them to have challenging conversations with students. There is also a desire to have such training to feel better equipped to engage in discussions of equity,diversity, and inclusion in a productive way.
- It would be helpful to put in place systems ensuring employee's future growth, clear responsibility boundaries, and the creation of new bridge-making roles paired with revisions to existing roles to build dedicated, trusted, student-centered capacities to support diversity.
- There is a need for more efforts to break down silos and dismantle a "system of superiority". This can be accomplished with continued attention to greater transparency among other strategies.

Workshop 3 Findings

Workshop 3 was in person in Gould Court on January 11, 2024 and brought together faculty, staff, and students for an in-person discussion about the themes that emerged from Workshops 1 and 2. A key point was to build off of the findings from the previous two workshops and focus on possibilities for change.

From Workshop 1, students identified priorities relating to clear expectations from faculty and staff, curriculum and course load readjustment, and a need for tangible actions and support in the EDI space. Faculty identified priorities related to the need for support systems, realigned professional expectations and best practices, and workload balance and better communication.

In Workshop 2 faculty and staff identified the perception of silos, where faculty and staff felt privy to different streams of information that made trust difficult to achieve. They also expressed a perceived lack of support from the system to have challenging conversations, with the impression that "the system does not reward you to do so".

This third workshop was organized around 4 breakout groups:

Group 1: How do we cultivate an accessible, inclusive, and equitable climate at the CBE?
Group 2: How do we attract, retain, and graduate a diverse and excellent student body?
Group 3: How do we attract and retain diverse faculty & staff?
Group 4: How do we improve accountability at all levels?

Participants were self-selected into groups and the discussion was recorded on post-it notes. Themes from across the four groups emerged related to budget, funding, trust, transparency, accountability, outlets for feedback, representation (BIPOC), resources, and event promotion.

There were concerns about accessibility and workload. It was noted that:
- Students need more accessible spaces to voice concerns about their experiences.

- There is a need for a clearer understanding between students and faculty about external commitments (jobs, mental health) and adjusting workload accordingly. Students expressed significant duress and stress around workload.
- Faculty should trust students.

There were calls for greater attention to equity, diversity, and inclusion. Recommendations included:
- Holding equity sessions outside of class time.
- Increasing opportunities for graduate student employment with better pay.
- Creating opportunities for people of color in higher-level positions.
- Exploring different leadership levels for EDI efforts.

Participants identified a need for transparency and accountability. Recommendations included:
- Publicizing events and opportunities related to EDI.
- Publishing annual reports on EDI progress and budgets.
- Implementing clear guidelines and timelines for reporting progress.
- Sharing student comments with department chairs and curriculum committees.

Participants also requested improved communication and engagement by:
- Increasing communication between students, faculty, and staff.
- Conducting focus groups with students to measure progress and areas for change.
- Utilizing anonymous surveys to gather feedback.
- Holding regular meetings for clear expectations, reviews, and follow-up.

Some of the specific proposals also included:
- Outreach to firms for funding and scholarships.
- Explore accountable funding advancement for specific opportunities.
- Change faculty code to incentivize engagement with student feedback.
- Consider collective agreements through student council or governance.

Summary

Main Findings

Faculty, staff, and students all acknowledged that we have more work to do as a college to support people here in their work and address racism, misgendering, and toxicity in the College of Built Environments.

Students expressed frustration about the lack of progress being made in the college around these issues. Students also report feeling overworked and under-supported without a clear, constructive, and effective outlet to express their concerns. Faculty also expressed concerns about overwork and not having the needed support systems in place. There seems to be an uneven awareness and engagement of equity, diversity, and inclusion issues among faculty and staff. For example, one participant was surprised by the

harmful effects that conventional architectural precedents can have on students. Another had never realized the visual cues that signal oppression in the built environment to BIPOC people. This underscores the need for greater support for consciousness raising and skill-building for members of the CBE community.

The workshops generated many ideas about the ways that we can change our systems and our culture in the college. Much of this work hinges on rebuilding trust across the college, identifying clear channels of communication that help us make connections across our hectic lives, and connecting with funding opportunities to build EDI programs to support substantial change across the college and extend into the professions.

Next Steps

After the workshop series was completed, the DCo team compared the findings and recommendations from the workshops with the CBE's draft implementation steps for each goal, as outlined in the EDI Strategic Plan. The document acknowledges the hard work already done in the College to fulfill the goals of the EDI Strategic Plan and highlights some areas of alignment and divergence between the plan and the workshop outcomes. The document also suggests some possible revisions or additions to the plan based on the workshop feedback.

What We're Already Working On
- Students need pathways to report concerns – the CBE Student Council is working on developing a grievance portal, estimated opening date is winter 2025
- Better publicize EDI efforts and events in and outside our college – the DC is drafting quarterly newsletters with updates and events, starting spring 2024
- Host more events around EDI with the goal of one per quarter - e.g. public lectures, workshops, etc - e.g. Dr Yvette Pearson lecture "Leading Change" on 4/24/24 and the Chelina Odbert lecture on "Journey Toward Justice in the Public Realm" 5/8/24
- Establish affinity groups – As of this report CBE has five functioning affinity groups: Somos CBE, Saha CBE, Fil-Am Sa CBE, International Student AG, BIPOC Student AG
- Build mental health resources for students – We hired a mental health counselor (0.5FTE) for CBE students in Winter 2024
- Create a pathway for BIPOC high school students to CBE – the Youths in the Built Environment Program has been under way for 2 years now. It includes visits to diverse middle and high schools in the greater Seattle area weekly
- Create an easily accessible public archive of EDI resources – Multiple pages have been built and posted on the CBE website: https://be.uw.edu/about/equity-diversity-and-inclusion/
- Subsidize required software for students – Software is available on CBE computers in the Digital Commons and more investigations on software needs are ongoing
- Enact a college-wide curriculum audit of DIV courses in each department – the DC has a committee dedicated to curriculum, this is one of their goals

- Define a publicly stated CBE budget for EDI work in the College
- Host an annual EDI training for CBE faculty, staff, and students
- Provide more financial support for student workers and more scholarships
- Establish a student-led, compensated curriculum review committee
- Identify a roster of reviewers, lecturers, and organizations to prioritize diverse and marginalized voices
- Connect with local BIPOC-led organizations
- Conduct metrics reviews of EDI efforts in other colleges to benchmark CBE's progress
- Create a central bank of supplies for student work (needs vary by dept)

Appendix A - Designing in Color

Designing in Color (DCo) is an award-winning collective of architects and designers of culture. Our mission is to diversify the way architecture is taught and practiced to amplify marginalized communities who've been historically silenced and erased throughout the design process.

With firsthand experience attending architecture school as well as professional practice, the DCo team knows personally how design injustice shows up throughout architecture and the built environment.

Designing in Color is focused on disrupting the Eurocentric way architecture has been taught and practiced for decades. We want to replace that outdated system with a new, empathetic design foundation rooted in equity and justice. DCo works hard so the issues and struggles we endured in our education and practice don't harm the next generation of designers.

Everything DCo creates is proudly informed by the principles of social justice, spatial justice, and design equity. We work with our clients to oppose racialized space. We accomplish this with three main methods (3 C's):

challenge

Young professionals are encouraged to identify structures of power that inhibit their creativity in spaces of design.

collaborate

Architecture is a collaborative process defined by problem-solving. DCo brings students and professionals together through workshops meant to spark ideas and solutions to a multitude of design justice issues.

create

We believe in turning our collaboration into positive action. Content creation of all types of media helps ensure that the proposed work reaches a wide range of people.

Team of DCo Workshop Developers and Facilitators:

Christopher Locke

Opalia Meade

Jonathan Sharpe

Rubin Quarcoopome

Brian Wisniewski

Appendix B - List of Resources

A number of participants shared some useful resources for others to dive deeper as a means of research and reflection. These included the following texts:

Alexander, Michelle. "The new jim crow." *Ohio St. J. Crim. L.* 9 (2011): 7.

Bhambra, Gurminder, Gebrial, Dalia and Keren Nisancruglu. (eds). *Decolonizing the University*. Pluto Press, 2018.

Cheng, Irene, Charles L. Davis, and Mabel O. Wilson, eds. *Race and modern architecture: A critical history from the enlightenment to the present*. University of Pittsburgh Press, 2020.

Davis, Charles. 'Cannon Fodder: Debating the Racial Politics of Canonicity in Modern Architectural History.'" Harvard Graduate School of Design, December 2, 2020. https://www.gsd.harvard.edu/event/charles-davis/.

Desmond, Matthew. *Evicted: Poverty and profit in the American city*. Crown, 2016.

Fainstein, Susan S. "The just city." *International journal of urban Sciences* 18, no. 1 (2014): 1-18.Harvard

Hooks, bell. *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. Routledge, 1994.

Kendi, Ibram X. *How to be an antiracist*. One World Press, 2019.

McGee, Ebony Omotola. *Black, brown and bruised: How racialized STEM education stifles innovation*. Harvard Education Press, 2021.

Oluo, Ijeaoma. S*o you want to talk about race*. Seal Press, 2019

Porter, Libby. *Unlearning the colonial cultures of planning*. Routledge, 2016.

Wilkerson, Isabel. *Caste: The origins of our discontents*. Random House, 2020