

Democracy's College, Episode 62

The Institutional Model for Faculty Diversity and Its Role in Advancing STEM Equity

With guest Kimberly A. Griffin and host Gianina Baker

Sal Nudo: Welcome to the Democracy's College podcast series. This podcast focuses on educational equity, justice, and excellence for all students in the P-20 educational pathways. This podcast is a product of the Office of Community College Research and Leadership, or OCCRL, at the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign. Learn more about OCCRL at occrll.illinois.edu.

In this episode, Dr. Gianina Baker, the associate director of OCCRL, talks with Dr. Kimberly Griffin about her Institutional Model for Faculty Diversity and its role in advancing STEM equity. The conversation with Dr. Griffin, who is the dean of the College of Education at the University of Maryland, explores the model's connection to the NSF ASPIRE Alliance and its practical applications in higher education.

Dr. Gianina Baker: Dr. Kimberly A. Griffin, she, her, was appointed dean of the College of Education at the University of Maryland in 2022 and has been a member of its faculty since 2012. Griffin joined the college as an associate professor in the Higher Education, Student Affairs, and International Education Policy Program and later served on the dean's leadership team as the associate dean for graduate studies and faculty affairs. In this role, she led efforts to revise the college's tenure and promotion policy as well as support and guide faculty hiring and graduate student recruitment.

Prior to joining UMD, she was a faculty member at Pennsylvania State University and an assistant dean for graduate studies at the Stanford University School of Medicine and an admissions officer at Stanford University.

A leader committed to excellence, care, community, and equity, Griffin is energized by the opportunity to collaborate with faculty, staff, and students to advance the college and its goals. She's driven by education's ability to make an impact in schools and communities and has worked tirelessly throughout her career to maximize the connection between research and practice. As a scholar, Griffin identifies herself as a problem-based researcher, and her work aims to promote access, equity, and justice in higher education.

Much of her current research and writing focuses on mentorship, career development, and faculty and graduate student diversity. Her research has been funded by the Burroughs Welcome Fund, National Institutes of Health, and National Science Foundation. And she is the co-author of the book *On Being a Mentor: A Guide for Higher Education Faculty*. She previously served as the editor-in-chief of the *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education* from 2018 to 2022. Over her five-year term, her vision-driven leadership translated to notable growth in the journal's readership, impact, and revenues.

Griffin's work has been widely recognized for its relevance and effectiveness in addressing persistent problems in higher education and science. She received the Promising Scholar/Early Career Award by the Association for the Study of Higher Education in 2013 and was named an Emerging Scholar in 2010 and Diamond Honoree in 2020 by ACPA. For the past three years, she's been named one of the 200 most influential scholars by *Education Week*.

Griffin received her bachelor's degree from Stanford University, her master's degree in education policy and leadership from the University of Maryland, and her doctorate in higher education and organizational change from the University of California, Los Angeles.

Welcome to the Democracy's College podcast, Dr. Griffin.

Dr. Kimberly A. Griffin: Aw, thank you. That was very kind. I'm really excited to be with you all today.

Dr. Baker: So, we here at OCCRL have been engaged with the project titled the NSF Eddie Bernice Johnson INCLUDES Aspire Alliance for over two years now. The Aspire Alliance works to expand the talent pool of STEM faculty nationwide by engaging with a growing network of partners to support systemic change in the STEM higher education system. Aspire regional collaboratives have developed geographically proximate partnerships among postsecondary institutions to support broad pathways toward STEM faculty positions at community colleges for cohorts of a wide range of graduate students.

As the project was winding down, a number of our project leads thought it would be best to curate the lessons and learnings from the ASPIRE regional collaboratives into an edited volume due out next year. To better understand how to support diverse faculty, this project really centered on the institutional model for faculty diversity. So we are *excited* to have you, Dr. Griffin, on today's podcast as you were *central* to the model's creation.

So, let's get started. Could you share with us the origin of the institutional model for faculty diversity, which we'll call the model, in later questions. What prompted or inspired you to develop it? What experiences or needs inspired its development?

Dr. Griffin: Well, I'm honored to know that folks are using it and that it continues to be relevant and valuable in your work.

I would say that the model, or the idea of the model, started early in my career. Well before I was in graduate school, I was working in diversity outreach and recruitment with graduate students with this idea that, you know, if we increase the diversity of students in graduate programs, ultimately that's the way we would increase diversity in the professoriate, right? So, I had this idea early in my career that this was something that we needed to better understand and what needed to happen to encourage more people to enter graduate school. But then once in graduate school, what happens? You know, what lights get turned on or get turned off around wanting to stay on that pathway to decide to apply to a faculty position, to get that faculty position, and then stay in the academy?

So early in my career, I would say that I spent a lot of time thinking about that question and working in and with institutions that were thinking about like, well, how do we work with individuals in the pipeline or on that pathway to keep them in it, right? Like, so that it was an individual-level problem rather than taking a step back and thinking about it as a systems-level problem.

I had the opportunity to do some work with Kenny Gibbs early in my career, and he's an immunologist, and we came together to do this study to really track how people were making sense and making meaning of this journey to the academy, and what was making them more or less interested in pursuing academic careers. And in the process of doing that work, I think we became really aware that it wasn't just the individual, that they were functioning within structures and systems that were either pulling them in or pushing them out. So, I had the sense that beyond thinking about, like, well, what skills do we need to arm individuals with? How do we make individual people more resilient or more hireable or more successful? How do we have to think about institutions? And how are institutions supporting individuals, selecting individuals, sometimes getting in their own way of what goals they say they have around increasing faculty diversity. What is the institution doing, rather than what do we need to do to individuals to make them more successful in that structure or system?

So along came the opportunity to work with APLU on an early INCLUDES project. So, in collaboration with folks like Alan Mabe and Travis York, Jessica Bennett, Howard Gobstein, I remember sitting on many a Zoom call and sitting around many a table talking about, okay, we're entering this project, we're going to do this work, and we want to offer institutions guidance on how to increase faculty diversity. How do we move beyond helping institutions tell people how to fix themselves to stay in their system? And really think about how *institutions* need to change. What work do *they* need to do to be more welcoming, more

accessible, and to actually recruit and retain the faculty that they say that they want to see on their campuses?

So, we had the sense that we needed to do this work and that we needed to take a different approach to this work. And we had the sense that there was *a lot* of literature on this work already. There were a lot of people *doing* this work. And that while everybody likes a good checklist of what different things do we need to do, or what's the one program that we need to implement, that it was this multidimensional problem. So, how do we create something that captures the fact that it's a multi-dimensional problem with *multiple* sites of intervention that is complex, and it's not as complicated as we're making it, that we really can pinpoint what are the different points of intervention and the different spaces in which we can show up to bring about the outcomes we'd like to see. So, that's kind of how this idea met this opportunity and ultimately became a framework.

Dr. Baker: What I think is a framework that absolutely will stand the test of time because it can be adapted for many different uses, some of which we'll discuss here shortly.

In thinking about the model and the many ways it can be used, what was your main hope or vision for its use in higher education?

Dr. Griffin: Oh gosh, just what you said. I think I am most delighted that it is usable for *any* scholar. You describe me as saying that I'm a problem-based researcher. I am. I hold that really, really close to my heart. It's really important to me that I do work that actually has an impact out in the world and is usable to someone. So, I wanted to be part of developing something that was usable, that people could look at and make sense of and be like, okay. okay, like I see what this is trying to tell me in terms of, you know, what next step to take or what information I need to collect and acknowledge the fact that institutions are so different. There's no one thing that every single institution should do or should not do. But there are these different categories of intervention that we really needed to think about and that institutions could adapt the framework in ways that made sense for their own individual context. So, you know, the fact that people feel like it is applicable and usable, it was the goal from the beginning for it to be something that was applicable and usable.

And I think the second thing that was really important to me, particularly at this stage of my career, is that as a scholar, I certainly always have this desire to learn new things and ask new questions and strike out on new roads of inquiry. But there are so many questions that we have in higher education practice, particularly around diversity and equity-related issues that we actually have pretty good answers to, that there are decades of research on. And when we look to higher education leaders to make decisions that are going to advance us towards those diversity and equity goals that we may share, we don't always have the

time to go back and read the decades of research that tell us what we *could* or what we should do. So how could I kind of try to thread the needle between offering folks the decades of research in what is still a very long article that I hope that people sometimes take the time to read, but also how do you synthesize that in an image that would give you the gist, that would be like, okay, like I see what I need to think about and I know that it is grounded in research, it is grounded in practice, that this isn't something that someone just plucked out of the air and said, like, well, this is the way it works. That someones, multiple people, took the time to really think about, well, what's the best of what we know and how would that ultimately come together in a way that could actually inform what we do on college campuses and how we think about increasing faculty diversity in a comprehensive way.

So that was my hope and my vision for the work, that people would know it was rigorous, that people would know it was thoughtful, that it was grounded in research, that it was also grounded in practice, that folks had actually tried some things and the best of what we knew about what worked was in this framework and that it would have an impact and that people would use it.

Dr. Baker: That's a great segueway into our next question. Are there aspects of the model that have evolved since its initial creation? And if so, what might have prompted some of these changes?

Dr. Griffin: We started talking about the framework maybe in 2017, 2018. You know, we always said that there needed to be this, like, comprehensive literature review that really grounded the work to show that, like, this was evidence-based. And so wrote that; I think I submitted it, I remember the summer of 2019. So, I guess it's been about six years since the framework was introduced to the world.

And in that time, I went and became an administrator. So, I haven't really sat with the framework. I had not thought about, you know, what I would change about it. How could it look different? And as I revisited it, you know, as I started thinking about this conversation and preparing for our conversation today, I don't know that I would change it a whole lot because it was developed in a way to be adaptable, to be broad, to not be so prescriptive and specific. So hopefully it will continue to be timely for long periods of time. I think there are things that I could *add* to it, particularly given the space and time that we're all navigating in higher education right now, that would be additionally helpful. But I think the bones of it still hold up pretty well six years later.

Dr. Baker: Timely is appropriate. That's the one word that definitely came to mind as you've been talking through its development. And there's four domains within the model itself. And

if you're all trying to learn more about this, we have some of this information on our website.

We wonder, Dr. Griffin, is there one that you consider the most significant in today's sociopolitical climate? And are there domains that need further development?

Dr. Griffin: So for folks who may not have the framework in front of them, there are these three boxes that are all stacked on top of each other. So, there's a recruitment box, there's a transition box, and there's a retention box. And it suggests that there's a relationship between those in terms of promoting faculty diversity. And then *around* that box, there's a larger box called institutional context. Institutional context, in my mind, is the most important one. I don't know that I always would have said that, but I think in *this particular moment*, institutional context matters so much.

So, at the time in developing the framework, when I was thinking about institutional context, I was thinking more in terms of type of institution. So, is it a regional institution? Is it a research institution? Is it a community college like the community colleges that y'all have been working with and supporting through your Aspire INCLUDES networks? You know, what exactly is the institution that you're working within? And then the different strategies and the different pathways and what advancement looks like. What transition looks like might be very different based on institutional type.

Now I'm thinking more about location. Where in the country you are. What does your board look like? Is it governor-appointed or is it not? Are you in a red state? Are you in a blue state? Are you in a purple state? Really understanding the context that you're working within is extremely important because there are some states in which you can't even begin to have a conversation about diversity, equity, or inclusion. And I think for all of us, we are being pushed to consider and reconsider what our equity goals look like, what our outreach efforts *can* look like, should look like, given different pressures that we're under. But I really think that context is important.

If I were to add something to the model now, for folks who are listening who might be familiar with the Campus Racial Climate Framework that was initially developed by Walter Allen and Alma Clayton-Pederson and Sylvia Hurtado and Jeff Milem, they have, you know, all the things that are happening within the institution. And then they have these two factors, these two pieces that are outside of the box that have arrows in. And so basically they're suggesting that campus racial climate, all these things that are happening on campus are impacted by the government and policy context and the social historical context of that particular moment. And if we're not living that now, right? Your ability to do this work, what it looks like, the dynamics of the work are very much influenced by the

government and policy context, not only at the national level, but at the state level as well, as well as the socio-historical context of this moment. I would add those things if I was going back to make a change to it now.

So, the final part of the framework I *thought* was important, but I would want to interrogate more is a recursive loop between recruitment and retention. And I think continuing to give attention to that and continuing to think about what are the dynamics between a strong set of policies around retention having an impact on your ability to recruit more folks to your institution. How is strong retention strategy a good recruitment strategy at the same time? I think that that deserves more time and attention and unpacking.

Dr. Baker: You've given us some other pieces to think about, especially as we've been adapting this work to community colleges as you've just hit on. We keep thinking about it and working with and piloting the tool, the audit itself, to ask others within community college contexts, you know, what does this mean for you? And so, in some of those focus groups, we learned that, especially within the recruitment phase, networking, making sure that you're following up after those key pieces of outreach, hiring, and yield. In terms of transition, we talked a little bit about what pieces might be included in that and retitled it transitioning. So thinking about pedagogy, professional status, work-life balance, being a community college agent. Those were pieces that we kind of were spelling out. [We're] thankful to those that, again, joined those focus groups and gave us that kind of feedback.

And then in retention, especially, again, within the community college context, thinking through research and disciplinary activities and what that means specific to community colleges, as well as thinking about engagement in a deeper, more comprehensive way. And so all of those were key in what we talked through in an upcoming issue around the self-assessment tool within the *New Directions for Community Colleges* [issue]. And given your involvement in the APLU project on broadening faculty diversity, how might you envision this model being translated into practice within other postsecondary education institutions?

Dr. Griffin: I mean, ultimately, the model was almost in two parts, right? Like there is this framework in which you can think about the work you're trying to do to increase faculty diversity. And, you know, just seeding the idea that it's not just about who you hire in any given year. It's thinking about outreach and that hiring process and then who you ultimately yield. I love transitioning versus transition, right? Like that it doesn't happen at one point in time and it's not just from your previous job to your current job [laughs] or from grad school to your current job. It's transitioning all different dimensions of your life and your identity into this new set of roles and into this institution.

And then retention, right? Like, how are we thinking about the skills that need to be developed? How do we think about sense of belonging and connection and how we're thinking about navigating these processes. That *ultimately* to have institutional leaders think about the diversity of their faculty in this broad way, that it's *all* these different components that we really need to be thinking about and that they all need to be in coordination with each other is really important.

But *then* there was also this self-assessment tool that we developed, right? A series of questions that institutional leaders could ask themselves about each of those dimensions and what activities they had in place in each of those dimensions. And I remember as we were developing the self-assessment tool, we were really careful because we didn't want it to come across as a checklist, and that there was a right or a wrong, that you didn't get a point for every time you checked yes, you didn't get a minus one every time you checked no. The goal wasn't necessarily to have every single intervention. It was more like, well, have you thought about these things? Are you doing some things in each of the buckets? Is it that you're doing an awful lot in outreach, but you actually don't have many yield efforts? Or you're very bottom heavy in retention efforts, but not having much going on in recruitment? Or have you not even begun to think about transition or transitioning? So that there was kind of this more conceptual, how do you think about this work of increasing faculty diversity and what role does the institution have in it, down to a very, like, fine grained, you know, what boxes can I check? How do I really do a self-assessment of what interventions we have in place on our campus and what *might* be something that we want to do or try moving forward? Because we checked no, but we had never thought about that as a potential intervention. Or we checked no and we checked no for a particular reason and we won't be trying that, right?

So, I think that for institutions, it can be an opportunity to either start a conversation or to engage in some critical reflection on what you're doing, what you're not doing, and why. It doesn't necessarily point you in a specific direction. It is not the golden road to increasing faculty diversity. It's a beginning of conversations and questions you should ask yourself if you're really serious about doing the institutional-level work to change what your faculty looks like.

Dr. Baker: You made a *very* key point there, and I hope if you didn't hear that you'll rewind this just a bit to go back to hear again, you know, how you can use this, right? Not just as a conversation starter, perhaps, but also a critical piece of reflection about what you're doing on your campus. It's a great point.

You talked just briefly a little bit, and I wonder, I know that you've been away from the work for a little bit, but I wonder, are there any noteworthy examples of other scholars or institutions that use the model in ways that you find especially effective or meaningful?

Dr. Griffin: (Laughs) It's so funny. It's hard to track whether and how people are using your work, right? So as a scholar, you think about your citation index, and how many times has my article been cited that introduces this framework, right? So, I think one of the honors of my career is to have the next generation of scholars who I really respect, who I think are doing *really* thoughtful, critical work, cite my work. So, you know, I see folks like Roman Liera and Steve Desir and Damani White-Lewis and Culpepper and Daniel Blake, earlier-career colleagues, citing my work. I'm just like, ah: I've done a good thing, right? Like, I've written something that hopefully helps them do their work better because we need their work. It's brilliant and wonderful and it's going to continue to push the field forward.

When I think about one of the moments that I was like, oh, people are actually, like, reading and thinking about this stuff in a really critical way. I can't remember if it had become X yet, but the, you know, [on] the artist formerly known as Twitter, I saw a journal club had decided to read the chapter. And they were really like going through and engaging and back and forth and having this really interesting conversation online about what they were taking from it. I'm almost sure they were a group of scientists, right? Like, so, there's a group of grad students and faculty members who are in science, who are reading, you know, my education article and looking at my education framework and really like engaging with it and thinking about it as like a critical piece of scholarship, but also really making clear applications to practice in their own role in academic systems, right? Like, if they choose to stay in the academy, they're going to be the people applying for faculty jobs, selecting the next generation of scholars and talking about what they're learning from what they're reading. And *that* impact is really powerful too, right? Like, that it's not just an institution. And I know that there are institutions out there that are using the framework to guide their work. I'm so glad that there are. I remember sitting in a Zoom room during a presentation and the framework came up and it was the APLU citation. So I don't think they connected it to the fact that, like, I was one of the people that had worked on it, which was also lovely and wonderful.

And so there's *that* level of change, right? Institutions and academic leaders picking it up. But then there's people outside of education, you know, outside of the scholarly field of education who are doing the *work* of education, who are working in colleges and universities, picking it up and reading it and making sense of it or looking at the framework and saying, like, yeah, I understand what this is trying to say. And now I want to try to apply

it. As somebody who is part of this system, who continues to keep the system moving forward, that to me is just really amazing and wonderful and I love to see it.

Dr. Baker: I wonder, as you saw this conversation unfolding, as you said on X, also formerly known as Twitter, what misconceptions did you see if people, if they had [them] about the model or its intended purpose? Did that come up at all?

Dr. Griffin: No, they got it. I was so happy. They totally got it. They were just like, what I appreciate about this was that, like, there's a lot of explanations that are offered for why the faculty isn't more diverse. And they were saying that, like, yeah, but it tackles all the explanations. Like if you've heard, like, a reason or a myth why, read the article because it tells you, like, with data why that's not the case. And I was like, yay, they got it! So I could not see misapplications amongst this group. They were just really thinking about it in such a focused way and asking really good questions and thinking hard about whether and how they could apply it. So I just really appreciated seeing that all happen.

Dr. Baker: It sounds like the model itself helped clear up some of the misconception, right? In that there's all these things that are out there and the way that you put it together, the way that you were able to write about it helped people. Because you're right, it was easy to probably come up with, well, what about this? What about this? And like you said, then it's right there and they're like, oh goodness, this does, like, kind of put all this disparate thoughts about why we can't increase faculty diversity together in a way that makes sense. So, good job. Good job. You responded to what you were hearing out in the field.

Dr. Griffin: I can't say enough about the number of folks whose thinking is reflected in the model. So, like, at the end of the day, yes, I am the person who wrote the article and did the lit review that grounded the framework. But even the first versions of it, my colleagues that we were working on the APLU INCLUDES grant together, like, their thinking was very much engaged in the work. But we had a conference where so many people who were scholars and practitioners were weighing in and offering thoughts. And Kiernan Mathews was there and he was offering thoughts. And Anne Austin was there and she was offering thoughts on whether and how things fit together and whether or not this really reflected what we saw in the field, and that it was a model for kind of thinking about how we brought folks into the faculty to begin with, right? Like that by turning these different levers, we could increase faculty diversity, but it kind of reflected the faculty path more generally. Does that make sense?

Dr. Baker: Yes.

Dr. Griffin: So that we kind of have to understand the system to begin with to think about, like, how would we start to change it and adjust it if our goal was to see a more diverse

community of people entering these roles, right? Like these are the different components, like, there *is* an outreach part. We either do it intentionally or we do it unintentionally, right? But we can do it in intentional ways where we encourage a different group of people and stay *in touch* with a more diverse group of people to encourage them to ultimately apply to our positions. We're always going to do hiring. We're either going to select intentionally or select unintentionally. How can we be more intentional about those selection decisions that we're making? How can we be more intentional about our yield efforts? So, I think it was just more a matter of how do we look at the different components that are already there and change those structures that already exist to work towards our equity goals rather than against our equity goals.

Dr. Baker: I mean, everything that you've said thus far is great advice, especially for someone who's just beginning to engage with the model. But is there any other advice that you might give to educators, other fellow administrators who are just beginning to work with this model or brand new to [it] and found out about it today on this podcast.

Dr. Griffin: It can feel super overwhelming. Like, I wouldn't recommend: read the lit review, download the self-assessment, and get started (laughs). That's just a lot. I would say, like, look at the model and think about it. And maybe just start thinking about, like, a gut check of, you know, what's here that you expected to be here and what hadn't you thought about before? What did you think about maybe as not being under your control or, like, well, you know, that's just the way that's always been that maybe it isn't the way it's always been, right? Like just really start with the model maybe as, again, opening the door to a conversation of thinking about, like, huh, what's here that is pretty certain that, yes, if we change that, that could help us reach our goals in terms of faculty diversity, but what here might be new or something that you hadn't thought about in that particular way?

And then maybe go back and read the lit review, right (laughs)? And, like, kind of get familiar with, like, well, what is it that we already *know* about the barriers that exist that get in our own way? There certainly are *plenty* of intervention strategies that try to work with and address the candidates. But what do we know about the institutions and the structures and the systems that we're trying to get them to fit into? And what is maybe one or two things that you can change? Maybe what's one or two buckets of those? Let's see, one, two, three, four, five, six. Seven or eight of them? Like, what's something that you can, like, okay, this is something that we haven't really thought about very much. Let's focus on this for right now, right? And then moving on to another and then on to another. I think that's always a good place to start or just starting with having a conversation with your team. You know, if you're a department chair having a conversation with your faculty, if you're a dean having a conversation with your department chairs, you know: [I] saw this framework, what do you

think? What do we think of where we are in terms of faculty diversity in gender, in race, in sexual identity, in *all* the ways that we care about in first-generation status and low-income. And if we wanted to change that, what would we have to do? How could we think about how we do hiring a bit differently? How could we think about the retention work that we're doing a bit differently? What does our tenure and promotion strategy even look like? And are we rewarding the work that we say we want folks to do in ways that are meaningful and that aren't getting in the way of them reaching their goals in terms of tenure and promotion? So just start small. You don't have to try to take it all on at one moment. Start small.

Dr. Baker: And I think to pick up on the earlier part of our conversation: Pay particular attention to institutional context. Because that can take up a good deal of time. But definitely something to be aware of as you're operating within *all* of these structures, whether it be institutional or the larger sociopolitical context.

So, we're about at the end of our time, but I have to ask: Is there anything else you'd like to share about the model, its impact, or your ongoing work?

Dr. Griffin: Oh, goodness. I think it's probably due for an update; so I invite *anybody* who has good ideas, who has good thoughts, please take it and run with it. It is not something that was meant to sit on the shelf as, like, this perfect forever model and framework and understanding of how we do and increase faculty diversity or the institution's role in that work. I am sure that there is *a lot* that could be changed that could be different; that the framework could be critiqued, please do so. That's what makes work better. So, lots of good thinking to continue to move this work forward. So please use it if you find it useful, but if you have thoughts on how to make it better, make it better.

Dr. Baker: Thank you. I mean, there's so many nuggets in here that Dr. Griffin left you, but there's no one right way to do this work. You just have to do it. Sit down, start small, and ask colleagues to join you in that conversation.

Thank you, Dr. Griffin, for joining us today. To hear more about the origins of the institutional model for faculty diversity as well as the corresponding self-assessment tool.

I hope you, our listeners, learn about the model. And you can find out more about OCCRL's involvement with NSF Eddie Bernice Johnson [INCLUDES ASPIRE Alliance project](#) on our website, www.occril.illinois.edu.

Thank you again.

Dr. Griffin: Thank you.

Sal Nudo: Tune in to the next several episodes of Democracy's College to hear from university leaders who will discuss a wide range of information about data as part of

OCCRL's collaboration with the Office of the Governor on a project called Higher Education Futures Roundtable.

In addition, another future Democracy's College episode will feature host Hannah Kuneyl, who will be talking with Dr. Sayda Khan, also on the topic of data. Their conversation will offer a beginner's guide on how to get started with data and then delve into how to build trust and data literacy. Kuneyl's episode will be a continuation of other podcasts from OCCRL about our office's Illinois Community College Leadership Institute.

Background music for this podcast is provided by Pixabay. Thank you for listening and for your contributions to equity, justice, and excellence in education for all students.