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In 2020, the Association of Schools and Programs of Public Health (ASPPH) launched the *Framing the Future: Education for Public Health 2030 (FTF 2030) initiative*. With the vision to “ensure equitable, quality education in public health for achieving health equity and well-being for everyone, everywhere.” This effort builds upon the work of ASPPH’s original Framing the Future initiative (2011-2015) in responding to new and ongoing challenges in academic public health.

Working closely with the ASPPH leadership, the FTF 2030 steering committee created three cross-cutting expert panels to examine key issues and develop recommendations to realize the FTF 2030 vision:

All three panels convened in September 2021 and the Inclusive Excellence through an Anti-racism Lens expert panel (IE panel) launched with 14 representatives from academe and practice. The IE panel began work by refining their charge (see Appendix A) and composing an explicit “commitment to a consensus process of creating an inclusive workspace through an anti-racism lens.” The panel also reviewed existing resources and guidance, in particular ASPPH’s Task Force on Zero Tolerance for Discrimination, Harassment and Racism in Academic Public Health’s *Dismantling Racism and Structural Racism in Academic Public Health Framework* (Association of Schools and Programs of Public Health, 2021), which had been released in October 2021.
The Dismantling Racism Framework’s intention to “create momentum” around a shared commitment to health equity represented an important starting point for the panel’s environmental scan, helping illuminate a future in which accredited schools and programs could ensure inclusive excellence through an anti-racism lens for improving the health of the public. The ultimate purpose of this environmental scan was to facilitate the development and implementation of measures to track progress towards diversity, equity, inclusion, and social justice (DEIJ) and anti-racism (AR) objectives (e.g., how might we measure progress on the objective for faculty to become “trained in and deliver on the commitment to social justice, inclusive excellence and anti-racism in their teaching, research, practice, and service,”). Additional products stimulated from this scan could include material to further populate ASPPH’s member-only Academic Public Health Resources Hub. The Hub is a collection of resources, tools, and promising practices that ASPPH members could supplement with lessons learned, for delivering what success could look like in framing the future of education for public health by 2030.

PROBLEM STATEMENT

Schools and programs of public health have committed to varying degrees of DEIJ as organizational values. Since the expert panel launched in 2021, some US states had already deployed severe restrictions to DEI and AR educational and practice efforts even before the US Supreme Court ruling against affirmative action on June 29, 2023 (Students for Fair Admissions, Inc. v. President and Fellows of Harvard College, 2023). Work to create diverse, equitable, inclusive, and socially just teaching and learning environments became more difficult in certain states. On the other hand, school and program leadership in DEIJ-friendly states are still able to maintain, follow through on original plans, and execute positive changes. With more faculty, staff, and students engaging in this critically important work, both internally and with community members and other partners, some schools and programs have moved successfully to address anti-racism (AR).

With members represented across these various states, ASPPH continually strives to advance excellence and innovation in teaching, research, and practice and to foster and support a culture of awareness and inclusion among its members around the world. By the spring of 2023, IE panelists had convened in 10 interactive panel meetings, reflecting upon, and discussing their individual and institutional experiences along with challenges and promising strategies for delivering on ASPPH’s strategic goal to “champion the development of a diverse and exceptional public health workforce.”

Due to the abundance of activity to promote DEIJ and AR efforts in academic public health and the lack of a mechanism to share resources, in June 2022 ASPPH launched the members-only Academic Public Health Resources Hub (the Hub), which includes a topic area on DEIJ, designed to elicit “materials and resources to enhance skills, expertise, and knowledge to dismantle the conditions that enable racism and other forms of discrimination in academic public health institutions, and to empower faculty, staff, and students to commit to a bold IDEA of Inclusion, Diversity, Equity, and Antiracism.” Data from this environmental scan offers additional inspiration for panelists and colleagues to continue populating the Hub with resources and strategies for the benefit of all member schools and programs.
With DEIJ and AR activity at ASPPH’s national office proceeding but with varying levels of success in implementation across our membership, it became increasingly important to assure synergy between the IE panel and ASPPH’s Dismantling Racism Framework as well as with high-level work underway in DEIJ-focused projects and by ASPPH’s Diversity and Inclusion Committee and Section. The IE panel’s work intersects specifically with the strategic approach in the Dismantling Racism Framework’s Domain 1, excerpted as follows:

**DISMANTLING RACISM AND STRUCTURAL RACISM IN ACADEMIC PUBLIC HEALTH FRAMEWORK**

**Strategic Approach for Domain 1: Education, Pedagogy, and Training**

The Task Force now presents a set of pedagogical approaches to guide teaching and transform learning to promote our IDEA for Academic Public Health Justice. The Framework supports the work of the ASPPH Framing the Future 2030 and the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning initiatives with the common goal of collaboration for educational excellence. The Task Force focuses on educational programming that prepares students as public health professionals and provides professional development learning opportunities for faculty, staff, students and alumni, and community-based organizations to dismantle racism and advance health equity.

The Task Force also recommends that all schools and programs develop policies and trainings regarding inclusion, diversity, equity, and antiracism for the professional development of faculty, staff, and students. These trainings should apply principles of antiracism to counter behaviors such as implicit bias, microaggressions, and stereotype threats. Trainings also should utilize a common set of definitions and articulate planned measures of success. The policies should explicitly connect participation in trainings as a required component of the annual review and be included in the Promotion & Tenure (P&T) process. In addition, the Task Force acknowledges that for education and training to be successful, administrative and faculty leaders must collaborate broadly with the academic community in guaranteeing that the institution will be accountable for needed change.

**Immediate Strategies**

**FACULTY**

Adopt and adapt public health curricula to highlight the ways racism and other forms of discrimination impact the health and well-being of populations and individuals. Evaluate institutional culture and climate surrounding the education mission; hold listening sessions for faculty and staff to respond to events of racism and other discriminatory injustice; develop competencies and curricula in all areas of equity as core to public health professional training. Develop teaching evaluations to assess faculty practices in inclusion, diversity, equity, and antiracism. Create IDEA-focused teaching, practice, and research awards, including awards to recognize excellence in faculty teaching that address the impact of racism and eradicate structural barriers to attaining equitable health outcomes.
STUDENTS & ALUMNI
Review and revise student evaluation materials to assess competencies in public health that advance goals of inclusion, diversity, equity, and antiracism; offer networking/mentoring opportunities for students with alumni and public health practitioners; audit scholarship awarding process to ensure fairness.

STAFF
Create evaluations to assess culture and climate of programs; hold listening sessions to respond to racial justice events; require inclusion excellence training; mandate holistic application review training; provide training focused on antiracist admissions and hiring practices.

POPULATIONS SERVED AND PUBLIC HEALTH WORKFORCE
Develop partnerships for continuing education opportunities with evidence-based practices that promote excellence in inclusion, diversity, equity, and antiracism.

Intermediate Strategies

FACULTY
Identify antiracist intercultural and trauma-informed teaching competencies; examine theory, structure, and practice of antiracism; establish and require an **Inclusion, Diversity, Equity, and Antiracism (IDEA) Certificate** program; establish and fund inclusion, diversity, equity, and antiracism trainings with a mix of faculty, staff, and community members.

STUDENTS & ALUMNI
Engage students and alumni in conversations about inclusion, diversity, equity, and antiracism topics to address curricular gaps and workforce needs; establish or expand postdoctoral fellowship programs for underrepresented students.

STAFF
Evaluate and assess the culture and climate of programs; hold listening sessions for faculty and staff to respond to racial justice events; establish and require an **Inclusion, Diversity, Equity, and Antiracism (IDEA) Certificate** program; establish and fund trainings with a mix of faculty, staff, and community members.

POPULATIONS SERVED AND PUBLIC HEALTH WORKFORCE
Identify gaps in inclusion, diversity, equity, and antiracism training and collaboratively develop workforce trainings.
Since the Dismantling Racism Framework recommends specific strategies, the FTF environmental scan sought to build upon those strategies by identifying and capturing data on specific DEIJ and AR strategies, planned or underway, at a small sample of member institutions.

The scan also sought to capture indicators of success and challenges in operationalizing the listed respondents’ strategies, e.g., did we hit or miss the goal? Ultimately, the environmental scan aimed to make sense of various DEIJ and AR experiences, successes, and opportunities with a wide array of strategies and to provide examples of how to apply, operationalize, and sustain inclusive excellence using an anti-racism lens in education for public health. The examples are offered in the hopes that they will prompt others to adapt or adopt similar methods and then to share their experiences and spark further interest by others to implement new or enhance initiatives in a wide array of contexts.
ENVIRONMENTAL SCAN BACKGROUND AND PROCESS

Throughout their convenings, as guided by the co-chairs and ASPPH staff, the IE expert panel considered their five drivers, the key groups with vested interest anticipated to implement the recommendations issuing from this project:

1. **Governance, Leadership, and Administration**, with two sub-drivers’ "university" and "unit" (the unit correlates to ASPPH-member schools or programs of public health)
2. **Faculty**
3. **Staff**
4. **Trainees, including post-doctoral trainees, and students**
5. **Partners**

and formulated five questions specific to each driver’s scope.

The questions sought to stimulate respondents to scan the environments/units at their institutions with respect to inclusive excellence through an anti-racism lens. The questions were added into the Google Sheets template each respondent used to fill in their responses (see the questions, “Environmental Scan Questions,” in Appendix B and “Environmental Scan Instrument (Per the Google Doc)” in Appendix C. The questions prompted respondents to address the unit type, implementation details, impact, barriers or facilitators, and requirements for sustainability of initiatives or activities planned or underway to promote, ensure, advance, and/or achieve inclusive excellence through an anti-racism lens within academic public health (for the first four drivers) and inclusive excellence through an anti-racism lens *in general* (for the fifth driver, “partners”).

Respondents submitted responses to the following questions:

- Question 1: for institutions and units’ systems, structures, policies, procedures, practices, opportunities, strategies and/or initiatives (what?)
- Question 2: implementation (how?)
- Question 3: impact (so what?)
- Question 4: barriers or facilitators (factors that impede or abet?)
- Question 5: requirements for sustainability (actions and methods that maintain and secure the continuation of inclusive excellence through an anti-racist lens?).
DATA COLLECTION PROTOCOLS AND ANALYSIS

The ASPPH research team consisted of two researchers, also termed “staff,” who circulated the environmental scan using Google Sheets (see “Environmental Scan Instrument (Per the Google Sheet)” in Appendix C) in March 2023 to the IE panel with an initial deadline of three weeks. To increase the response rate, staff eventually extended the formal deadline an extra month, permitting final inputs through April 2023. Staff sent multiple reminders via email to non-responding panelists throughout the process to permit additional time for completion to increase the response rate. Panel members entered results manually into the Google Sheets using individualized pages marked with their names to capture their unique set of responses.

Data Analysis

One researcher carefully examined the data to address and correct unclear information, when obvious, and in special cases to contact the respondent for clarification. Subsequently, the researcher transferred the data from Google Sheets into Microsoft Excel to streamline the analysis process, formatting the material for uniformity. Each of the two researchers, working independently, perused the findings provided by each respondent and reviewed the material across all the respondents to become familiar with the content and to begin identifying initial observations and emerging themes, to eventually result in a listing of primary deductive codes.

The researchers met to discuss initial observations before proceeding independently to manually pattern code themes that emerged from the qualitative responses. They then convened to discuss similarities and differences in interpretation, working to normalize their views and to agree on a pre-final list of primary codes (using deductive reasoning based on the items in each question) and secondary themes (using inductive reasoning based on observations and evidence from the data) to use in rescanning the data. Staff created definitions for the primary codes based on the aims of the environmental scan and the content it yielded. The primary deductive codes and definitions are shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Primary deductive codes and corresponding definitions for initial data analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIMARY CODING</th>
<th>DEFINITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>A combination of structures that represents a holistic framework, e.g., Health Science Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Individual component or part of a system, e.g., committee, council, office, key mover, target participants/groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Course or principle of action adopted or proposed by government, party, business, or individual, e.g., faculty Senate approves curricular change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
METHODS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedure/ Process</th>
<th>A series of actions conducted in a certain order or manner; an established or official way of doing something</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practice</td>
<td>The actual application or use of an idea, belief, or method as opposed to theories relating to it, e.g., how a person teaches an epidemiology principle to a class or explicit DEIJ actions in a given area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy/ Initiative</td>
<td>Plan of action, process, or program designed to achieve a major or overall aim or solve a problem, e.g., a university's strategic plan, a race and equity initiative, or funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Not answered above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researchers then independently recoded the data by question category and driver combining them into unique tables for ease of reporting descriptive statistics. They organized the responses categorically within the tables using a thematic flow stemming from the response categories and by ordering the highest frequency at the top of each listing.

Staff met regularly throughout their analysis, pattern coding, and recoding processes to compare results and discuss differences or discrepancies, working independently and together to recalibrate codes as necessary to ensure consistency in interpretations. The researchers ultimately agreed on a refined, final set of themes and sub-themes to reflect the data accurately.

Data Synthesis and Reporting

Following standard ASPPH data reporting practice, staff reported data in aggregate format with possible personal and institutional identifying information removed from individual responses. Due to the nature of open-ended questions in this scan, staff shifted data elements as appropriate to other question or driver categories.

Staff then arranged two meetings to brief the expert panel co-chairs on their draft results, taking in questions and guidance to improve the draft products. The researchers then presented high-level draft results to the full expert panel on June 22, 2023, and took in questions and suggestions for refining this report. Staff finalized this environmental scan report in late 2023 and completed design work and published it in early 2024.

This report includes tables showing frequencies of items in each thematic category along with representative excerpts from the raw data to illuminate context and detail on the themes. All excerpted data is retained with original spelling and formatting, including typos marked by “[sic].” Material is bolded where it correlates with the categorizing theme and is helpful to call out. In instances where the respondent included identifying information about the institution or unit, the researchers substituted “xx” to preserve confidentiality.

Themes were not quantified into percentages in the tables because of the limited sample size.
RESPONDENT CHARACTERISTICS
Ten of the 14 expert panel members responded to the scan (71% response rate). The 10 respondents represented eight of 142 (6%) ASPPH-member institutions or parent institutions at the time of the study in eight different US states (NOTE: two states were represented twice each among the respondents). One panel member from an accrediting agency opted out from the start of the process on the grounds that the study is relevant only to panel members based in schools and programs or who work in community partnership with academe in areas that address inclusive excellence. One of the 10 respondents resides at the university level in a provost position, eight are administrators in a school or program of public health, and one is a consultant and professor (retired). Of the ten respondents, eight respondents (80%) represent schools of public health and two (20%) represent programs of public health. In addition, four respondents (40%) represent private colleges and/or universities, while six (60%) represent public institutions. Respondent size was calculated using ASPPH 2022 fall enrollments data (considered a strong correlate for institutional size), with results ranging from 54 students to 3,902 students. Of the eight states represented by the 10 respondents, as of June 2023, DEIJ legislation was introduced in three of the states, with two bills passing in the state of Texas (Lu, 2023). Critical Race Theory (CRT) legislation was introduced in six respondents’ states, with 11 bills passing (UCLA School of Law Critical Race Studies Program, 2023). Note that both DEIJ and CRT data are reported for the 2023 legislative sessions.

All 10 respondents (100%) answered each of the open-ended questions among the five drivers, and while not necessarily responding for each driver category, the respondents filled out most of the cells in each of their submitted scans. Respondents varied in the comprehensiveness of their responses with four of the 10 respondents consistently contributing responses of significant depth and breadth. One of the respondents took care to fill out each category for each driver under each question and another respondent sought additional inputs from colleagues and marked those four individuals’ contributions with their initials, effectively adding multiple perspectives to the responses.

RESPONSES
Activities (the “What?”)
The first environmental scan question asked about systems, structures, policies, procedures, practices, opportunities, strategies and/or initiatives underway (or in development) that promote, ensure, or advance
inclusive excellence through an anti-racism lens within or in collaboration with academic public health for each of the five Framing the Future drivers (see the “Environmental Scan Instrument,” in Appendix C). The 114 major open-ended responses are categorized in two sub-headings: “New Structures and Spaces” and “Strategies, Practices, and Policies” in Table 2.

Table 2: Activities underway (or in development) that promote, ensure, or advance inclusive excellence through an anti-racism lens in academic public health, across all drivers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSE CATEGORIES</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Structures and Spaces</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of a new entity (e.g., council, committee, advisory board, assembly, association)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of a new office, position, and/or hire</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of a new center</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of a new program with the community</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies, Practices, and Policies</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of trainings, workshops, and panel sessions (extracurricular)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infusion of DEIJ and critical race practices (e.g., in admissions, curricula, and practica)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding (e.g., scholarships for students, faculty opportunities)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research in DEIJ and AR (e.g., Geospatial Health Research Lab)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership commitment (e.g., P&amp;T support for diverse faculty and awards)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of DEIJ and AR principles into the academic culture (e.g., faculty expectations, program evaluations, human resources, P&amp;T criteria)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility (e.g., creation of website, posting, school mission statements)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement of the community in bi-directional activities</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of a new strategic plan (e.g., Equity, Justice, and Anti-Racism)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESULTS

None of the responses indicated systems or procedures.

Illustrative excerpts from each of the major response sub-categories follow:

**NEW STRUCTURES AND SPACES**

Creation of a new entity (e.g., council, committee, advisory board, assembly, association)
- “Creation of EDI Committees”
- “Dean’s Advisory Council for Students (DACS)”
- “DEI Committee at university Reagents” [sic]
- “School wide DEIJ Committee”
- “IDEA (Inclusion, Diversity, Equity & Access) Committee”

Creation of a new office, position, and/or hire
- “Associate Provost for Community and Inclusion”
- “Associate Dean for DEIJ”
- “School-wide DEIJ Committee”
- “Executive VP of Student Affairs and Diversity”
- “Associate Dean for Faculty Development and Diversity”
- “Creation of a new position-AVP/Associate for Diverse Faculty Success”

Creation of a new center
- “Creation of a Center for Anti-Racism and Community Health (ARCH)”
- “Center for Anti-Racism Research”
- “Creation of Center for first-generation students”
- “Creation of LGBTQIA+ Center for Faculty and Staff”
- “Newbury Center for first-generation students”
- “NIH Training center”
- “HRSA Center of Excellence in MCH”

**STRATEGIES, PRACTICES, AND POLICIES**

Creation of trainings, workshops, and panel sessions (extracurricular)
- “Universal Anti-Racism Training”
- “Annual all-school retreats with DEI components, often with outside consultants/trainers”
- “Teaching and Learning Series and Annual Teaching Symposium”
- “Regular DEI training and workshops”
- “PATIENTS program in the School of Pharmacy”
- “Panel sessions and workshops (AR)”
- “Training and curricular opportunities”
Infusion of DEIJ and critical race practices (e.g., in admissions, curricula, and practica)
- “Curricular infusion into the UGPH (AR) that meets GE requirements”
- “The addition of an undergraduate minor in public health equity and social justice”

Funding (e.g., scholarships for students, faculty opportunities)
- “Funding, pilot grant award opportunities that could focus on DEI”
- “Funding to increase the pursuit of PH”

Research in DEIJ and AR (e.g., Geospatial Health Research Lab)
- “Research working in the community using a SDOH focus and alternative response model”
- “Research Prioritization (D&I) by developing innovative solution and establishing best practices”
- “Practicum experiences and research projects”

Leadership commitment (e.g., P&T support for diverse faculty and awards)
- “Leadership commitment to DEI”
- “Engage community leaders who train and support research in true collaborative work”
- “Leaders Igniting Generational Healing and Transformational (LIGHT) offering biannual literary journal in public health, a festival and a creative writing in public health summer camp for children.”

Integration of DEIJ and AR principles into the academic culture (e.g., faculty expectations, program evaluations, human resources, P&T criteria)
- “Recommend all units re-evaluate promotion and tenure criteria to ensure DEI values are reflected in faculty expectations”
- “Integration of DEI within Human Resources”
- “P&T support for diverse faculty”
- “Integration of AR principles into program evaluations and work within partners.”

Visibility (e.g., creation of website, posting, school mission statements)
- “Required DEI statement in website profiles”
- “Webpage Posting”

Engagement of the community in bi-directional activities
- “Community research engagement and participation”
- “Community practice engagement and participation”
Methods and Means (the “How?”)

The second environmental scan question asked how the structures, policies, practices, opportunities, strategies and/or initiatives reported in the prior response have been implemented. Respondents reported various methods and means to fulfill the objective(s) of the previously listed activity or action, yielding 101 responses in total. The major open-ended answers are summarized in the following table.

*Post-survey, “sweat equity” was confirmed as defined by the respondent to mean “sustained effort; hard work” (Wordnik, 2023)*

Table 3: How the activities reported in Table 1 have been or will be implemented to promote, ensure, or advance inclusive excellence through an anti-racism lens in academic public health, across all drivers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSE CATEGORIES</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workgroups, committees, trainings/workshops, meetings, and open calls for engagement in these activities</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding (e.g., positions, programs, pilot grants, community partnerships, scholarships)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEIJ programming (e.g., seminars, listening sessions, celebrations, speaker series, book club)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-level leadership backing</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syllabus and course review, curricular focus area created, and adaptation of problem-based learning</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication (e.g., website, annual report, strategic plan creation)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentorship, advising support, or individual-level commitments</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varying modalities implemented (e.g., virtual, in-person, hybrid)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launch of center or office</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate surveys</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Sweat equity&quot;*</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance evaluation includes inclusive excellence</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment of students</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility (e.g., in hiring and job performance)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other responses</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>101</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excerpts from how the activities or actions have been implemented follow:

**Workgroups, committees, trainings/workshops, meetings, and open calls for engagement in these activities**
- “Workshops to have faculty discuss tool, interpretation of criteria”
- “Trainings are well-done and most appreciate this”
- “Call for engagement in school-wide committees; Departments and centers have their own committees”
- “Started a DEI working group to determine strategies and processes to attract and retain students, faculty and staff”
- “Open meetings”

**Funding (e.g., positions, programs, pilot grants, community partnerships, scholarships)**
- “Seed funding”
- “Participation and funding (in the form of salary support) for faculty fellows”
- “Programs and funding”
- “Funded Partnerships”
- “Funded programs more easily managed”

**DEIJ programming (e.g., seminars, listening sessions, celebrations, speaker series, book club)**
- “Sponsored seminars, and other activities’”
- “New sessions and seminars on various topics”
- “Listening session”
- “#Occupyxx a Diversity speaker Series, Atlas week, and the annual MLK tribute”
- “Inclusion of speakers across the US”

**High-level leadership backing**
- “Contributions from university leadership”
- “Leadership Program (Inclusive Excellence)”
- “Annual reporting out of achievements to leadership”
RESULTS

Syllabus and course review, curricular focus area created, and adaptation of problem-based learning
- “Adapted Rutger’s syllabus review”
- “Using problem-based teaching”
- “Created focus areas onto recruitment retention”
- “Created focus area to increase scholarly output and funding”

Communication (e.g., website, annual report, strategic plan creation)
- “New website for the center”
- “School posts draft from annual review for use in website profiles”
- “Creation of a strategic plan with goals for faculty, staff, and students.”

Mentorship, advising support, or individual-level commitments
- “Advising and support of organization that hold diversity and inclusion among their top priorities”
- “Dean mentoring students”

Impact (The “So What?” Factor)

The third environmental scan question, “What has been the impact?” sought to discern whether there was a difference or change resulting from the activity(ies) implemented. Impact analysis of the findings in this study follows three models:

Table 4: Three models of evaluation consulted for this environmental scan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVALUATION MODEL</th>
<th>WHAT IT SHOWS</th>
<th>WHY IT IS USEFUL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The Kirkpatrick model of evaluating training and education (Kirkpatrick Partners, 2023) | The efficacy of teaching and learning | Demonstrates trainees’/students’:
  - Reactions to their learning (level 1)
  - Degree to which they acquired the “intended knowledge, skills, attitude, confidence, and commitment based on their participation” (level 2)
  - Application of their learning in practice situations or in real-life settings (level 3)
  - Influence or effect on targeted outcomes as a direct result of the learning (level 4) |
### Outcome evaluation

(Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2023)

The “degree to which the program is having an effect on the target population’s behaviors”

Reveals “whether the program is being effective in meeting it’s [sic] objectives”

### Impact evaluation

The “degree to which the program meets its ultimate goal”

Provides evidence for use in policy and funding decisions

The total impact statements numbered 154 of which 126 (76%) were categorized as promising or positive. Nine of the 10 respondents indicated promising or positive impacts and one respondent from a DEI-challenged state indicated zero promising impacts. Responses listed as promising or positive are categorized in five sub-categories summarized in the sequence shown in the following table.

**Table 5: Promising or positive impacts, differences, or change resulting from the activity(ies) to promote, ensure, or advance inclusive excellence through an anti-racism lens in academic public health, across all drivers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSE CATEGORIES</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Changes in Practices, Target Populations, Norms, Policies, and Visibility</strong></td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved practices</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased recruitment, applications, enrollment, hiring, and/or retention of target populations</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of a culture, norms, and values, and/or climate</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy change/mandates (curricular, teaching, etc.)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced visibility/Influence/Reputation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infrastructure Building Processes</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building of connections and working relationships/Engaging drivers</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of new entities/Positions/Leadership/Points of contact</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affinity and community building/Support</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication about resources/Information dissemination</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual Learning and Participation</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciation/Positive feedback [Level 1, Reaction-Kirkpatrick]</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment/Improved KSAs and commitments [Level 2, Behavior-Kirkpatrick]</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure/Awareness raising</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Products</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing events and programs (curricular and non-curricular)/Facilitating spaces</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding/Awards/Resources/Etc.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production of reports, recommendations, tools, etc.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Readiness and Planning Processes</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarifying and identifying an approach</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building a foundation/Planning for the work</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>126</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Illustrative excerpts from each of the major response sub-categories follow:

**CHANGES IN PRACTICES, TARGET POPULATIONS, NORMS, POLICIES, AND VISIBILITY**

Improved practices

- “**All faculty now have a DEI statement and must update it annually** as part of annual review with their chair/supervisor - this keeps DEI work front of mind”
- "The School create[d] **new guiding principles for working with the city**. Each department has a representative on the committee, along with community members. The principles include points related compensation, data, sharing power, etc."
- “**More consistent application of DEI principles** in recruitment, admission, and hiring”
- “**Very positive impact, especially within units initiatives can be tailored to the local culture**"
Increased recruitment, applications, enrollment, hiring, and/or retention of target populations

- “Hiring of more faculty of color”
- “Retention of faculty”
- “The undergrad PH major has grown exponentially over the last ten years. It is in high demand by students.”
- “Increased applications”
- “Increased diversity of the faculty and staff”
- “More students taking courses that help develop an understanding of the complexities of living in increasingly diverse and interconnected societies.”

Establishment of a culture, norms, and values, and/or climate

- “Elevation of DEI as values that need to be evidenced across units”
- “Established a culture across the campuses that includes equity and diversity among its most important values”
- “Norming of using anti-racism principles among faculty to promote inclusive excellence”

Policy change/Mandates (curricular, teaching, etc.)

- “The impact of the performance evaluation has been to institutionalize the annual opportunity for faculty to reflect on what they engaged in to advance anti-racism.”
- “Now [the course] is a 3-credit quarter long class that is offered twice per year and required for Epi students (Started as a year-long elective 1 credit journal club focused on frameworks, methods, and practical application of anti-racism in research)”
- “Juneteenth is now a paid Univ holiday”

Enhanced visibility/Influence/Reputation

- “Increased media presence of not just xx but also the issues the faculty are focused on.”
- “Has influenced Provost in decisions related to support for faculty diversity.”
- “Positive reputation in community”

INFRASTRUCTURE BUILDING PROCESSES

Building of connections and working relationships/Engaging drivers

- “All incoming students, faculty and staff given selected book in summer to read allowing for early engagement of incoming students”
- “Students who engage in the organizations have found it very rewarding and have a higher level of engagement with the School”

Creation of new entities/Positions/Leadership/Points of contact

- “A group chose to spin up the Student Advisory Board for the ARCH Center which brought student voice in selecting priorities for anti-racist programming and research”
- “My position has had a positive impact for the school. An active DEI infrastructure within xx has been built”
Affinity and community building/Support
- “These committees are the anchors for advancing our inclusion and belonging efforts for students from minoritized backgrounds. Students are able to find community, advocate for issues that affect and alert us of any instances of inequity or bias.”
- “more explicit faculty support to intentionally use theoretical frameworks and instructional strategies to promote inclusive excellence in the classroom”

Communication about resources/Information dissemination
- “Explicit communication of resources, EDI structures, bias reporting, enrichment/pathways programming, climate survey results, required training”
- “The Staff Council developed, implemented, and disseminated the results from the first ever xx Staff Satisfaction Survey”

Individual Learning and Participation

Appreciation/Positive feedback [Level 1, Reaction-Kirkpatrick]
- “Faculty who attend and participate appreciate the space and feel well supported”
- “We’ve received overall positive course evaluations about the content of the foundational courses.”

Empowerment/Improved KSAs and commitments [Level 2, Behavior-Kirkpatrick]
- “empowerment of students to lead and support programs that center URM student issues (first gens, international students, minority racial/ethnic groups, etc.).”
- “Increased critical consciousness regarding the impact of oppressive ideologies and systems of power on health outcomes/inequities”

Exposure/Awareness raising
- “Students are introduced to the DEI principles and values that we are asking [them] to abide by and consider in all of their academic and other campus activities.”

Products

Implementing events and programs (curricular and non-curricular)/Facilitating spaces
- “implementation of Universal Anti-Racism Training (UART)”
- “increased availability of educational activities aimed at students and trainees”
- “We have new courses on structural racism”

Funding/Awards/Resources/Etc.
- “We are awarding 5…scholarships to incoming master’s students for the first time!”
- “The funding of and publishing about health equity issues in Public Health -- particularly with regard to the effects of racism on health and health policy -- has increased”
- “The impact on extramural funds in this research priority area has been profound.”
RESULTS

Production of reports, recommendations, tools, etc.
- “Tremendous! This past year the DEI committees provided a 42 page report of DEI / anti-racism related activity. It was such an explosion of effort!”
- “We have seen several changes with the group, very strong recommendations to the Dean's Office”

READINESS AND PLANNING PROCESSES

Clarifying and identifying an approach
- “These changes were important in making it clear that the work of DEI, advancing equity and anti-racism principles do not belong to student affinity groups only, but the entire set of xx student organizations.”
- “Identification of priority education, training, and policy needs for all employees and students rooted in critical consciousness, global citizenship education, and community-based learning.”

Building a foundation/Planning for the work
- “At the school level, this workplan was the first ever articulation of DEI priorities, goals and strategies”
- “The [Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning] has developed momentum on the campus”

Of the remaining 28 non-promising or neutral impact responses, one was marked as “minimal,” six responses indicated the respondent did not know or was not aware, and the remaining 21 responses were “inconclusive” (for example, the respondent noted that the implementation of the activity is in progress, the impact is pending, “not clear,” or N/A.) No respondents indicated negative or unintended impacts. See these findings in Table 6 below.

Table 6: Non-promising or Non-positive Impacts resulting from the activity(ies) to promote, ensure, or advance inclusive excellence through an anti-racism lens in academic public health, across all drivers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSE CATEGORIES</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Don’t Know/Not Aware</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconclusive (e.g., impact is pending, N/A, or not clear)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESULTS

Three respondents indicated more than one kind of impact in four cases (n=4 conflicting impacts), as shown below:

1. One respondent who indicated a "profound" impact on extramural funding adding that it is "less clear the impact on external partners."

2. Another respondent indicated in two unique responses:
   a. That their position has had a positive impact for the school in that "An active DEI infrastructure within xx has been built" but that they "Can't say" regarding the overall impact
   b. The Vice Provost office has been "helpful" for their role, but that the overall impact is "Hard to tell"

3. The third respondent indicated that the university's strategic plan includes DEI and that "Juneteenth is now a paid Univ holiday," but notes the overall impact is "Mixed!" and that how the plan is "being translated into policy and programmatic change, and behavior change, is unclear"

Barriers and Facilitators

The fourth environmental scan question asked: “What have been barriers or facilitators to implementation?” as they relate to achieving inclusive excellence through an anti-racism lens across all drivers. The major open-ended answers addressing the 90 reported barriers are summarized in Table 7 below.

Table 7: Barriers to implementing inclusive excellence through an anti-racism lens in academic public health, across all drivers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSE CATEGORIES</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation/Engagement/Motivation/Confidence/Adoption is less than optimal</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competing demands on drivers’ time/Lack of capacity/Lack of incentives for drivers</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drivers at different stages of understanding/Expertise/Awareness/Deployment</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of money/Resources/Staffing/Opportunities (e.g., journals to publish)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-DEI legislation or political/social climate not supportive of DEI</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pushback (faculty = 5; students = 1; both faculty and students = 1)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mistrust of the university</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large scope/Spectrum of effort</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other responses – listed once</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Illustrative excerpts for each of the major barriers follow:

Participation/Engagement/Motivation/Confidence/Adoption is less than optimal
- “Faculty who need to work on these issues **often do not attend**”
- “The Council is quite new and the leaders were a bit **reluctant to take on so much responsibility** outside of their normal work effort”
- “**Not being bold enough** in communicating its agenda for fear of alienating supporters”
- “The trainings are presented as **mandatory (but it isnt [sic] clear that this can be enforced)**”
- “The school has tried to make it easy for faculty but **some have yet to develop and post a [mandatory] statement**”

Competing demands on drivers’ time/Lack of capacity/Lack of incentives for drivers
- “**We need more than 1 hour per month!**”
- “**lack of community capacity** to engage in extra steps that are part of bureaucratic [sic] processes”
- “As an R1 institution, faculty are still told to focus on research--this type of work is relegated to service which is **not as valued in promotion and tenure process**”

Drivers at different stages of understanding/Expertise/Awareness/Deployment
- “**Faculty are at very different stages along the continuum** and trainings not targeted to faculty level of interest/acceptance”
- “**limited capacity of faculty to measure** what actually happens in the classroom”
- “Those in leadership or decision-making positions **not understanding DEI values or how to apply them** in recruitment and retention processes”
- “**not all colleges utilize this faculty performance evaluation section** on inclusive excellence”

Lack of money/Resources/Staffing/Opportunities (e.g., journals to publish)
- “obtaining sustained operational **funding**”
- “much of the **(Goldman) software** used by student affairs is 15-20 years behind state of the art, making much of the data-based work incredibly difficult and tedious”
- “**under-staffing** leading to burnout and less-than desired outcomes”
- “**few opportunities or journals willing to publish** this work”

Anti-DEI legislation or political/social climate not supportive of DEI
- ”As we await the Supreme Court decision, **we anticipate that we may have to make institutional changes** to be compliant”
- “**current political / social climate** in the state”
Pushback
- “push-back from faculty, especially as discussions continue to require anti-racism as part of diversity credit [with 5/7 responses tagged for faculty]”
- “pushback from students when felt those 2 objectives [teaching anti-racism in research in an epi class] were in conflict”
- “resistance by faculty and students to require courses about differences of experience, culture, inequity”

The major open-ended answers addressing the 61 reported facilitators are summarized below in Table 8.

Table 8: Facilitators to implementing inclusive excellence through an anti-racism lens in academic public health, across all drivers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSE CATEGORIES</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supportive drivers (e.g., leading change, representing, deploying $, mentoring, etc.)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty or administrator skill/Expertise</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student affairs office/Students</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonization of material/Consistent offerings</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations for drivers to show up, contribute, etc.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy or guidelines</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other responses – listed one time only</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>61</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESULTS

Illustrative excerpts from the major facilitators’ response categories follow:

Supportive drivers (e.g., leading change, representing, deploying $, mentoring, etc.)
- “support staff in Dean’s office”
- “the Vice Provost was encouraging all Deans to establish a DEI director or dean-level position for each graduate school”
- “support from graduate students, chairs, and supervisors”
- “supportive Faculty Senate”
- “support from the dean overrode financial barriers”
- “alumni and donors that support DEI principles and effort”
- “additional mentorship sessions with the Deans”

Faculty or administrator skill/Expertise
- “faculty with commitment and expertise to revamp the curriculum”
- “skilled facilitation, collaboration, and leadership of Black administrators”

Student affairs office/Students
- “A great Student Affairs department that already has a comprehensive Orientation schedule and their decision to "center" the DEI modules/session as critical for incoming students”
- “Eagerness of students to concretely change learning dynamics to incorporate racial consciousness while valuing individual positionality, especially experiences with interlocking systems of oppression”

Funding
- “received seed grant money for units to implement DEI pilot projects, online set of resources”
- “sustained funding from the Dean’s Office”

Harmonization of material/Consistent offering
- “We also harmonized the DEI modules together with all of the other academic advising, educational materials that students received into one Canvas site. This creates easy access and students see that DEI is foundational in the school’s expectations of being a ‘xx Citizen’”
- “consistent offering of class across academic year at same time and place which is the same every year and part of the decision for whether students apply”
Sustainability

The fifth and final environmental scan question, “What is required for sustainability?” sought to elicit requirements for sustaining inclusive excellence through an anti-racism lens. The question yielded 146 responses, as indicated below in Table 9.

Table 9: Sustainability requirements for inclusive excellence through an anti-racism lens in academic public health, across all drivers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSE CATEGORIES</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support, commitment, leadership, communications, and/or engagement from drivers</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual actions, leadership/Political will, commitment, effort, expertise, and/or intentionality/Attending to duty</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration/Institutionalization of change, Infrastructure building, Mobilizing across multiple levels</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy and mandates or requirements leveraged by a structure (entity or position)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular practice and deployment</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstration and/or communication of value or impact/Positive testimonials</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear goals and outcomes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing and promotion</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>146</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESULTS

Illustrative excerpts from the major sustainability response categories follow:

Support, commitment, leadership, communications, and/or engagement from various drivers
- “Continued commitment on the part of the University to support funding” [university level = 3 responses]
- “Commitment and availability of the Dean” [unit level = 18 responses]
- “University and college-level leadership must demonstrate commitment and resources (as applicable) for these efforts” [both university and unit levels = 5 responses]
- “Support of the faculty to take advantage of various programs” [faculty = 6 responses]
- “Commitment [by staff] to completing these important trainings regularly” [staff = 2 responses]
- “Volunteer (student) DEI Ambassadors” [students = 2 responses]
- “We need more engagement [from students, faculty, and staff], otherwise program should not continue” [students, faculty, and staff = 1 response]
- “Continued support from the state are [sic] essential, as ultimately each xx campus is beholden to the legislature’s budgetary whims and the Regents policy directives” [state/community/partners = 7 responses]

Resources
- “They have been successful in maintaining [sic] funding but diversifying their funding stream would be advantageous in the long-term” [funding = 15]
- “Continued enthusiasm for faculty to provide service effort in each department or unit” [general =11]
- “Continued and expanded staffing” [hiring/staffing = 9]
- “Continued professional development for faculty” [training = 3]

Individual actions, leadership/political will, commitment, effort, expertise, and/or intentionality/attending to duty
- “Asst Dean (or a chairman) has to pull the teams together or individual departments will do their own thing in silo - and often without knowledge of available resources or collaboration opportunities”
- “Dept faculty or staff to provide committee leadership”
- “Motivated staff members from each dept/unit who will support the chairs and overall purpose of the Council”
- “Given the political/social climate in Texas, the main thing required for sustainability is people willing to do the work, no matter how tough it might be”
- “Ability of institutional staff to think and do “outside the box””
- “Faculty to remain intentional in structuring class sessions this way”
Integration/Institutionalization of change, Infrastructure building, Mobilizing across multiple levels

- "incorporation of anti-racism principles in bodies that influence science, research, and the practice that is informed by it (e.g., NASEM, USPSTF, CPSTF)"
- "Integration within HR policies and practices which then inform policies and practices at the unit level"
- "Buy-in from across the Univ"
- "infrastructure"
- "bold, strategic leadership, organizing, and mobilizing at multiple levels (faculty, staff, students, admin, alum, community)"

Policy and mandates or requirements leveraged by a structure (entity or position)

- "faculty code which supports the need for this type of curriculum"
- "This is now built into the asynchronous foundational courses that all MPH students must complete"
- "by-laws"
- "Ideally, it would be good to have formal school-wide and departmental / program policies developed and evaluated on a regular basis"

Regular practice and deployment

- “opportunities to practice ASL skills regularly”
- “daily activities of the university, etc.”
- “Faculty need to be open to addressing their own prejudices and beliefs”
- “need to continue to review syllabi regularly as part of an ongoing process”

Demonstration and/or communication of value or impact/Positive testimonials

- “She will need to demonstrate impact to expand her footprint/resources”
- “Need commitment from leadership and faculty and staff to speak out about the value of the awards”
- “developing a sense of their value which will take leadership engagement”
The responses in this report demonstrate activities underway (or in development) that promote, ensure, or advance inclusive excellence through an anti-racism lens in or in collaboration with academic public health for each of the five drivers. The findings are anticipated to be of use in offering guidance for additional probing and exploration, testing, adaptation, adoption, and/or highlighting opportunities and gaps that other institutions may consider as they initiate or advance similar DEIJ and/or AR work.

Notable observations follow:

None of the activities in Table 2 demonstrated systems or procedures but rather indicated a rich array of structures, spaces, strategies, practices, and policies the respondents have led or observed that advance inclusive excellence through an anti-racism lens. However, much of the work appears siloed. For example, of the 114 activities revealed in Table 2, only a small proportion include multi-pronged activities, integration of content or practices across spaces, or mobilization of efforts and resources among drivers or in different settings, as follows:

- Twelve represent “Infusion of DEIJ and critical race practices (e.g., in admissions, curricula, and practica)”
- Six represent “Integration of DEIJ and AR principles into the academic culture (e.g., faculty expectations, program evaluations, human resources, P&T criteria)”
- Five exemplify “Engagement of the community in bi-directional activities”

Wrapping around or otherwise coordinating, combining, and/or integrating the most successful activities across drivers and/or throughout multiple spaces and settings in is of potential value for multiplying opportunities and institutionalizing systems-wide efforts for greater impact. Along these lines, the bulk of activity in Table 2 lies in the realm of strategies, practices, and policies undertaken by individuals or what may represent atomized groups rather than cross-collaborating bodies that could more effectively advance inclusive excellence work. There are few examples that mention linking content or connecting drivers in mutual efforts, for example “community stakeholders who train and support academic researchers.”
DISCUSSION

In Table 3, methods and means of implementing the listed activities indicated a wide variety of expected approaches, with the four top areas near each other: funding, DEIJ programming, high-level leadership backing, and curricular methods (such as syllabus and course review and creating a curricular focus area).

Table 5 reveals promising impact data with 126 responses flagged as promising or positive and with nearly 40% of those responses indicating actual “changes in practices, target populations, norms, policies, and visibility.” However, more systematic measurement of progress towards goals and objectives is needed. Responses in this category range from: improved practices; increased recruitment, applications, enrollment, hiring, and/or retention of target populations; establishment of a culture, norms, and values, and/or climate; policy change/mandates (curricular, teaching, etc.); to enhanced visibility/influence/reputation.

Other significant impact data include:
- infrastructure building processes (such as the building of connections and working relationships; creation of new entities, positions, and leadership; and affinity and community building)
- individual learning and participation (such as appreciation for programming and skill building gained from workshops)
- the generation of products (such as events, programs, spaces for activity, funding, reports, etc.)
- readiness and planning processes (such as clarifying and identifying an approach or building a foundation for later work).

Inconclusive impacts (21 in total) shown in Table 6, indicating the impact of an activity is pending, N/A, or not clear, suggest the need for additional time, ability, staff support, resources, and/or incentives to determine potential results. It is important to note that analysis of the impact statements reveal only three instances of respondents indicating they have supportive metrics to back up the claim, keeping in mind that the environmental scan did not explicitly inquire about evaluation or request data to support the respondents’ statements.

The top barrier in Table 7 reveals the optional nature of the majority of DEIJ activity in that the main observation reported points to a lack of participation/engagement/motivation/confidence/adoption. The data show some instances of policies not followed, such as faculty opting not to post a DEI statement on their faculty profile, which could be rectified by follow-through, where feasible and in DEIJ-friendly states, and discerning ways to hold responsible parties/units accountable for conforming to policies. A close second barrier shows competing demands on drivers’ time/lack of capacity/lack of incentives for drivers, indicating how stretched or under-supported individuals are for engaging in inclusive excellence work. An important third barrier is that individuals are at different stages of understanding, have various levels of expertise or awareness, or vary in their deployment of inclusive excellence strategies, suggesting the possibility for tailoring content and strategies for different participants’ levels.
Sustainability factors in Table 9 represent a strong set of 146 observations ripe for further exploration and deeper investigation. The top response shows general support, commitment, leadership, communications, and/or engagement from various drivers as critical for maintaining inclusive excellence through an anti-racism lens. The second response with nearly as many responses is resources. The third category returns to a point made already in the impact findings – individuals’ action, leadership/political will, commitment, effort, expertise, and/or intentionality/attending to duty – that much inclusive excellence work is driven by personal endeavors. The fourth category indicates another point from the impact findings, the value of integration/institutionalization of change, infrastructure building, and mobilizing across multiple levels to continue and advance this work. The fifth response category demonstrates policy and mandates or requirements leveraged by a structure (entity or position), which was offered in just 8% of the total responses. This area is one that could be leveraged to demonstrate results and increase impact. Two lesser response categories show regular practice and deployment and the demonstration and/or communication of value or impact/positive testimonials as additional, potentially useful means of sustaining the work and extending influence.

Facilitators in Table 8 are heavily weighted toward supportive human drivers, with nearly half of the total responses in the facilitator pool demonstrating individuals leading change (i.e., champions), representing the issues, deploying money, and mentoring, along with other helpful actions. Much smaller sets of facilitators indicate faculty or administrator skill or expertise in this area; student affairs office staff or students who support and/or advance the work; funding; and the harmonization of material/consistent offerings that enable the uptake of DEIJ offerings. It is important to note that most of the drivers across all categories represent individuals’ actions as opposed to collective group actions, pointing toward an area of potential future emphasis for increased effectiveness.

The fourth barrier bundles lack of money/resources/staffing/opportunities (e.g., journals to publish) and is indicative of overall under-resourcing in this important area. The fifth barrier includes anti-DEI legislation, which is difficult to counter from the academic public health perspective; however, the other aspect of this barrier, that the political/social climate is not supportive of DEI, where not thwarted by the specter of anti-DEI mandates, retains the potential for proactively influencing the environment for change. The sixth and final significant barrier (there are others with smaller numbers) reveals straight-up pushback, with faculty leading the resistance in nearly every reported instance.
STRENGTHS
The response rate of 71% (10 of the 14 expert panel members participated) was strong. The resulting data yielded important themes that will be useful in promoting, ensuring, and/or advancing inclusive excellence through an anti-racism lens in academic public health, across all drivers both in Framing the Future 2030 educational efforts and across ASPPH’s DEIJ initiatives.

LIMITATIONS
Limitations of the scan include a small sample size from which to make comparisons, generalize, and draw conclusions. Of the 10 respondents’ states, there were two sets of overlapping states, therefore only eight states were represented. Additionally, the scan resulted in uneven participation among the two main types of ASPPH members, schools vs. programs, and kind of institution, public vs. private, as compared with their representation in the ASPPH membership at the time of the study. Eight (80%) of the scan respondents represent schools of public health vs. 64 schools (45%) in the ASPPH membership and two (20%) scan respondents represent programs of public health vs. 77 programs (55%) in the ASPPH membership. The ratio of private to public institutions in the sample also does not match the ASPPH membership with 40% from private institutions in the sample, as compared with 60% in ASPPH membership, and with 60% representing public institutions in the scan sample, vs. 40% in the membership.

Unique factors at additional, potentially DEIJ-advanced as well as its opposite, DEIJ-challenged, ASPPH-member institutions, may have been missed in respondents’ reports. Data may have been lacking from insufficient time or attention to respond or due to a lack of full information about the multiplicity of drivers’ activities, implementation, impacts, barriers, and facilitators sought, potentially rendering the data incomplete. Respondents did indicate that, on average, filling out the extensive qualitative and open-ended scan took between 90 minutes to three hours, a hefty obstacle considering busy administrators’ time and energy.

Only one representative contributed to the study from each of the 10 institutions represented and each participant’s responses should not be taken to represent the full complement of systems, structures, policies, procedures, practices, opportunities, strategies and/or initiatives of that institution. There is the possibility of respondent (courtesy/social desirability) bias, especially given the fact of a 14-member sample strongly vested both personally and professionally in desiring success in DEIJ activity.
CONCLUSION

This report illuminates a small sample of ASPPH-member school and program activity in DEIJ and AR underway (or in development) that promotes, ensures, or advances inclusive excellence through an anti-racism lens within or in collaboration with academic public health for each of the five Framing the Future drivers.

Through their panel work, in general, and via inputs into this environmental scan, specifically, the respondents are demonstrating accountability, a shared vision, leadership, intentionality, and perseverance in vital inclusive excellence, diversity, equity, social justice, and anti-racist work. Some are operating in friendly environments and can advance multiple objectives that gain sticking power in a reinforcing system of positive feedback loops. Others, particularly one respondent in a severely DEI-challenged state, is not able to begin or complete inclusive excellence through an anti-racism lens work, giving voice to the difficulty and frustration of the situation for ASPPH members in similar situations. Since the Students for Fair Admissions v. Harvard ruling (Students for Fair Admissions v. Harvard, 600 U.S. 181 (2023)) (Supreme Court of the United States, 2023) was rendered in June 2023 after the environmental scan was completed in April, subsequent restrictions are likely to influence DEIJ and AR activity, particularly in certain states.

Regardless, this scan effectively serves to support two ASPPH strategic objectives:

1.2: Advance the journey on diversity, equity, inclusion, and social justice in academic public health

3.2: Advance teaching, learning, research, practice, and scholarship to meet the evolving needs of the field (Association of Schools and Programs of Public Health, 2022)

for enhancing school and program of public health relevance, credibility, and effectiveness in responding to DEIJ and AR challenges and opportunities in both academic public health and society.
CONCLUSION

It also confirms the Dismantling Racism Framework’s immediate, intermediate, and long-term strategies as recommended for “Domain 1: Education, Pedagogy, and Training” as appropriate, namely:

- Educational programming for students to become public health professionals
- Professional development learning opportunities for faculty, staff, and community-based organizations to dismantle racism and advance health equity.

Requiring trainings and assuring accountability for participation in dismantling racism initiatives along with each component recommended in the Dismantling Racism Framework’s immediate strategy areas resonate across IE panel’s environmental scan findings. In addition, the environmental scan reveals evidence for each recommendation in the Framework’s intermediate and long-term strategy recommendations, excluding establishing and requiring an Inclusion, Diversity, Equity, and Antiracism (IDEA) Certificate program.

The scan’s key findings point the way towards important objectives for academic public health suggesting both: (a) an opportunity to systematically and intentionally wrap around, coordinate, and integrate DEIJ and AR efforts more across drivers and/or throughout multiple spaces and settings, and (b) a need to address the gap in respondents’ ability to measure evidence-based indicators of success

Activities and lessons learned from this environmental scan not only served as a foundation for the final work product of the expert panel, but also is anticipated help inspire members to populate ASPPH’s Academic Public Health Resources Hub, a members-only online repository for collecting resources, tools, and promising practices. Indeed, resources from activities reported in the scan represent living and breathing examples and lessons from other members’ exploration, testing, adaptation, and/or adoption in one’s local setting.

This study is expected to offer robust direction for recommendations and action planning across all five Framing the Future 2030 drivers that could transform structures, spaces, strategies, practices, and policies that promote inclusive excellence through an anti-racism lens in academic public health. At this critical juncture in history, the IE expert panel hopes the findings from this environmental scan are useful in offering an evidence base for co-creating a world where every person is valued and has opportunities to reach their fullest potential.
APPENDIX A:

INCLUSIVE EXCELLENCE THROUGH AN ANTI-RACISM LENS PANEL CHARGE

To succeed in achieving social justice, inclusive excellence, and anti-racism, we aim to deliver a resilient education system for public health that includes:

- University (including school and program) governance, leadership, and administration of systems, structures, policies, practices, procedures, and norms that promote high-quality, inclusive, and equitable teaching and learning
- Faculty who are trained in and deliver on the commitment to social justice, inclusive excellence, and anti-racism in their teaching, research, practice, and service
- Staff (in administrative roles) who are trained in delivering on the commitment to social justice, inclusive excellence, and anti-racism in their professional activities
- Students, including post-doctoral trainees, and other learners who engage actively with others from diverse backgrounds, settings, professions, and sectors, and who are trained in and deliver on the commitment to social justice, inclusive excellence, and anti-racism in their professional activities
- Partners (in collaboration with academe) with whom we commit to respectful, authentic, constructive, and ongoing dialogue and bidirectional learning.
APPENDIX B:
ENVIRONMENTAL SCAN QUESTIONS

GOVERNANCE, LEADERSHIP, AND ADMINISTRATION

1a. What are the university-level systems, structures, and/or policies in place (or in development) that promote, ensure, or advance inclusive excellence through an anti-racism lens within academic public health?
   a. How have they been implemented?
   b. What has been the impact?
   c. What have been barriers or facilitators to implementation?
   d. What is required for sustainability?

1b. What are the unit-level (e.g., school, department, program) policies, procedures, and/or practices in place (or in development) that promote, ensure, or advance inclusive excellence through an anti-racism lens within academic public health?
   a. How have they been implemented?
   b. What has been the impact?
   c. What have been barriers or facilitators to implementation?
   d. What is required for sustainability?

FACULTY

2. What are faculty currently doing or planning to do in research, teaching, and practice to promote/advance/ensure inclusive excellence through an anti-racism lens within academic public health?
   a. How have the strategies or activities been implemented?
   b. What has been the impact?
   c. What have been barriers or facilitators to implementation?
   d. What is required for sustainability?

STAFF

3. What are staff currently doing or planning to do to promote/advance/ensure inclusive excellence through an anti-racism lens within academic public health?
   a. How have the strategies or activities been implemented?
   b. What has been the impact?
   c. What have been barriers or facilitators to implementation?
   d. What is required for sustainability?
APPENDIX B: ENVIRONMENTAL SCAN QUESTIONS

TRAINEES, INCLUDING POST-DOCTORAL TRAINEES, AND STUDENTS

4. What curricular and training opportunities are in place or in development for trainees and students to promote/advance/ensure inclusive excellence through an anti-racism lens within academic public health?
   a. How have the strategies or activities been implemented?
   b. What has been the impact?
   c. What have been barriers or facilitators to implementation?
   d. What is required for sustainability?

PARTNERS

5. What strategies and initiatives are deployed or planned at your institution and/or by faculty to promote bidirectional partnerships, collaborations, and relationships outside of our usual networks to build successful connections for achieving inclusive excellence through an anti-racism lens?
   a. How have the strategies or activities been implemented?
   b. What has been the impact?
   c. What have been barriers or facilitators to implementation?
   d. What is required for sustainability?
### APPENDIX C:
ENVIRONMENTAL SCAN INSTRUMENT (PER THE GOOGLE SHEET)

**Template Answer Sheet**
Responses due by: Friday, March 24 in the yellow-highlighted cells (send questions to Liz Weist at eweist@aspph.org)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DRIVERS</th>
<th>GOVERNANCE, LEADERSHIP, AND ADMINISTRATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q&amp;A QUESTION</td>
<td>What are the university-level systems, structures, and/or policies in place (or in development) that promote, ensure, or advance inclusive excellence through an anti-racism lens within academic public health?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANSWER</td>
<td>How have they been implemented?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DRIVER</th>
<th>FACULTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q&amp;A QUESTION</td>
<td>What are the unit-level (e.g., school, department, program) policies, procedures, and/or practices in place (or in development) that promote, ensure, or advance inclusive excellence through an anti-racism lens within academic public health?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANSWER</td>
<td>How have they been implemented?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DRIVER</th>
<th>STAFF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q&amp;A QUESTION</td>
<td>What are faculty currently doing or planning to do in research, teaching, and practice to promote/advance/ensure inclusive excellence through an anti-racism lens within academic public health?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANSWER</td>
<td>How have they been implemented?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DRIVER</th>
<th>TRAINEES, INCLUDING POST-DOCTORAL TRAINEES, AND STUDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q&amp;A QUESTION</td>
<td>What are faculty currently doing or planning to do in research, teaching, and practice to promote/advance/ensure inclusive excellence through an anti-racism lens within academic public health?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANSWER</td>
<td>How have they been implemented?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DRIVER</th>
<th>PARTNERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q&amp;A QUESTION</td>
<td>What are faculty currently doing or planning to do in research, teaching, and practice to promote/advance/ensure inclusive excellence through an anti-racism lens within academic public health?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANSWER</td>
<td>How have they been implemented?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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