The content of this presentation is based on Belonging Through a Culture of Dignity (chapter 1 in particular) by Dr. Floyd Cobb and John Krownapple.

Ch. 1 includes that cautionary tale of "The Streetlight Effect," which represents confirmation bias and our tendency to look for answers/solutions to problems where everyone else is looking (under the streetlight), instead of venturing into the darkness, where the solutions reside.

The Cycle of Dysfunctional Equity Work represents a predictable, recursive pattern of behavior taken by organizations in response to the issues that emerge from diversity and social inequality/injustice.

Catalyst/"Uh-oh" incident:
The district or school focuses its attention on equity as a result of some sort of incident.
It could be that disproportionality in student outcomes has been exposed, a hate/bias incident occurred, recognition of the unique challenges present in a rural or urban environment, changing demographics have become apparent, etc.

Catalyst/"Uh-oh" incident:
Brings equity into the spotlight
Statements:
Public commitment to equity – Leaders in organizations say/write/publish things such as “we believe all students can succeed, this is not us, we are against racism/injustice/bias,” etc.
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Problems with implementation:
Then come the predictable problems of implementation, which is why we wrote this book.

Let’s look at a few common strategies that have problematic results. **Disclaimer:** In and of themselves, these strategies aren’t “bad.” **When not part of a comprehensive strategy/approach** guided by deep reflection and a vision of a transformed culture, such strategies often become “problems with implementation.” In the end, frustrations that surround these strategies uphold the inequitable status quo, which keeps the environment ripe for the next catalyst.

**DEI Leadership Positions**
Sometimes positions are created as a response, for example: a “Diversity Executive” is hired. (Saw a bunch of director positions created this summer)
Committees form and take on the work. Sometimes the director forms the committee. In the absence of the director, the sup or CEO tasks the assembly of a committee to address the issue.

Soon, they discover – usually through trial and error – that they are not yet equipped to lead the work. They don't have collective efficacy. Equity passionate does not equal equity competent.

Common strategy of orgs since 2016 (when it experienced a resurgence as part of the presidential election, Clinton’s campaign amplifying/talking about implicit bias). Relying on this training doesn't support the change needed (research shows). Implicit bias training is only the solution if implicit bias is the problem that we’re trying to solve. Usually, the problem is much more complex.

• Can work against accountability: People with long-standing, harmful biases are likely to have views reinforced when trainings present biases as being commonly held.
• Can create a culture of moral licensing (I've received the training, so my actions can't be harmful/bad...they’re inherently moral – after all, I've been "trained.")
• Can lead to increased harm/mistreatment of people with marginalized identities (e.g., reduction in upward mobility)
• Can trigger trauma for those most in need of equity and inclusion.
• Research doesn't support

I know someone: The committee realize they need help. Someone on the committee has heard of someone or seen someone at a conference, and they call that person in to fix things. The person shows up with an en vogue approach or innovation, and the committee, equity advocates, and families most affected get re-enthused.

We’re (re)starting the conversation.
Regardless of quality or intention, the consultant’s work ends up somehow functioning as a train-the-trainer.
Trainings ensued. Often times, they’re reduced to “diversity” workshops...learning about interpersonal differences instead systems of inequity with institutional and structural as well as interpersonal components. Thus, the approach becomes watered down and ineffective. Other times...
... the training becomes divisive and harms relational trust.

The trainings are misguided and/or don’t follow a process of collective consciousness development. For instance, trainings assume that people will talk constructively about racism without first establishing relational trust within a group and preparing themselves with the openness and dialogic skills requisite of such conversations.

People start asking about results and why nothing seems to be changing. Equity-passionate individuals and groups grow disheartened. They wonder, “With this equity commitment, why does everything appear to be business as usual in schools?” Sometimes a governing body (e.g., board of directors, board of ed) requests a report to know what is resulting from their investment or support.

Let’s focus on something practical. The pressure for results increases and drives people to look for pragmatic solutions. They search for answers under the metaphoric streetlight. They gravitate to something “technical” such as how to holding circles in the classroom or toward an approach such as Culturally Responsive Teaching. Attention shifts to this solution so the org can “get equity into the classroom” (where the “rubber meets the road”) so they can get results with students.

Teachers start to request direction – “Just tell us what to do and we’ll do it,” they say. Teachers request tangible strategies or an action checklist. But since equity pedagogies are responsive by nature, there is no prescriptive checklist or mandatory techniques. Frustration ensues. Techniques being implemented eventually fall out of favor (our kids are getting tired of meeting in circles), and the equity initiative becomes “one more thing” to fit into an already crowded schedule.
Educators rationalize the equity in schools as “Just good teaching, after all.” Lacking a prescriptive course of action, many educators rationalize inaction by reducing equity pedagogy to “just good teaching.”

The original public commitment to equity ends up changing the status quo very little, if at all. In fact, the effort has probably done damage through unintended consequences.

- **Damaged relational trust**
- **Undermined the credibility of future equity initiatives**
- **Teachers feel targeted, blamed, and alienated.**
- **Equity passionate colleagues feel equity-defeated.**
- **Money and resources have been wasted.**
- **Our children are the ultimate casualty.**

The equity initiative fades away until the next Catalyst/Uh-Oh incident. Nothing substantially changes within the status quo. The environment remains ripe for Over time, attention shifts to other initiatives. That is, until the next inequity event draws attention back to step one, rebooting the dysfunctional cycle of equity into its next iteration.

Here is the simplest form of the cycle, as displayed in chapter 1 of Belonging Through a Culture of Dignity.
Soooo... If not a mandatory training, then what?

Hope to see you on January 26th! The keynote will focus on building a shared language of the concepts of belonging and dignity, as well as highlighting cases of successful implementation/school transformation using our approach.

Theory of Equity Success
from Ch 8 of Belonging Through a Culture of Dignity.
We need more than a workshop – we need a process within which we apply the “keys” to improvement science and work (take action) to make things better. (Things = practices & policies, etc.)
Keys – 1) vision of INCLUSION, 2) climate of BELONGING, 3) culture of DIGNITY

Stay Connected...
Thank you! Please stay in touch and engaged.

@Jkrownapple
John.Krownapple@gmail.com

If you have questions about our consulting services, focused on professional learning & organizational change through “Belonging and Dignity,” please contact Brian Roy, Executive Director of Partnerships at The Core Collaborative (brian@thecorecollaborative.com). My twitter handle is @jkrownapple, and email is john.krownapple@gmail.com