Make Excellence Belong

100 Statements on Inclusion, Diversity, Equity, Accountability, & Belonging
IDEA & Belonging Playing Cards

E.J. Bahng, Jamal Johnson, Yekaterina Taykalo, & John Hauptman
Make Excellence Belong

100 Statements on Inclusion, Diversity, Equity, Accountability, & Belonging
IDEA & Belonging Playing Cards

by

E.J. Bahng
Jamal Johnson
Yekaterina Taykalo
John Hauptman

Iowa State University
2022, Make Excellence Belong:100 Statements on Inclusion, Diversity, Equity, Accountability, & Belonging, IDEA & Belonging Playing Cards by E.J. Bahng et al. is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution Non-commercial No Derivatives 4.0 International License, except where otherwise noted.

The images were created using StoryboardThat.com.
Dedication

To the Iowa State University (ISU) undergraduate and graduate students, faculty and staff members, and former ISU President Dr. Gregory L. Geoffroy who developed and advocated the ISU Six Principles of Community. They are the following: Respect, Purpose, Cooperation, Richness of Diversity, Freedom from Discrimination, & Honest and Respectful Expression of Ideas.

These principles have taken root as their legacy.
There is an important and unrecognized role for flawed, error-prone cognitive processes in the many evaluations, or judgments of merit that are at the center of our academic institutions.
We should only accept students who have 4.0+ GPAs.

And these processes are indeed flawed in systematic ways.
I know you did all the work you could, we just simply can’t offer you the scholarship.

Our institutions are not strict meritocracies.
It is imperative to articulate these individual psychological processes and their impact.
Flawed individual judgments are at the core of college and university processes of hiring and promotion of faculty. Flawed individual judgements (FIJs) → Reward systems at IHEs. FIJs & institutional processes both operate and they reinforce each other.
IDEA-Belonging # 6

Can you go over the hiring requirements with me again? I'm not sure I've got it all the way yet.

New faculty feel less certain than senior faculty about which job candidates meet “our standards.”
Experts are very confident of their opinions but that expert intuition is not always reliable.
The best predictors of job success related to on-the-job performance are not credentials, personality or first impression.

We are to evaluate a job candidate’s long-term success and actual long-term outcomes.
IDEA-Belonging # 9

Our confidence is unrelated to our accuracy (e.g., a faculty member’s subjective confidence grows over the course of a career).
All human beings, including academic faculty and administrators, are prone to some common kinds of errors in making judgments.
Well, I wouldn't have made this mistake, I'm too smart!

Our extensive academic training and experience build our confidence and make it very unlikely that we will worry about those potential errors or take steps to overcome the well-known but faulty conclusions we are prone to drawing.
We are often confident when we are wrong, and an objective observer is more likely to detect our errors than we are.
IDEA-Belonging # 13

We are making judgments under conditions of uncertainty.

Not all the data are in yet, but I have to make a decision now...
We are to make lots of different kinds of rapid decisions based on the evidence at hand.
Experience-based decision-making strategies (e.g., heuristics, representativeness, availability, and anchoring and adjustment) can be both useful and dangerous. They can lead to seriously biased outcomes that contribute to a highly stratified status quo that is experienced as natural and as reflecting some kind of underlying true merit.
We tend to use poor evidence simply because we have it. We rely on evidence that is not particularly good when hiring faculty—evidence that reflects institutional structures that are highly stratified, segregated, and the result of differential access.
Can you tell the class what Asian people think about Shakespeare?

We rely heavily on “representativeness” or the degree to which a person appears to us to be similar to existing members of the relevant category (e.g., friends, successful faculty).
Similarity (e.g., shared characteristics) is not a particularly good predictor of merit, even though people heavily rely on it.
A particular institutional criterion (based on a single current indicator): Getting degrees or having worked at top-50 institutions may be reasonable evidence that they are likely to be successful in my department, but it is not good evidence that they will be more successful than people who have different training. This criterion may be a function of differential access and stratification process among other irrelevant factors.
We have a tendency to rely on redundant pieces of evidence (several good publications, prestigious journal acceptance, person’s advisor) rather than pieces of evidence from independent domains (e.g., good publication, impressive service, reports of good teaching), which produce higher quality predictions.
If we only assess the journal in terms of its “merit” (i.e., its quality), we may fail to notice that it has different standards for different areas of research. (e.g., newly emerging fields in which women and racial-ethnic minority scholars may be interested).
Seeing some similarity between someone’s current performance on a particular indicator and the outcome desired in the future is actually not a solid basis for prediction of future outcomes, but sometimes it feels like it is to us.
We tend to know people “like us” even within our fields, a phenomenon sometimes called “homophily.” Availability of exemplars might differentially operate on our selection of faculty colleagues (even the differential distribution of scholars with particular backgrounds in various disciplines, as well as the highly differentiated nature of our social networks).
People estimate familiar groups to have larger influence and competence than unfamiliar groups, regardless of the specific evidence they are given (e.g., familiarity, an example of availability).
In my years as a teacher I have found that students involved in clubs get better grades.

We generalize from our own experience (familiarity) to the actual world.
We are particularly vulnerable to errors of judgment based on illusory correlation, Implicit Association Bias (measured by IAT), fast judgments or non-deliberative judgments.
Errors of judgment are common.
Our judgments of individuals are saturated with our expectations about groups, our own past experience, and the status quo.
Anyone with merit could succeed.
Homophily, preferences for similarity, is ubiquitous, the consequences of some forms of homophily are pernicious (e.g., segregation).
We are an equity-based institution! We have "Six Principles of Community."

1. Respect!
2. Purpose!
3. Cooperation!
4. Richness of Diversity!
5. Freedom from Discrimination!
6. Honest Respectful Expression of Ideas

OK, maybe. But I really don't understand that.

People’s egalitarian goals, and their beliefs that they are egalitarian, can lead them to make non-egalitarian choices without realizing they are doing so.
But I can't be racist... I didn't even do anything wrong, at least I don't think I did... I just want the best candidate...

It is difficult for people to be aware of all the ways in which their behavior reflects their unconscious beliefs and attitudes.
Now that I've read this book on race theory and prejudice, I won't make any more mistakes like this.

Our intentions, and genuine egalitarian principles, are not enough to guide our behavior. The combination of small preferences for people like us (homophily) and trust in our good intentions yields behavior that isolates or marginalizes people who are not like us and impedes our capacity to create institutions that are diverse and inclusive.
You all have so much potential!

Excellence is uniformly distributed across different groups.
Leaders are responsible for diversity.
Diversity increases positive outcomes, but only if everyone in the group can contribute his or her best.
Architecture pitch meeting

We've been having a lot of issues when it comes to accessibility in design recently. We need to be more conscious of those choices.

That is an excellent point, thank you for bringing it up.

A diverse group increases the likelihood of a range of solutions and the acceptance of innovations is more likely among a diverse group of people.
Fields are less ready to accept innovations that come from women and people of color, it will be harder to demonstrate the worth of new approaches.
I actually had a good idea about how to reach a wider and more diverse audience this morning!

Inclusion of a broader range of people is likely to appropriately broaden the areas of inquiry.
An intellectual advantage of a diverse faculty for students is that a diverse range of academic interests will be available.
This Candidate reminds me of my buddy Dave, He's probably a good candidate!

Someone’s social group does play a role, overall, whether people think it does or not (e.g., hiring, advancement, retention promotion).
We didn't MEAN to! How were we supposed to know how to pronounce a name that crazy??

Good intentions are not enough. All of us at least occasionally make decisions influenced by the gender, race, ethnicity, or other characteristics of the person we are assessing.
I just don’t want to be her mentor or help her with the learning curve, it’s not worth my time.

There are many cases where one gives or withholds opportunities, politeness, and kindness on the basis of minimal cues (e.g., cursory information about them).
We do not encounter unambiguous behaviors. We are usually faced with ambiguous behaviors that can be interpreted in multiple ways.
When people have a great deal of individuating information, not just cursory information, they are still affected by their beliefs about gender differences.
There are so many boys in your math class. You must be working so hard to keep up!

Regardless of the domain, parents and teachers see boys’ and girls’ academic excellence differently, despite the large amount of individuating information they have (e.g., boys are talented and girls work hard in math and science).
College students are more likely to view their male (vs. their female) professors as brilliant.
IDEA-Belonging # 48

You're just naturally good at this

You just have to try harder!

Parents seem to see talent and effort as inversely related to each other, even though they are compatible.
I want to be an astronaut!

That's nice... fat chance

People attend to individuating information, but they attend differently, depending on the sex of the child or person who is displaying the behavior and depending on the nature of the information.
It is difficult to counter gender bias in part because our views about gender differences are exceptionally detailed.
Schemas are hypotheses that we use to interpret people and social events. All stereotypes are schemas, but not all schemas are stereotypes.
It is possible to create an arbitrary link between visual cues and beliefs about personality, behavior, and intelligence.
Although schema formation is ubiquitous and helpful overall, schemas are a form of “fast” thinking that can lead to error and, when applied to people, can lead to inappropriate perception and treatment of others.
IDEA-Belonging # 54

There is some evidence that both Hispanics and Asian Americans internalize—to some extent—the views of themselves that Whites have of them.

I have to be smart, wealthy, self-reliant, hard-working to be a model-minority?!

AND, I have to be cold but competent?!

Achievement!
Tiger Helicopter Parent!
Everyone knows Asians aren't good athletes.

What do you mean "everyone"?

When people's knowledge of a negative stereotype about them is activated, and the stereotype is in an area that is important to them, their performance suffers (stereotype threat).
You're probably not going to succeed anyway, so why try?

Women for whom math is important perform less well on a math test when they are told that women typically perform worse on it than when they are told that there is no gender difference.
It seems like everybody expects me to be a great writer...a successful, prolific writer...

Expectations do not need to be directly communicated to people to impair their performance.
They don't understand me...I practically stand out here, why do I even try?

Stereotype threat effectively announces that the person does not belong. A corrosive sense of not fitting in, of being unwelcome, is usually accompanied by depressed performance and confirmation of negative stereotypes.
People who are in environments where they feel—and observers feel—that they fit have an easier time.
When African Americans (AAs) and Whites are having a conversation together, different threats are activated. AAs are concerned about appearing competent, believing as they do that Whites are likely to think they are not competent, while Whites are concerned about appearing likable and non-racist, believing as they do that AAs are likely to think they are racist.
Both gender and race-ethnicity produce complex expectations in ourselves and in observers about what we are good at and what we can achieve. Those expectations in turn can enhance or diminish our performance.

I thought Black People were supposed to be Good at basketball!
Gender schemas, hypotheses about what it means to be male or female, skew our perceptions and evaluations of men and women, causing us to overrate men and underrate women.
Gender schemas affect our judgments of people’s competence, ability, and personal characteristics.
Many of our judgments are small everyday events, such as not listening when a woman talks to us or not congratulating a woman on an achievement. These small but frequent occurrences accumulate to advantage men and disadvantage women.
We do not see other people simply as people; we see them as males and females. Once gender schemas are invoked, they work to disadvantage women by directing and skewing our perception, even in the case of objective characteristics like height.
Absent other information, the average is a good measure to go by. At the same time, that strategy has a cost for individuals who are misjudged. When one underestimates people’s abilities or skills, one tends to give those people less credit than they deserve, to ask less of them, and to rob them of their potential growth.
...and after that I'm going to go to a top college and then I'm going to get a good job then....!

I hope she knows that credential is not the only path...

It is tempting to think excellence is straightforward but it is not.
He might not have the good publications but I can't help but like him! He is a good person!

Likability matters (vs. competence). People rated those who were high in likability as better candidates for being placed on a fast track and as better candidates for a highly prestigious upper level position.
Assertive women were seen as not having social skills, they were also seen as less hireable than assertive men.
You're so aggressive!

That's interesting! I just speak up for myself!

Women are in a difficult position. If they are not perceived as competent, they will not get the job. But if they make their competence clear by behaving assertively, they will be seen as lacking social skills and will be downgraded for that reason.
There is a trade-off for women between competence and femininity.
IDEA-Belonging # 72

She fits perfectly to all the required and preferred qualifications. But, she is not friendly and asks too many questions. She might be a difficult person to work with in our department. I don’t think she will be able to build a successful career here!

I think my on-campus interview went well!

People shift their standards in order to justify a choice that seems a priori reasonable to them (e.g., gender schemas determined what seemed reasonable).
It's kind of hard to evaluate candidates without knowing what we're looking for.

It's fine! I'll know a good candidate when I see one.

People can easily shift their standards if they have not antecedently decided what the criteria are (e.g., accreditation, education, experience).
Observers/evaluators are able to recognize outstanding talents in women. It is when people are less than outstanding (which most people are) that schemas have more room to operate.
Beliefs that women and men are on an equal footing make it more likely that an evaluator will judge a woman poorly. Their very belief in the existence of equality (e.g., like equality of opportunity) is associated with more negative evaluations of women.
IDEA-Belonging # 76

You challenge my expectations every day! I mean, you're EXCEPTIONAL!

What do you mean by that?

In subtyping, seeing someone who is very different from one’s expectations may result in an accurate perception of that person without a change in one’s overall view (e.g., outstanding individuals, average individuals).
I believe that women are less able than men in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics!

In the domain of social perception, where perceptions are affected by a person’s group membership, and where beliefs can substitute for firsthand experience, the rule (e.g., female candidates were seen as less competent than male candidates) may itself be incorrect.
IDEA-Belonging # 78

Accolades:
• Hundreds of Published Research Papers
• 2 PhD's at Yale University

I can't believe I am finally a member of National Academy of Sciences!

When women are stars, they will be recognized. A woman must be a star to have received a favorable rating.
I was looking over the CV's of potential new hires and I liked a lot of them. But for some reason the women were severely lacking.

The review of gender schemas in action demonstrated that both men and women are likely to overrate men and underrate women in settings where professional competence is at issue.
Seminar on Schema, Stereotypes, and being conscious of our Bias

Part of what makes schemas so powerful is their very subtlety.
Dr. Peterson, do you think you could marshal for the graduation ceremonies again? It seems like everybody is busy at that time.

Could you also do meeting minutes this afternoon? I don't know who else to ask!

Sure...

I wonder whether he understands my teaching and service workloads..

Also, didn't we agree on taking turns for the marshalling service at graduations?!

Women appear to teach more and perform more service, regardless of rank.
Yes, I suppose I can be on the Green Committee as well...

Women say “no” to committee assignments less often than men do (e.g., faculty in political science).
My secret has always been to never teach undergraduate courses!

By the way, can you be on a few more committees this year? We need more people for the parking committee.

In addition to serving on more internal committees, the women also had more undergraduate students than the men and fewer postdocs.
“I don’t care who they are; I just want the best person” -- is a good example of moral “licensing.” Once people have assured themselves that they judge fairly, they are less concerned about their behavior in any particular case.
The propensity to make errors in evaluation can best be handled by having explicit valid criteria and procedures (e.g., at the committee level, at the chair level, and at the HR level).
When people say that they “don’t see race,” they are not taking into account data about how evaluations work. We generally take people's social identities into account (e.g., males or females, African Americans or Whites or Hispanics).
My dream is to work at my parent’s laundromat business and live nearby them.

I'm going to own my own fortune 500 company in 10 years and travel around the world.

Schemas about different ethnic groups are related to schemas about job prestige (e.g., Hispanics are assumed to hold lower status jobs and to have greater family orientation and religiosity; Whites as having higher status).
Three ethnic groups, African Americans, Asians, and Hispanics, see a characteristic of Whites as having more opportunities, being intelligent, being confident, and being outgoing.
Whites are seen as more competent and this gives them an advantage in the same way that the perception of men as more competent than women gives them an advantage.
Differential assumptions about ability have implications for evaluations of success and failure.
Whites were rated as more effective than African Americans (AAs) when internal reasons were given for their success. Whites are seen as having earned their success, even when identical language is used to indicate that AAs are responsible for their success.
It appears that non-Whites are as likely as Whites to see successful leadership (e.g., competence, confidence, intelligence, and competitiveness) as White. There were no differences as a function of the participant’s race. Uniform Effects.
That candidate could provide perspectives we've never been able to consider.

By emphasizing that diversity is “good for the organization” over diversity is “fair,” one broadens one’s conception of diversity.
When there are clear and valid standards for performance, and when it is possible to evaluate people without knowledge of their social identity, then people can judge impartially.
We have to think about why we've hired mostly White candidates in the past 10 years.

It is healthy to start with the possibility that one is choosing the White over the African American for reasons that are incidental to their actual performances. That will make it more likely that we perceive evidence in favor of the hypothesis.
Underrepresented minorities prefer to have differences acknowledged rather than ignored and prefer a multicultural approach in which different orientations are valued, rather than a color-blind approach or an assimilationist approach in which minorities are assimilated into the majority culture.
The worst part is the small, daily slights, they constantly badger us and it just never stops!

A meta-analysis comparing the negative effects of subtle and overt discrimination found that both were correlated with negative effects in a variety of areas (e.g., decreased success in one’s job as measured by promotions and productivity, substance abuse). Correlations were as high for the subtle measures of discrimination as for the more overt measures.
We concluded that gender, race, and ethnicity schemas result in a systematic small undervaluation of women and non-Whites and a systematic small overvaluation of White men in professional settings.
The underrepresentation of women and people of color in positions of power and prestige is a complex phenomenon that no single factor can explain.
Let's continue to develop policies and procedures that will help people operate more consistently with their egalitarian principles!

We have repeatedly stated that most academics sincerely espouse egalitarian principles. We have also repeatedly stated that a belief in the merit principle makes it difficult for people to see the small ways in which they violate it. Suggestion: Policies and procedures that will help people operate more consistently with their principles.
1. There is an important and unrecognized role for flawed, error-prone cognitive processes in the many evaluations or judgments of merit that are at the center of our academic institutions (p. 20).
2. And these processes are indeed flawed in systematic ways (p. 20).
3. Our institutions are not strict meritocracies (p. 20).
4. It is imperative to articulate these individual psychological processes and their impact (21).
5. Flawed individual judgments are at the core of college and university processes of hiring and promotion of faculty (p. 21).
   a. Flawed individual judgements (FIJs)→ Reward systems at IHEs
   b. FIJs & institutional processes both operate and they reinforce each other.
6. New faculty feel less certain than senior faculty about which job candidates meet “our standards” (p. 21).
7. Experts are very confident of their opinions but that expert intuition is not always reliable (p. 21).
8. We are to evaluate a job candidate’s long-term success and actual long-term outcomes (p. 22).
9. Our confidence is unrelated to our accuracy (e.g., a faculty member’s subjective confidence grows over the course of a career) (pp. 21-22).
10. All human beings, including academic faculty and administrators, are prone to some common kinds of errors in making judgments (p. 22).
11. Our extensive academic training and experience build our confidence and make it very unlikely that we will worry about those potential errors or take steps to overcome the well-known but faulty conclusions we are prone to drawing. (p. 22)
12. We are often confident when we are wrong, and an objective observer is more likely to detect our errors than we are (p. 22).
13. We are making judgments under conditions of uncertainty (p. 22).
14. We are to make lots of different kinds of rapid decisions based on the evidence at hand (p. 23).
15. Experience-based decision-making strategies (e.g., heuristics, representativeness, availability, and anchoring and adjustment) can be both useful and dangerous. They can lead to seriously biased outcomes that contribute to a highly stratified status quo that is experienced as natural and as reflecting some kind of underlying true merit. (p. 23)
16. We tend to use poor evidence simply because we have it. We rely on evidence that is not particularly good when hiring faculty—evidence that reflects institutional structures that are highly stratified, segregated, and the result of differential access (p. 24).
17. We rely heavily on “representativeness” or the degree to which a person appears to us to be similar to existing members of the relevant category (e.g., friends, successful faculty)
18. Similarity (e.g., shared characteristics) is not a particularly good predictor of merit, even though people heavily rely on it (p. 24).
19. A particular institutional criterion (based on a single current indicator): Getting degrees or having
worked at top-50 institutions may be reasonable evidence that they are likely to be successful in my department, but it is not good evidence that they will be more successful than people who have different training. This criterion may be a function of differential access and stratification process among other irrelevant factors (p. 25).

20. We have a tendency to rely on redundant pieces of evidence (several good publications, prestigious journal acceptance, person’s advisor) rather than pieces of evidence from independent domains (e.g., good publication, impressive service, reports of good teaching), which produce higher quality predictions (p. 26).

21. If we only assess the journal in terms of its “merit” (i.e., its quality), we may fail to notice that it has different standards for different areas of research. (e.g., newly emerging fields in which women and racial-ethnic minority scholars may be interested) (p. 26).

22. Seeing some similarity between someone’s current performance on a particular indicator and the outcome desired in the future is actually not a solid basis for prediction of future outcomes, but sometimes it feels like it is to us (p. 26).

23. We tend to know people “like us” even within our fields, a phenomenon sometimes called “homophily.” Availability of exemplars might differentially operate on our selection of faculty colleagues (even the differential distribution of scholars with particular backgrounds in various disciplines, as well as the highly differentiated nature of our social networks) (p. 27).

24. People estimate familiar groups to have larger influence and competence than unfamiliar groups, regardless of the specific evidence they are given (e.g., familiarity, an example of availability) (p. 27).

25. We generalize from our own experience (familiarity) to the actual world (p. 27).

26. We are particularly vulnerable to errors of judgment based on illusory correlation, Implicit Association Bias (measured by IAT), fast judgments or non-deliberative judgments (p. 27).

27. Errors of judgment are common (p. 28).

28. Our judgments of individuals are saturated with our expectations about groups, our own past experience, and the status quo (p. 29).

29. Anyone with merit could succeed (p. 30).

30. Homophily, preferences for similarity, is ubiquitous, the consequences of some forms of homophily are pernicious (e.g., segregation) (p. 30).

31. People`s egalitarian goals, and their beliefs that they are egalitarian, can lead them to make nonegalitarian choices without realizing they are doing so. (p.32)

32. It is difficult for people to be aware of all the ways in which their behavior reflects their unconscious beliefs and attitude (p. 33)

33. Our intentions, and genuine egalitarian principles, are not enough to guide our behavior. The combination of small preferences for people like us (homophily) and trust in our good intentions yields behavior that isolates or marginalizes people who are not like us and impedes our capacity to create institutions that are diverse and inclusive (33).

34. Excellence is uniformly distributed across different groups (41).

35. Leaders are responsible for diversity (a broad conception of leaders) (p. 41).

36. Diversity increases positive outcomes, but only if everyone in the group can contribute his or her best (p. 42).

37. A diverse group increases the likelihood of a range of solutions and the acceptance of innovations is more
likely among a diverse group of people (p. 44).
38. Fields are less ready to accept innovations that come from women and people of color, it will be
harder to demonstrate the worth of new approaches (p. 47).
39. Inclusion of a broader range of people is likely to appropriately broaden the areas of inquiry (p. 49).
40. An intellectual advantage of a diverse faculty for students is that a diverse range of academic
interests will be available. (p.52)
41. Someone’s social group does play a role, overall, whether people think it does or not (Hiring &
Advancement, retention and promotion) (p. 71).
42. Good intentions are not enough. All of us at least occasionally make decisions influenced by the
gender, race, ethnicity, or other characteristics of the person we are assessing (p. 72).
43. There are many cases where one gives or withholds opportunities, politeness, and kindness on the
basis of minimal cues (e.g., cursory information about them) (p. 75)
44. We do not encounter unambiguous behaviors. We are usually faced with ambiguous behaviors that
can be interpreted in multiple ways (p. 76).
45. When people have a great deal of individuating information, not just cursory information, they are
still affected by their beliefs about gender differences (p. 76).
46. Regardless of the domain, parents and teachers see boys’ and girls’ academic excellence differently,
despite the large amount of individuating information they have (e.g., boys are talented and girls work
hard in math and science) (p. 78).
47. College students are more likely to view their male (vs. their female) professors as brilliant (p. 78).
48. Parents seem to see talent and effort as inversely related to each other, even though they are
compatible (p. 79).
49. People attend to individuating information, but they attend differently, depending on the sex of the
child or person who is displaying the behavior and depending on the nature of the information (p. 79)
50. It is difficult to counter gender bias in part because our views about gender differences are
exceptionally detailed (p. 79)
51. Schemas are hypotheses that we use to interpret people and social events. All stereotypes are
schemas, but not all schemas are stereotypes (p. 80).
52. It is possible to create an arbitrary link between visual cues and beliefs about personality, behavior,
and intelligence (p. 81).
53. Although schema formation is ubiquitous and helpful overall, schemas are a form of “fast” thinking
that can lead to error and, when applied to people, can lead to inappropriate perception and treatment of
others (p. 82).
54. There is some evidence that both Hispanics and Asian Americans internalize—to some extent—the
views of themselves that Whites have of them (p. 83).
55. When people’s knowledge of a negative stereotype about them is activated, and the stereotype is in
an area that is important to them, their performance suffers (stereotype threat) (p. 84).
56. Women for whom math is important perform less well on a math test when they are told that women
typically perform worse on it than when they are told that there is no gender difference. (p. 84).
57. Expectations do not need to be directly communicated to people to impair their performance (p. 84).
58. Stereotype threat effectively announces that the person does not belong. A corrosive sense of not
fitting in, of being unwelcome, is usually accompanied by depressed performance and confirmation of negative stereotypes (p. 85).

59. People who are in environments where they feel—and observers feel—that they fit have an easier time (p. 85).

60. When African Americans (AAs) and Whites are having a conversation together, different threats are activated. AAs are concerned about appearing competent, believing as they do that Whites are likely to think they are not competent, while Whites are concerned about appearing likable and non-racist, believing as they do that AAs are likely to think they are racist (p. 85).

61. Both gender and race-ethnicity produce complex expectations in ourselves and in observers about what we are good at and what we can achieve. Those expectations in turn can enhance or diminish our performance (p. 85).

62. Gender schemas, hypotheses about what it means to be male or female, skew our perceptions and evaluations of men and women, causing us to overrate men and underrate women (p. 86).

63. Gender schemas affect our judgments of people’s competence, ability, and personal characteristics (p. 87).

64. Many of our judgments are small everyday events, such as not listening when a woman talks to us or not congratulating a woman on an achievement. These small but frequent occurrences accumulate to advantage men and disadvantage women (p. 87).

65. We do not see other people simply as people; we see them as males and females. Once gender schemas are invoked, they work to disadvantage women by directing and skewing our perception, even in the case of objective characteristics like height. (p.88)

66. Absent other information, the average is a good measure to go by. At the same time, that strategy has a cost for individuals who are misjudged. When one underestimates people’s abilities or skills, one tends to give those people less credit than they deserve, to ask less of them, and to rob them of their potential growth (p. 88).

67. It is tempting to think excellence is straightforward but it is not (p. 89).

68. Likability matters (vs. competence). People rated those who were high in likability as better candidates for being placed on a fast track and as better candidates for a highly prestigious upper level position. (p. 90)

69. Assertive women were seen as not having social skills, they were also seen as less hireable than assertive men (p. 90).

70. Women are in a difficult position. If they are not perceived as competent, they will not get the job. But if they make their competence clear by behaving assertively, they will be seen as lacking social skills and will be downgraded for that reason (p. 90)

71. There is a trade-off for women between competence and femininity (p. 91).

72. People shift their standards in order to justify a choice that seems a priori reasonable to them (e.g., gender schemas determined what seemed reasonable) (p. 91).

73. People can easily shift their standards if they have not antecedently decided what the criteria are (e.g., accreditation, education, experience) (p. 91).

74. Observers/evaluators are able to recognize outstanding talents in women. It is when people are less
than outstanding (which most people are) that schemas have more room to operate (p. 92).

75. Beliefs that women and men are on an equal footing make it more likely that an evaluator will judge a woman poorly. Their very belief in the existence of equality (e.g., like equality of opportunity) is associated with more negative evaluations of women (p. 92).

76. In subtyping, seeing someone who is very different from one’s expectations may result in an accurate perception of that person without a change in one’s overall view (e.g., outstanding individuals, average individuals) (p. 93).

77. In the domain of social perception, where perceptions are affected by a person’s group membership, and where beliefs can substitute for firsthand experience, the rule (e.g., female candidates were seen as less competent than male candidates) may itself be incorrect (p. 94).

78. When women are stars, they will be recognized. A woman must be a star to have received a favorable rating (p. 95).

79. The review of gender schemas in action demonstrated that both men and women are likely to overrate men and underrate women in settings where professional competence is at issue (p. 95).

80. Part of what makes schemas so powerful is their very subtlety (p. 95).

81. Women appear to teach more and perform more service, regardless of rank (p. 96).

82. Women say “no” to committee assignments less often than men do (e.g., faculty in political science) (p. 96).

83. In addition to serving on more internal committees, the women also had more undergraduate students than the men and fewer postdocs (p. 96).

84. “I don’t care who they are; I just want the best person”--is a good example of moral “licensing.” Once people have assured themselves that they judge fairly, they are less concerned about their behavior in any particular case (p. 97).

85. The propensity to make errors in evaluation can best be handled by having explicit valid criteria and procedures (e.g., at the committee level, at the chair level, and at the HR level) (p. 97).

86. When people say that they “don’t see race,” they are not taking into account data about how evaluations work. We generally take people's social identities into account (e.g., males or females, African Americans or Whites or Hispanics) (p. 98).

87. Schemas about different ethnic groups are related to schemas about job prestige (e.g., Hispanics are assumed to hold lower status jobs and to have greater family orientation and religiosity; Whites as having higher status) (p. 98).

88. Three ethnic groups, African Americans, Asians, and Hispanics, see a characteristic of Whites as having more opportunities, being intelligent, being confident, and being outgoing (p. 99).

89. Whites are seen as more competent and this gives them an advantage in the same way that the perception of men as more competent than women gives them an advantage (p. 99).

90. Differential assumptions about ability have implications for evaluations of success and failure (p. 99).

91. Whites were rated as more effective than African Americans when internal reasons were given for their success→ Whites are seen as having earned their success, even when identical language is used to indicate that AAs are responsible for their success (p. 100).

92. It appears that non-Whites are as likely as Whites to see successful leadership (e.g., competence,
confidence, intelligence, and competitiveness) as White. There were no differences as a function of the participant’s race. Uniform Effects (p. 100).

93. By emphasizing that diversity is “good for the organization” over diversity is “fair,” one broadens one’s conception of diversity (p. 62).

94. When there are clear and valid standards for performance, and when it is possible to evaluate people without knowledge of their social identity, then people can judge impartially (p. 101).

95. It is healthy to start with the possibility that one is choosing the White over the African American for reasons that are incidental to their actual performances. That will make it more likely that we perceive evidence in favor of the hypothesis (p. 101-102).

96. Underrepresented minorities prefer to have differences acknowledged rather than ignored and prefer a multicultural approach in which different orientations are valued, rather than a color-blind approach or an assimilationist approach in which minorities are assimilated into the majority culture (p. 102).

97. A meta-analysis comparing the negative effects of subtle and overt discrimination found that both were correlated with negative effects in a variety of areas (e.g., decreased success in one’s job as measured by promotions and productivity, substance abuse). Correlations were as high for the subtle measures of discrimination as for the more overt measures (pp. 103-104).

98. We concluded that gender, race, and ethnicity schemas result in a systematic small undervaluation of women and non-Whites and a systematic small overvaluation of White men in professional settings (p. 121).

99. The underrepresentation of women and people of color in positions of power and prestige is a complex phenomenon that no single factor can explain (p. 121).

100. We have repeatedly stated that most academics sincerely espouse egalitarian principles. We have also repeatedly stated that a belief in the merit principle makes it difficult for people to see the small ways in which they violate it. Workable solutions: Policies and procedures that will help people operate more consistently with their principles (p. 153).
Image References

• Card #10: Availability heuristic & confirmation bias graphics. https://jamesclear.com/common-mental-errors
• Card #32: your bias.is images. https://yourbias.is/
• Card #49: James Webb Space Telescope graphic. https://www.esa.int/Science_Exploration/Space_Science/New_launch_date_for_James_Webb_Space_Telescope
• Card #51: Types of Schemas graphic. https://www.verywellmind.com/what-is-a-schema-2795873
• Card #57: Writing process graphic. https://www.scribbr.com/academic-writing/writing-process/
Suggestions for interactive IDEA-Belonging activities

1. Know-Want-How-Commit activity:

Know: What do we already know about IDEA & Belonging in the context of a promotion and tenure review, or a search committee review, or any important work occurring in an institution of higher education?

Want: What more do we want to know about IDEA & Belonging in the context of a promotion and tenure review, or a search committee review, or any important work occurring in an institution of higher education?

How: How do we achieve a better understanding of IDEA & Belonging in the context of a promotion and tenure review, or a search committee review, or any important work occurring in an institution of higher education?
2. Think-Pair-Share activity:
   Individually, browse through the playing cards and select three cards with
   statements that you find familiar, and three cards with statements you
   find to be muddy.

   Pair up with your shoulder partner, and share your cards and elaborate on
   them.

   Share major discussion points from your group of two with the whole
   group.

3. Role-Play skit activity:
   As a group, choose a specific IDEA-Belonging card and develop a
   scenario for a short skit in which every member can play a role.

4. Commit (Exit ticket):
   After studying the IDEA & Belonging 100 Cards, what one commitment
   can each of us make?
An Acknowledgment and a Disclaimer

We are greatly indebted to Drs. Abigail J. Stewart and Virginia Valian. Their 17-year-long work on achieving diversity and excellence distilled in *An Inclusive Academy* has been our north star and our inspiration!

This set of 100 Playing Cards is a work-in-progress which has been developed through multiple ideations and iterations by the four authors since Fall 2021 and the current version was updated in June 2022. All the statements used in this visual training material are from the book *An Inclusive Academy: Achieving Diversity and Excellence* by Stewart & Valian (2018). Specific page numbers are cited for all 100 statements near the end of this book, not on the cards due to space. Some statements were edited for clarity. A few visual objects used in the cards were from several sources, and the citations are noted on the image reference page. This material is intended for educational purposes only.

The visual cues used in this training material are mainly for aiding dialogue and debates to unpack both familiar and untold stories, and to achieve sustainable IDEA-Belonging tactics, principles, theories, and methodologies. The illustrations were made with the *Storyboard That (SBT)* platform. Therefore, the ranges of expressions, characters and objects were limited to the options given by SBT. For the visual cues in this material, one may feel free to alter the gender and other specifics, including situations. It is suggested that one refrains from generalizing or connecting these cues to your own personal experiences to remain more open to other’s experiences.
Finally, the visual cues accompanying the statements are not perfect, but rather they are a beta release, full of gray areas which we hope allows varying takes on each statement. The 100 statements with specific page numbers but without images are listed above. Any suggestions or comments, please contact ejbahng@iastate.edu.

All characters, comments, backgrounds, and events in the 100 card illustrations are entirely fictional. Any resemblance to actual persons, living or dead, is purely coincidental. This is a work of creativity, first, to sketch the cyclical and cumulative impacts of IDEA & Belonging, second, to address the nuances associated with inclusion practices at an institution of higher education, and finally, three, to stress the importance of small, reflective changes to create a more inclusive work environment and to make excellence belong.

This visual educational material is based upon "Humanizing Science through STEM and the Arts (STEAM) Challenges: Make Excellence Belong" supported by the College of Human Sciences. Any topics, opinions, stories, fictional characters, or values expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the supporting unit.
Cover story "Welcome Image: Appreciation Moments" by Jordan Weber

This photo was taken at the Cliffs of Moher in Ireland. Traveling is one of my favorite activities, and this trip was with some of my closest friends from the marching band. We would frequently take 30-second breaks when we simply appreciated the environment we were in, and we dubbed these “Appreciation Moments.”

Jordan Weber is a Master of Education student in the Higher Education Student Affairs program at Iowa State University. He holds a Bachelor of Arts in Family Services from the University of Northern Iowa. Jordan has a passion for university admissions and recruitment, helping students explore the possibilities that await them in higher education.
"Make Excellence Belong" Project Team

E.J. is an associate professor in science education and a CHS Equity Advisor at Iowa State University (ISU); Jamal is from Des Moines, Iowa, majored in chemistry at ISU and soon-to-be a secondary science teacher; Kitty was the president of the ISU student organization for Minority Association for Pre-health students and soon-to-be a master’s student majoring in engineering; and John is an experimental physicist and professor at ISU. Our companions are Geo, Kitkat, & Khan.

We thank you!