



Microsoft Tech Resilience Mentoring Program

Training Session 2

How do I invite participation?

Mentors steer through participation norms. Let's look at the Round Robin.



Image from <https://www.avepoint.com/blog/microsoft-teams/microsoft-teams-adoption-covid19/>

We create an inclusive space by deliberately shaping:

- who participates
- how participation is valued
- how we model and steer the conversation

The mentoring space can and should support belonging.

An inclusive mentoring space

I was able to realize that despite all the obstacles, there IS a space for me in the field of CS and it is a field I belong in despite my feelings of alienation from the "CS culture" at my school... I really do feel like I found a community and the field of CS seems so much more inviting now.

- Mentee from 2020-2021 pilot



Round robin, synthesize & reflect back

- Rather than comment after each person shares, hear back from the group first.
"Thank you for sharing."
- Then, highlight themes/commonalities or note contrasts/differences
"I'm hearing that all of you ____"
"I noticed that some of you ____ while others ____."

Tips

Don't force.	Do let people pass and circle back.
Don't single out anyone to speak on behalf of their social identity group.	Do invite people to share what they wish and thank them for sharing.
Don't minimize someone else's experience even when you can't see their viewpoint.	Do listen to understand.
Don't stand by when someone else minimizes or belittles another.	Do take responsibility in the space by calling in people to the participation norms.

1) Invite, don't force. (Let people pass + circle back.)



What it <u>doesn't</u> look like:	What it <u>could</u> look like:
"X you need to go next. It's your turn."	"Sure, we can come back to you. Let me know if you want to share later."
"You are too quiet. We need to hear from you."	"X, would you like to share next? You can speak or use the chat. Feel free to pass your turn or we can come back to you."

Li, S., Malin, J. R., & Hackman, D. G. (2018). Mentoring supports and mentoring across difference: Insights from mentees. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*,

2) Do not single out anyone to speak for a social identity group. (Let folks share on their own terms.)



What it <u>doesn't</u> look like:	What it <u>could</u> look like:
X, I notice you are the only woman and person of color here. I bet this belonging video will really speak to you. Will you tell us what could we do to improve diversity in tech?	"X, would you like to share what you thought about the video? You can speak or use the chat. Feel free to pass your turn or we can come back to you."

Sue, D. W., Alsaidi, S., Awad, M. N., Glaeser, E., Calle, C. Z., & Mendez, N. (2019). Disarming racial microaggressions: Microintervention strategies for targets, White allies, and bystanders. *American Psychologist*, 74(1), 128-142.

Sekaquaptewa, D., Waldman, A., & Thompson, M. (2007). Solo status and self-construal: Being distinctive influences racial self-construal and performance apprehension in African American women. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 13(4), 321-327

3) Do not minimize another's experience even if you have a different interpretation. (Listen to understand, empathize + thank them.)



What it **doesn't** look like:

"That's weird. Are you sure the professor meant it that way?"

What it **could** look like:

"Thank you for being willing to share your experience with us. That sounds very difficult."

Remember intent vs. impact

Rowe, M. (2008). Micro-affirmations & micro-inequities. Journal of the International Ombudsman Association, 1(1).

Spencer, R., Pryce, J., Barry, J., Walsh, J., & Basualdo-Delmonico, A. (2020). Deconstructing empathy: A qualitative examination of mentor perspective-taking and adaptability in youth mentoring relationships. Children and Youth Services Review, 105043.

4) Don't stand by while this happens. (Instead, take responsibility by "calling in" that speaker + show support for the affected person..)

What it <u>doesn't</u> look like:	What it <u>could</u> look like:
"X, I can't believe you said that!"	<p>"In this space, it's important that people are able to share their own experiences. It's ok if our experiences are different from one another. X, I'm glad you have had a positive experience. Y, it takes courage to share what you did, and I'm sorry you had to go through that."</p> <p>In the self-guided scenario, one mentee minimized another mentee</p>

Rowe, M. (2008). Micro-affirmations & micro-inequities. Journal of the International Ombudsman Association, 1(1).

Sue, D. W., Alsaidi, S., Awad, M. N., Glaeser, E., Calle, C. Z., & Mendez, N. (2019). Disarming racial microaggressions: Microintervention strategies for targets, White allies, and bystanders. American Psychologist, 74(1), 128- 9
142.

Bibliography

Settles, I. H., Cortina, L. M., Stewart, A. J., & Malley, J. (2007). Voice matters: Buffering the impact of a negative climate for women in science. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 31(3), 270–281. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.2007.00370.x>

Abstract

The current study examined whether women scientists' perceptions of voice moderate the impact of poor workplace climates on job satisfaction and whether effective leadership and mentoring promote women's voice. Survey data were collected from 135 faculty women in the natural sciences. The results from multiple regression analyses indicated that negative (e.g., sexist, hostile) departmental climates were related to lower job satisfaction. However, voice interacted with climate, such that women who perceived that they had more voice in departmental matters showed higher levels of job satisfaction than those who perceived having less voice. An additional regression indicated that mentoring by other women (but not men) in academia and effective departmental leadership were positively related to women's sense of voice. Theoretical and practical implications for the retention and success of women in male-dominated fields are discussed. (PsycINFO Database Record (c) 2016 APA, all rights reserved)

O'Meara, K., Griffin, K. A., Nyunt, G., & Lounder, A. (2019). Disrupting ruling relations: The role of the PROMISE program as a third space. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 12(3), 205–218. <https://doi.org/10.1037/dhe0000095>

Abstract

Applying the concept of ruling relations—everyday norms, assumptions, logics, and social interactions that structure people's everyday lives (Smith, 1999)—to STEM underrepresented minority (URM) graduate student experiences provides a unique and important way to understand how inequality can be integrated into the graduate student socialization process. We used an ethnographic case study approach to understand the challenges URM students experience in STEM graduate programs and how an NSF-funded program called PROMISE, created to support the retention and advancement of URM students, countered these ruling relations. We found that students experienced isolation and a lack of community, an environment that stressed individualism and competition, and hierarchical structures in their STEM departments that made them question whether they belonged and could succeed. The PROMISE program opposed these ruling relations by operating as a "third space" for graduate participants, a space that was neither work nor home. This "third space" was experienced as neutral territory where hierarchy was de-emphasized and there was a critical mass of other URM STEM students with whom to find community, affirmation, and support. As a "third space," the PROMISE program fostered different rules of engagement—community, affirmation, and egalitarianism—which ran counter to participants' experiences in their home department. The article concludes with recommendations for practice. (PsycINFO Database Record (c) 2019 APA, all rights reserved)

Dewsbury, B., & Brame, C. J. (2019). Inclusive teaching. *CBE-Life Sciences Education*, 18:fe2, 1-5. <https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.19-01-0021>

Abstract

Over the past two decades, science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) faculty have been striving to make their teaching practices more inclusive and welcoming to the variety of students who enter college. However, many STEM faculty, even those at teaching-focused institutions, have been educated in a traditional environment that emphasizes research and may not include classroom teaching. This can produce a deficit in training that leaves many STEM faculty feeling uncertain about inclusive teaching practices and their essential undergirding principles. This essay describes an online, evidence-based teaching guide (<https://lse.ascb.org/evidence-based-teaching-guides/inclusive-teaching>) intended to help fill this gap, serving as a resource for science faculty as they work to become more inclusive, particular with regard to differences in race, ethnicity, and gender. The guide describes the importance of developing self-awareness and empathy for students as a precursor to considering classroom practices. It also explores the role of classroom climate before turning to pedagogical choices that can support students' sense of belonging, competence, and interest in the course. Finally, the guide suggests that true inclusivity is a community effort and that instructors should leverage local and national networks to maximize student learning and inclusion. Each of these essential points is supported by summaries of and links to articles that can inform these choices. The guide also includes an instructor checklist that offers a concise summary of key points with actionable steps that can guide instructors as they work toward a more inclusive practice. We hope that the guide will provide value for both faculty who are just beginning to consider how to change their teaching practices and faculty seeking to enrich their current efforts.

Holmes, M. H. Jackson, J. K., Stoiko, R. (2016). Departmental dialogues: Facilitating positive academic climates to improve equity in STEM disciplines. *Innovative Higher Education*, 41, 381-394.

Abstract

This exploratory qualitative study examined faculty responses to a collegiality-building process called Dialogues. The process used a series of discussions and activities to guide faculty members toward a common, mutually beneficial goal, while changing patterns of interaction. The responses revealed how faculty members experienced collegiality-building practices, including individual reflection, small group discussions, idea generation and prioritization, and consensus-building. The study examined faculty responses within STEM departments. We conclude with recommendations for encouraging inclusive and participatory departmental norms and behaviors in order to promote a positive departmental climate, which is crucial to achieving equity in all disciplines of the academia.

Li, S., Malin, J. R., & Hackman, D. G. (2018). Mentoring supports and mentoring across difference: Insights from mentees. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 1-22. doi:10.1080/13611267.2018.1561020

Abstract

Mentoring relationships in higher education are recognized as a critical factor in preparing and socializing doctoral students and junior faculty for academic roles. We examined the practices of 12 educational leadership professors who were recipients of the Jay D. Scribner Mentoring Award, from the perspectives of 103 mentees who submitted letters in support of their nominations. The process-based relational mentoring framework was adopted for thematic analysis and two core interpretative dimensions formed: effective mentoring practices that were universally acknowledged as effective and considerations for mentoring across difference. Mentees reported effective mentor traits and practices, including being approachable and accessible, demonstrating humility and genuine care for others, and tailoring the experience to mentees' individualized needs. Findings also included insights related to mentoring across difference, in which mentors and mentees differed by gender and race/ethnicity.

Sue, D. W., Alsaidi, S., Awad, M. N., Glaeser, E., Calle, C. Z., & Mendez, N. (2019). Disarming racial microaggressions: Microintervention strategies for targets, White allies, and bystanders. *American Psychologist*, 74(1), 128-142.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/amp0000296>

Abstract

Given the immense harm inflicted on individuals and groups of color via prejudice and discrimination, it becomes imperative for our nation to begin the process of disrupting, dismantling, and disarming the constant onslaught of micro- and macroaggressions. For too long, acceptance, silence, passivity, and inaction have been the predominant, albeit ineffective, strategies for coping with microaggressions. Inaction does nothing but support and proliferate biased perpetrator behaviors which occur at individual, institutional and societal levels. This article introduces a new strategic framework developed for addressing microaggressions that moves beyond coping and survival to concrete action steps and dialogues that targets, allies, and bystanders can perform (microinterventions). A review of responses to racist acts, suggest that microaggression reactions/interventions may be primarily to (a) remain passive, retreat, or give up; (b) strike back or hurt the aggressor; (c) stop, diminish, deflect, or put an end to the harmful act; (d) educate the perpetrator; (e) validate and support the targets; (f) act as an ally; (g) seek social support; (h) enlist outside authority or institutional intervention; or (h) achieve any combination of these objectives. We organize these responses into four major strategic goals of microinterventions: (a) make the invisible visible, (b) disarm the microaggression, (c) educate the perpetrator, and (d) seek external reinforcement or support. The objectives and rationale for each goal are discussed, along with specific microintervention tactics to employ and examples of how they are executed.

Sekaquaptewa, D., Waldman, A., & Thompson, M. (2007). Solo status and self-construal: Being distinctive influences racial self-construal and performance apprehension in African American women. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 13(4), 321–327. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1099-9809.13.4.321>

Abstract

A preliminary study and main experiment tested the hypothesis that racial solo status (being the only member of one's race in a group) increases racial self-construal among African Americans. The preliminary study showed that African American men and women reported greater collectivist (i.e., group-based) over individualist self-construal under solo compared to nonsolo status, whereas Whites did not. The main experiment showed that the increased collectivism among African American solo women appears to be strongly reflected in racial identity becoming a salient aspect of self-construal. African American participants were also more likely than Whites to perceive that their anticipated performance would be generalized to their race, to feel like representatives of their race, and to show greater performance apprehension (indirectly evidenced by increased self-handicapping) when in racial solo status. The implications of solo status for African Americans in evaluative situations (such as academic testing sessions) are discussed. (PsycINFO Database Record (c) 2016 APA, all rights reserved)

Rowe, M. (2008). Micro-affirmations & Micro-inequities. Journal of the International Ombudsman Association, 1(1).

Abstract

This article explains the difference between microaggressions and microaffirmations- seemingly small acts that have negative or positive consequences respectively. Multiple strategies for promoting microaffirmations are described including offering comfort during distress, sharing opportunity, giving credit. In short, small things make a difference.



We thank Audrey St. John and Becky Wai-Ling Packard
from Mount Holyoke College and MetaView Mentors for
their leadership and collaboration.