



UW-Madison Leadership Framework Outcome Content Validation

Larry Jolón

Center for Leadership & Involvement, University of Wisconsin-Madison

Overview

This phase of the expert content validation process focused on the evaluation of the UW-Madison Leadership Framework's outcomes and their developmental complexity. Five experts in leadership education reviewed and provided feedback on the Framework using the Outcome Validation Review Tool. Following the expert review, the Vetting Team, came together to review the responses, assess for patterns of feedback, and propose revisions to the Leadership Framework outcomes. The Vetting Team consists of undergraduate and graduate students, faculty, and staff. They have experience working with the Leadership Framework in various institutional contexts (within their school/college/unit/department).

UW-Madison Leadership Framework Vetting Team Members

- Meagan Blair – Leadership Development Coordinator, Center for Leadership & Involvement
- Katherine Charek Briggs – Assistant Director, Gender and Sexuality Campus Center
- Delaney Egan – Project Manager, Epistemic Analytics, Wisconsin Center for Education Research
- Jasmine Enriquez – Jones Leadership Center Intern, Center for Leadership & Involvement
- Nancy Graff Schultz – Associate Director for Administration, General Library System
- Jim Gray – Formerly from Office of Human Resources and Development
- Larry Jolón – Leadership Development Specialist, Center for Leadership & Involvement
- Sarah Marty – Interim-Co Director & Faculty Associate, Bolz Center for Arts Administration, Wisconsin School of Business
- Lauren Surovi – Special Projects Coordinator, Center for Leadership & Involvement

UW-Madison Leadership Framework Validation Team Members

- Meagan Blair – Leadership Development Coordinator, Center for Leadership & Involvement
- Larry Jolón – Leadership Development Specialist, Center for Leadership & Involvement
- Mark Kueppers – Assistant Dean/Director, Center for Leadership & Involvement
- Dr. Ning Sun – Coordinator of Student Affairs Assessment, Student Affairs

Purpose

The Leadership Framework Vetting Team was asked to review and make changes to our outcomes, as needed, with an eye towards the future expansion of the Leadership Framework to a multi-level developmental model. Each team member was given access to the expert reviewer's documented feedback in addition to the prepared Outcome Vetting Sheets and asked to identify patterns of feedback, scope, and perceived substantive changes while keeping in mind the primary criteria of clarity, cultural responsiveness, and portability. In addition, the team was asked to consider the historical context of the Leadership Framework along with our current campus environment.

The team looked for redundancy in language and opportunities to clarify current outcomes that would significantly enhance the quality of the Leadership Framework. Although the team's primary focus was on addressing feedback related to our outcomes, the knowledge gained from the additional recommendations will inform the future of the Leadership Framework and ensure greater impact. These recommendations spurred in-depth discussions and will be addressed through on-going strategic planning efforts.

Process

After receiving feedback from our expert reviewers, the CfLI Leadership Development Specialist (who will be referred to as CfLI for the rest of the document) created Outcomes Vetting Sheets which reflected the intersection of each value and competency. Each sheet reviewed the outcomes contained in those intersections and listed expert reviewers' feedback that needed to be addressed, recommended edits to outcome language, and response for that recommendation.

Each recommendation presented to the Framework Vetting Team was initially categorized into one of three levels:

- Level 1: CfLI recommended change –requested approval before meeting.
 - o Changes in syntax, grammar, single word changes, etc.
 - o Removing redundancies.
 - o If not approved, changed to Level 2, and required further discussion.
- Level 2: CfLI to recommended change –possible discussion needed but could be approved before meeting.
 - o Modified and/or additional outcomes with Expert Reviewer consensus.
- Level 3: Required discussion with Framework Vetting Team
 - o Modified, removed, and/or additional outcomes without Expert Reviewer consensus.
 - o No recommendation provided by CfLI before meeting.

Prior to weekly meetings, the Framework Vetting Team reviewed the Outcome Vetting Sheets to identify patterns of feedback, scope, and perceived substantive changes while keeping

in mind the primary criteria of clarity, cultural responsiveness, and portability. The historical context of the Leadership Framework and current campus environment were also considered.

During our weekly meetings, CfLI facilitated conversation and decision making for the team. Before beginning discussion, the team would review our Leadership Framework to ensure a holistic review of our outcomes. Once team members had an opportunity to discuss and provide suggestions, CfLI would share proposed outcome language edits and/or decisions and would ask the team to either vote Yes, No, or Abstain. If 50% or more of the team members present voted No and/or Abstain, conversation would continue until majority consensus was reached by the team.

Limitations

Although our process allowed our team members multiple avenues to provide feedback and engage in decision making, the virtual format of our process, our condensed format to review 89 outcomes, and our reviewers' limited time may have affected aspects of our process.

Not all team members were able to review outcomes via our Outcome Vetting Sheets in Box prior to each meeting which may have affected our discussion. Additionally, there were times when reviewers were not able to attend meetings and our team had to interpret their written thoughts which may have affected our decision making.

When the process first began, we had planned to meet four times in the month of April to review content. To ensure all team members could share their perspectives and prioritize quality discussion, our team added four additional meetings during the month of May. Unfortunately, not all team members could attend each meeting and would instead provide written feedback, which may have affected our decision making and discussion.

Summary of Feedback & Strategic Planning Opportunities

A summary of our initial qualitative data analysis is listed in Appendix A and our full Outcomes Vetting Sheets [are located at this Box folder](#). In addition to reviewing the content of the Leadership Framework outcomes, the expert reviewers also provided feedback related to the developmental complexity of the outcomes and the Knowledge, Skill, and Ability framework associated with our outcomes. That additional feedback [is located in this Box folder](#). Their feedback about the cultural responsiveness of our outcomes led to the development of a new Leadership Framework principle.

The Leadership Framework Validation Team has identified some growth areas presented in the additional feedback that have been prioritized as next steps in the development of the Leadership Framework. The following recommendations will be addressed over-time through on-going strategic planning efforts.

Addition of New Leadership Framework Principle

After analyzing our expert reviewers' feedback, the Validation Team concluded it was necessary to add a new principle to our Leadership Framework. Collectively and in multiple instances, the expert reviewers recommended referring to the perpetuation of systemic inequity and discrimination in the United States and acknowledging groups of people that are marginalized. The Validation Team recognized the importance of these recommendations and instead of addressing this feedback through individual outcomes, decided to elevate these recommendations by creating the following principle:

- Inequity and discrimination are systematically perpetuated requiring the experiences and perspectives of groups that are marginalized* to be honored and centered.

- *(Those groups include and are not limited to: groups excluded due to race, ethnicity, indigeneity, gender, gender expression, sexual orientation, age, ability, size, language, military affiliation, class, religion, citizenship status, and/or immigration status.)

This principle language was first drafted by the Validation Team based on expert reviewer feedback. The first draft was sent to the Vetting Team to collect and incorporate their feedback. Our expert reviewers then endorsed the creation of a new principle then collectively provided feedback and suggested language changes for a second draft. Finally, the Vetting Team reviewed and approved a final draft of this new Leadership Framework principle.

Strategic Planning Opportunities

- In future planning efforts our Framework Validation Team will analyze all expert reviewers' feedback about developmental complexity of our outcomes to identify trends in the data and consider next steps on how to best utilize your feedback.
 - Some additional considerations shared:
 - There will be overlap in developmental complexity for the outcome levels, but it is still important to define these levels for ease of use for practitioners.
 - Socially constructed identities will likely influence the developmental complexity for certain users of the Leadership Framework outcomes.
- While we consider the developmental complexity of our outcomes in future planning efforts, we should also define the language level we expect to institute for our outcomes if we are prioritizing accessibility and portability.

- When considering implementation of our revised Leadership Framework, we should explicitly tell users that we prioritized accessibility, cultural responsiveness, and portability.
- Since practitioners will be utilizing the Leadership Framework, creating columns based on our KSA Framework rather than our Competency/Value intersections would be easier for that audience to use and understand.
- There are some areas that could be further consolidated in the Framework:
 - o Decision Making could be combined with Ideas into Action given their overlap as competencies.
 - o Learning and Development of Others could be consolidated into Self-Awareness and Ideas into Action.

Acknowledgements and Next Steps

We have sincerely appreciated the amazing and compelling feedback received throughout this process and thank the expert reviewers for their time. There are revisions to the Leadership Framework that can be made in the short term and revisions that will take some time to incorporate. The expertise and insight the expert reviewers have provided will strengthen leadership education at the University of Wisconsin-Madison while elevating the discipline of leadership across higher education.

Appendix A

Content Changes

The following table represents the “**Content Changes**” feedback for the Leadership Framework Outcomes. Each header is titled with the intersection of the competency and value containing specific outcomes. Those headers each link to its respective Outcome Vetting Sheet. The left column states the original outcome and suggested changes by the expert reviewers. The right column states the team’s responses and planned changes.

<u>Self-Awareness & Integrity</u>	
<p>1 Original outcome: Understanding personal motivation to serve and how it relates to the collective effort</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recommended to add language to increase the scope of how users understand the collective effort. 	<p>Response: We added “organizational responsibility” and used organizational instead of the suggested word “positional” since that language sounded more accessible for Framework users.</p> <p>Planned change: Understanding personal motivation and organizational responsibility to serve and how it relates to the collective effort</p>
<p>2 Original outcome: Understanding one’s own culture and context and how it influences participation</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recommended to add additional language to reflect cultural responsibility by referring to power, privilege, and identity. - Recommended to refer to systems that perpetuate inequity. - The outcome assumes that users know how to understand these concepts. 	<p>Response: We added privilege and social identities since our team believed understanding these concepts are also important for engaging in leadership. Although it is important to understand how inequity is perpetuated, we thought that would make this outcome too complex and could be covered elsewhere in the Framework. Although the outcome makes assumptions about users understanding these concepts, our team plans to address this feedback when we address developmental complexity in the future.</p> <p>Planned Change: Understanding one’s own culture, context, privilege, and social identities and how they influence participation</p>

<p>3 Original outcome: Valuing fact-based information</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Include language like data-driven or evidence based. - It is problematic to use fact-based since we are not specifying where this information comes from. 	<p>Response: We adjusted this language to focus more on the process of gathering information and to allow space to create truth with other people. We decided to not include language like “data-driven” or “evidence-based” to make our language as accessible as possible for users.</p> <p>Planned change: Prioritizing gathering and verifying information</p>
<p>4 Original outcome: Maintaining focus on truth over achievement</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This outcome needs further clarity to reflect the intersection of Self-Awareness and Integrity. - Truth over achievement is vague and needs further explanation of what that process looks like. - The use of the word truth is problematic since this outcome does not define how truth is derived. 	<p>Response: We agreed that the use of the word truth is problematic and that the outcome was too vague. Given the intersection of this value and competency and the collective feedback of the expert reviewers, we decided to focus on how individuals can grow in their leadership development. Therefore, we changed the language to reflect that process.</p> <p>Planned change: Focusing on self-reflection and learning</p>
<p>5 Original outcome: Thinking, feeling, and behaving with consistency, genuineness, authenticity, and honesty towards others</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Thinking, feeling, and behaving consist of different capabilities and as written, could be complex enough to be broken into multiple outcomes. - Can this outcome be expanded to think about cultural understanding? 	<p>Response: We simplified the language in this outcome for clarity and added the word “people” to stray away from othering and move this outcome closer to cultural responsiveness.</p> <p>Planned change: Committing to genuineness, authenticity, and honesty towards other people</p>
<p>6 Original outcome: Ensuring transparency for the scrutiny of all the group’s stakeholders</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Transparency is not a practice done entirely in many institutions, it may not be sustainable, and it would help to clarify to be transparent about. 	<p>Response: We agreed that being transparent and scrutinized always is not entirely possible or sustainable. We instead replaced those words with “openness” and added the words “communication” and “accountability to demonstrate to be as transparent as possible.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recommend adding the word accountability. 	<p>Planned Change: Ensuring openness, communication, and accountability to all team members</p>
<p>7 Original outcome: Committing to working hard and continuous learning</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Suggest removing the phrase “working hard.” - Add working collaboratively to the outcome. - Continuous learning is not something all cultures value equally. 	<p>Response: By removing the phrase working hard or further defining this outcome, it becomes redundant since continuous learning is covered in other places in the Framework. Therefore, we decided to remove this outcome.</p> <p>Planned change: Remove outcome.</p>
<p><u>Self-Awareness & Inclusive Engagement</u></p>	
<p>8 Original outcome: Reflecting on personal beliefs, values, attitudes, and emotion that motivate one to take action</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider adding “one’s self and others.” - Consider adding “critical self-reflecting,” “privileges,” and “position one.” - Think about concepts from Social Identity Theory. 	<p>Response: We incorporated all feedback from expert reviewers to take into account cultural responsiveness and to expand how to affect change.</p> <p>Planned change: Reflecting on personal beliefs, values, attitudes, privileges, and emotions that motivate and/or position oneself and others to take action</p>
<p>9 Original outcome: Understanding one’s own strengths and limitations</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider adding the strengths and limitations of others. - Consider adding challenges and privileges. - Consider aligning the outcome more with the value of Inclusive Engagement. 	<p>Response: We incorporated most comments related to cultural responsiveness and aligned this with the intersecting value. We also added the word “biases” to further make this outcome culturally responsive.</p> <p>Planned change: Understanding how one’s own strengths, limitations, biases, and privileges impact effectively working with others</p>
<p>10 Original outcome: Creating processes for open communication and dialogue</p> <p>Feedback:</p>	<p>Response: We incorporated language edits related to creating space for communication and addressed the developmental feedback provided about students by adding the words “honest” and “intentional”.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider moving this outcome to Interpersonal Communication. - Think about how to create a space that allows students to have these types of conversations. 	<p>Planned change: Creating space for open, honest, and intentional communication and dialogue</p>
<p>11 Original outcome: Creating on-going opportunities for feedback and reflection</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider consolidating outcomes that are related to reflection and continuous learning. - Simplify the language used in the outcome. - Consider adding “critical self-reflection.” 	<p>Response: We incorporated feedback about simplifying language by adding “Thoughtfully and regularly giving, receiving, and reflecting” for the outcome and thought the outcome was unique enough to keep. However, this outcome makes more sense in another place in the Framework mentioned above. Since critical self-reflection is mentioned in other parts of the Framework, we decided not to include that piece.</p> <p>Planned change: Thoughtfully and regularly giving, receiving, and reflecting on feedback AND move outcome to Learning and Development of Others & Integrity</p>
<p>12 Original outcome: Engaging others who complement group and individual limitations</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider deleting this outcome because of redundancy. - Different communities may approach feedback and reflection differently. - Consider replacing “engaging” with “including”. - Consider adding “strengths and limitations.” 	<p>Response: Since this outcome is captured in other places in the Framework, we decided to delete this outcome.</p> <p>Planned change: Remove outcome.</p>
<p>13 Original outcome: Appreciating the knowledge, talents, and contributions of those in the community</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider specifying who the community is in the context of this outcome. - Consider adding “openly acknowledging” and “valuing.” 	<p>Response: We incorporated suggested edits from the expert reviewers and removed the word “community” since our intent was to say “perspectives”.</p> <p>Planned change: Openly acknowledging and valuing the knowledge, talents, and contributions of multiple perspectives</p>

<p>14 Original outcome: Recognizing the value of broad community participation in creating change</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider specifying who the community is in the context of this outcome, like stating community perspectives. - Consider adding “recognizing and leveraging the value” and reflect on how to build trust over time. 	<p>Response: We incorporated suggested edits from the expert reviewers and added “solving problems” to refer to how to work with multiple community perspectives overtime. We also clarified what we meant by community.</p> <p>Planned change: Recognizing and leveraging the value of multiple community perspectives in solving problems and creating change</p>
<p><u>Self-Awareness & Connection and Community</u></p>	
<p>15 Original outcome: Evaluating and being attentive to the degree of participation among group members</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider moving this outcome to an intersection that is more applicable. - Acknowledge that participation can be impacted by unanticipated factors. - Consider changing “being attentive” to “increasing.” 	<p>Response: We agreed that the outcome needed to be moved to another place in the Framework and we holistically looked at the Framework to determine its best placement. We kept the phrase “being attentive” to keep its meaning and added “Empathetically evaluating” to acknowledge to assess impacts by unanticipated factors.</p> <p>Planned change: Empathetically evaluating and being attentive to the degree of participation among group members AND move outcome to Interpersonal Communication & Inclusive Engagement</p>
<p>16 Original outcome: Building awareness of one’s influence on the dynamics and needs of the group</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider adding “influence and power in the dynamics of the group.” - Consider adding “and adjusting one’s approach when voices and perspectives are being left out. - Change outcome to “Growing awareness of personal influence on group dynamics.” 	<p>Response: We decided to keep most of the language of this outcome because “adjusting one’s approach” changes the intent of the outcome. We did add “power” as a suggested edit for cultural responsiveness.</p> <p>Planned change: Increasing awareness of one’s influence and power on the dynamics and needs of the group</p>

<p>17 Original outcome: Ensuring each member is part of goal attainment</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider moving this outcome to another intersection in the Framework. - Consider changing to “a part of” or “reflected in.” 	<p>Response: We decided to keep the outcome in this intersection because we believe it fit best in this section and added “contributions” and changed language to say “a part of” for clarity in meaning.</p> <p>Planned change: Ensuring each member’s contributions are a part of goal attainment</p>
<p>18 Original outcome: Demonstrating humility</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider adding “listening.” - Consider adding “vulnerability and self-reflexivity.” - Elaborate on what humility means to ensure cultural responsiveness and portability. 	<p>Response: To elaborate on what demonstrating humility looks like, we incorporated various behaviors the expert reviewers listed to elaborate further.</p> <p>Planned change: Demonstrating active listening, vulnerability, and the ability to achieve on behalf of others</p>
<p>19 Original outcome: Sharing ownership in the work and results of the group’s efforts</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider adding “development of goals.” - Consider adding “celebrating results.” 	<p>Response: We agreed with the suggested edits of our expert reviewers and incorporated all edits.</p> <p>Planned change: Sharing ownership in the work and development of goals, as well as celebrating the results of the group’s efforts</p>
<p><u>Interpersonal Communication & Integrity</u></p>	
<p>20 Original outcome: Appropriately addressing anxiety and conflict</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider removing anxiety and focusing on conflict. - Add “culturally appropriate” or “sustaining response” to the outcome. - Consider how to create moments to move forward to addressing conflict, like creating space and doing internal work. 	<p>Response: Based on expert reviewers’ feedback related to clarity, we removed anxiety and focused on conflict. We also elaborated on how we would appropriately address conflict.</p> <p>Planned change: Acknowledging internal conflicts and cultivating space to engage in difficult conversation</p>

<p>21 Original outcome: Encouraging open and honest communication</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider adding the word “active.” 	<p>Response: We agreed with and added our expert reviewers’ feedback.</p> <p>Planned change: Encouraging active, open, and honest communication</p>
<p>22 Original outcome: Modeling vulnerability by actively disclosing information that benefits the group</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This outcome seems redundant and could fit in another section of the Framework. - Consider adding “vulnerability and critical self-reflexivity.” - Consider using “increased candor” instead of “vulnerability.” 	<p>Response: We decided to expand on what we mean by vulnerability and instead of using candor, we added “openness, honesty, and critical self-reflection.” By making these edits, we believe the revised outcome has value where it is currently located in the Framework.</p> <p>Planned change: Modeling openness, honesty, and critical self-reflection by actively disclosing information to the group</p>
<p><u>Interpersonal Communication & Inclusive Engagement</u></p>	
<p>23 Original outcome: Engaging various individual and group communication strategies to draw out participation of others</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider adding “model listening with empathy”. - Consider adding “limit overemphasis of one perspective over others.” - Consider referring to languages in this outcome. 	<p>Response: We decided to keep the language in the outcome broader for portability and added “to elicit balanced participation” to address the comment about limiting overemphasis. We believed referring to language could confuse users and takes away from the original intent of the outcome.</p> <p>Planned change: Engaging a variety of individual and group communication strategies to elicit balanced participation</p>
<p>24 Original outcome: Listening to individual perspectives and ensuring they are reflected in group outcomes</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider adding “facilitating conversations that help inspire and motivate the group towards action.” - Consider addressing different languages. 	<p>Response: We agreed with expanding on how we ensure perspectives are included in outcomes and amended language to say, “facilitating inclusive conversations that motivate the group towards actionable outcomes.” We believed referring to language in this outcome would change the intent of this outcome.</p> <p>Planned change: Listening to individual perspectives and facilitating inclusive</p>

	conversations that motivate the group towards actionable outcomes
<p>25 Original outcome: Adapting one’s approach in order to be responsive to the needs of others</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Change the language in this outcome to align more closely with the intersecting value. - Consider adding “engaging other perspectives to the needs that are not being represented.” - Consider addressing different languages. 	<p>Response: We thought keeping the language broader instead of referring to communication styles was useful for this outcome. We did want to refer to other perspectives and people’s needs, so we added “of other people and different contexts.”</p> <p>Planned change: Understanding and adapting one’s approach in order to be responsive to the needs of other people and different contexts</p>
<u>Interpersonal Communication & Connection and Community</u>	
<p>26 Original outcome: Cultivating a network of peers and colleagues in diverse communities</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Check if this outcome is redundant. - Consider adding “from communities that are historically underrepresented and/or absent from the group” or “underserved communities.” 	<p>Response: We agreed that the outcome should be changed for cultural responsiveness and we decided on “including communities that are marginalized.”</p> <p>Planned change: Cultivating a network of peers and colleagues in diverse communities including communities that are marginalized</p>

<p>27 Original outcome: Mediating conflict to further the group’s mission</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider adding the word “leveraging.” - Consider saying stakeholders or describe who comprises “the group.” 	<p>Response: We agreed with adding the word “leveraging” and stating “group’s goal” for specificity. Given the use of the word “group” in other parts of the Framework, we decided to keep that word.</p> <p>Planned change: Mediating and leveraging conflict to further the group's goal</p>
<p>28 Original outcome: Developing trust with others in the group</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider thinking about how to foster trust from others, like incorporating language like “collaboration and growth.” - Consider discussing transparency. - Consider saying stakeholders or describe who comprises “the group.” 	<p>Response: To foster trust, we believe that takes an intentional process, so we added “Facilitating engagement”. Additionally, we added “collaboration and growth” as suggested. Given the use of the word “group” in other parts of the Framework, we decided to keep that word.</p> <p>Planned change: Facilitating engagement that fosters trust, collaboration, and growth in the group</p>
<p>29 Original outcome: Openly acknowledging and appreciating the contributions of others</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider adding “centering and appreciating the contribution of perspectives that are historically silenced.” 	<p>Response: For cultural responsivity, we changed “others” to “other people” and specify “communities that are marginalized”. We also incorporated other suggested edits from the expert reviewers.</p> <p>Planned change: Openly acknowledging, centering, and appreciating the contributions of other people, especially those from communities that are marginalized</p>
<p><u>Learning and Development of Others & Integrity</u></p>	
<p>30 Original outcome: Providing and receiving feedback for the purposes of continued learning</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider removing “for purpose of continued learning” or adding “agreed upon goal attainment.” - Add the phrase “at different stages of the work” and “growth.” - Consider making this two outcomes. 	<p>Response: We agreed that this outcome was redundant and decided to remove this outcome.</p> <p>Planned change: Remove Outcome</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The outcome is redundant so consider removing. 	
<p>31 Original outcome: Leading by example to help others be authentic contributors</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider referring to the self like adding language about “remodeling critical self-reflexivity and consistent self-growth.” 	<p>Response: We agreed with the expert reviewers’ feedback that the outcome should refer to personal self-reflection to help others be authentic. So, we added the phrase “and modeling self-reflection.”</p> <p>Planned change: Leading by example and modeling self-reflection to help others be authentic contributors</p>
<p>32 Original outcome: Supporting others to take risks that allow new information and perspectives to emerge</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider removing the word “risks.” - Consider adding “to be strategic in questioning the status quo.” 	<p>Response: We believe that suggested edits by the expert reviewers change the original intent of this outcome, so we decided to keep the original language.</p> <p>Planned change: No Change</p>
<p><u>Learning and Development of Others & Inclusive Engagement</u></p>	
<p>33 Original outcome: Assessing the goals, needs, and aspirations of others to support growth and development</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider referring to groups and teams. 	<p>Response: We incorporated language to change “others” to “team members” for portability.</p> <p>Planned change: Assessing the goals, needs, and aspirations of team members to support growth and development</p>

<p>34 Original outcome: Facilitating the learning of others by delegating work that extends current knowledge or experience</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider adding “growth” and “introducing and centering underrepresented perspectives and knowledge.” - Given the complexity of the statement, consider focusing on delegation or doing two different outcomes. - Think about how to be inclusive when delegating work. 	<p>Response: We simplified the language of this outcome based on the expert reviewers’ feedback by focusing on delegation. Additionally, we tried to make this outcome more inclusive by saying “team members” rather than “others”.</p> <p>Planned change: Delegating work to extend team members’ learning, knowledge, or experience</p>
<p>35 Original outcome: Partnering in peer-to-peer learning</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No suggested edits. 	<p>Response: No suggested edits.</p> <p>Planned change: No Change</p>
<p>36 Original outcome: Providing direction to resources that support others’ growth</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider adding “critical self-reflection” and “development in areas of improvement”. - Clarify what we mean by “providing direction.” 	<p>Response: We clarified what direction would entail by adding “prompt reflection and support other team members’ growth and development”. We also changed “others” to “team members” for consistency.</p> <p>Planned change: Providing guidance and direction to resources that prompt reflection and support other team members’ growth and development</p>
<p><u>Learning and Development of Others & Connection and Community</u></p>	
<p>37 Original outcome: Developing group facilitation knowledge in others</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Focus more on the concept of group facilitation for clarity. 	<p>Response: We agreed with the expert reviewers’ feedback and changed the outcome language to focus on group facilitation.</p> <p>Planned change: Developing the knowledge and practice of group facilitation</p>
<p>38 Original outcome: Engaging others in community work to expand their network of peers and colleagues</p>	<p>Response: We agreed that we needed to change language for cultural responsiveness, so we amended “others” to “stakeholders” and</p>

<p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider changing “engaging” to “coaching”. - Amend “community” to “community-based”. - Add “critically reflect on one’s identities, privileges and institutional role. - Change the focus to expanding networks. - Considering changing the word other. 	<p>“community” to “community-based”. We did not add other social identity theory-based language since it is reflected in other parts of the Framework. We also did not want to change the original intent of this outcome.</p> <p>Planned change: Engaging stakeholders in community-based work that expands their network of peers and colleagues</p>
<p>39 Original outcome: Trusting others to represent the group in community forums</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Focus more on fostering representation. - Considering changing the word other. 	<p>Response: We agreed that the focus is about fostering additional representation, so the new outcome language reflects that focus. We also changed the word “others” to “stakeholders”.</p> <p>Planned change: Fostering additional representation by creating space for other stakeholders to represent the group</p>
<p><u>Context and Culture & Integrity</u></p>	
<p>40 Original outcome: Understanding the culture and context in which the group exists</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider clarifying which group we are referring to. - Add additional concepts individuals can learn about including social conditions, identities, history, and privileges of groups. - Considering expanding how we understand groups of people like community, state, and nation. 	<p>Response: We agreed with the expert reviewers about adding additional concepts related to cultural context about people for cultural responsiveness and added “history“ and “social conditions”. Identities and privileges now appear in other parts of the Framework because of this vetting process. We decided to use “the issue and affected community” instead of describing other forms of groups for consistency within the Framework. Changing that term also meant moving this outcome under the value of Connection and Community.</p> <p>Planned change: Acknowledging and learning the history, culture, social conditions, and context of the issue and affected community AND move outcome to Context and Culture and Connection & Community</p>

<p>41 Original outcome: Acknowledging the impact of systemic racism, sexism, ableism, etc., on individuals and environments</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Considering adding “communities”. - List institutional and structural forms of discrimination. - The outcome is not portable given the complexity of the language and it can be limiting to list types of discrimination. 	<p>Response: Since outcome 29 lists groups of people that are marginalized, we decided not to list forms of discrimination and instead approach this more broadly. We then incorporated comments about cultural responsiveness suggested by the expert reviewers.</p> <p>Planned change: Acknowledging the influence and impact of institutional, structural, and systemic forms of discrimination on individuals, communities, and environments</p>
<p>42 Original outcome: Being aware of judging others’ behavior and beliefs according to the standards of one’s own culture</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Considering being more specific about what we mean by standards of one’s own culture. - Incorporate language that refers to how dominant culture and affect our ability to critically self-reflect and cause us to judge other people. - Use more direct language than just being aware. - Do not assume fault since this outcome assumes all users are judging people. 	<p>Response: We agreed with the expert reviewers about being more specific about the influence of dominant culture, so we added “culture, biases, privilege, and power”. We also added “refraining” to be more direct with actions when engaging in leadership to not judge people and this was restructured to not assume fault for all users.</p> <p>Planned change: Being aware and refraining when the personal influence of culture, biases, privilege, and/or power causes judgment of other people</p>
<p>43 Original outcome: Recognizing the value and challenges of cultural differences</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Considering saying “Valuing cultural difference” or “Help others see the value in EDI as concepts and practices. - Add additional language to beyond just valuing cultural differences. 	<p>Response: We simplified the language of this outcome and added “understanding” to ensure users spend time learning more about cultural differences.</p> <p>Planned change: Understanding and valuing cultural differences</p>
<p><u>Context and Culture & Inclusive Engagement</u></p>	

<p>44 Original outcome: Encouraging full participation of all members by identifying and removing barriers</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Considering adding “created by systemic inequity”. - Removing barriers is not always possible and the word “spanning” might be a possible replacement. 	<p>Response: We agreed that removing barriers is not always possible, so we used “addressing” for accessibility. We also added “created by systemic inequity” as suggested by the expert reviewers.</p> <p>Planned change: Encouraging full participation of all members by identifying and addressing barriers created by systemic inequity</p>
<p>45 Original outcome: Challenging what is culturally dominant or normative for the group or institution</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recommend explicitly naming how dominant culture can have a negative impact on organizations and groups. - Consider eliminating “group or institution” or add “individual, organizational, and societal”. 	<p>Response: We clarified that equity and inclusion can be affected by dominant culture and for consistency changed “group or institution” to “dominant group or organizational culture”.</p> <p>Planned change: Understanding and challenging the impact of dominant group or organizational culture on equity and inclusion</p>
<p><u>Context and Culture & Connection and Community</u></p>	
<p>46 Original outcome: Demonstrating knowledge of history and cultural context of each constituency</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Instead of constituency can we recommend incorporating concepts from Social Identity Theory. - Consider adding “of the unique and valuable” and “including those perspectives that have been historically undervalued and/or under served.” - Consider saying “community sourced knowledge”. 	<p>Response: We agreed that constituency needed to be elaborated on so we used “group member” and referred to social identity as vital knowledge to learn. Additionally, we incorporated the phrase “community sourced knowledge”.</p> <p>Planned change: Demonstrating community sourced knowledge of the history, cultural context, and social identities of each participant and group member</p>
<p>47 Original outcome: Identifying goals that are meaningful to all</p> <p>Feedback:</p>	<p>Response: We decided to keep the outcomes where it is currently located since we believe it is unique enough to have value in its current placement. Additionally, we did not want to change the original intent of this outcome.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider moving this outcome to another place in the Framework. - Consider adding “with special attention to the goals of inclusivity and collaboration.” 	<p>Planned change: No Change</p>
<p>48 Original outcome: Promoting trust and good will across different cultures</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There could be some value in being broader and saying, “inclusive practices”. - “Promoting” sounds patronizing and recommend substituting that word. 	<p>Response: We changed “promoting” to “fostering and supporting” to be more culturally responsive. Additionally, we also changed “trust and goodwill” to “inclusive practices” to emphasize building trust.</p> <p>Planned change: Fostering and supporting inclusive practices across cultures to build trust</p>
<p>49 Original outcome: Building and engaging with intersectional communities</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider adding “collaborative partnerships” and unpacking what we mean by “communities”. - Unpack the word “intersectional” for clarity and cultural responsiveness. 	<p>Response: We clarified what we meant by “intersectional” by stating “diversity of backgrounds and perspectives” and elaborating on “communities” by saying “groups and partnerships”. Elaborating on communities allows us to be clearer and more portable with this outcome.</p> <p>Planned change: Purposefully including a diversity of backgrounds and perspectives in building groups and partnerships</p>
<p><u>Decision-Making & Integrity</u></p>	
<p>50 Original outcome: Acknowledging one’s self-interest and ensuring it doesn’t interfere with decision-making process</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider adding “positionality” and “working toward a collaborative decision-making process”. - Consider amending “ensuring it doesn’t interfere” with “gauging the impact on”. 	<p>Response: For clarity, we removed “ensuring it doesn’t interfere” and added “organizational position” and “working collaboratively” for cultural responsiveness.</p> <p>Planned change: Acknowledging one’s self-interest and organizational position while working collaboratively in the decision-making process</p>
<p>51 Original outcome: Engaging affected communities in decision-making that impacts them</p>	<p>Response: Incorporated edits for language clarity and added the word authentically as suggested by the expert reviewers.</p>

<p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider adding “authentically”. - Change “engaging” to “involving” and change the sentence structure for clarity. 	<p>Planned change: Authentically involving communities impacted by decision-making</p>
<p>52 Original outcome: Leading decision-making processes with transparent criteria and goals</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No suggested edits. 	<p>Response: No suggested edits.</p> <p>Planned change: No Change</p>
<p>53 Original outcome: Exhibiting personal accountability for decisions made</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider adding group accountability in addition to personal accountability. - Change “exhibiting” to “developing”. 	<p>Response: We agreed with expanding the scope of accountability processes by including groups. Additionally, we wanted to ensure this process was sustainable by changing “exhibiting” to “developing and maintaining”.</p> <p>Planned change: Developing and maintaining personal and group accountability processes for decision making</p>
<p>54 Original outcome: Demonstrating the flexibility to recognize when a decision needs to be revisited</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider actions like assessing, revisiting, and adapting when evaluating decision making. - Consider clarify the language of the outcome. 	<p>Response: We agreed that flexibility needed to be defined so we added “revisit, adapt, and/or change” for clarity on this outcome.</p> <p>Planned change: Demonstrating the flexibility to revisit, adapt, and/or change decisions</p>
<p><u>Decision-Making & Inclusive Engagement</u></p>	
<p>55 Original outcome: Recognizing “groupthink” and encouraging alternatives</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This outcome is redundant, and we should consider consolidating. - Consider defining what we mean by “groupthink”. 	<p>Response: We elaborated on the word groupthink by saying “when there is perceived pressure to conform with the group.” Because of this change in language we believe the outcome is unique enough to remain in the Framework.</p>

	Planned change: Encouraging alternative perspectives when there is perceived pressure to conform with the group
<p>56 Original outcome: Encouraging consensus-building through constructive dialogue</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This outcome is redundant, and we should consider consolidating. 	<p>Response: We believe the process of consensus building is unique enough to keep the outcome in the Framework.</p> <p>Planned change: No Change</p>
<p>57 Original outcome: Creating processes where all perspectives are actively sought out and invited</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This outcome is redundant, and we should consider consolidating. - Consider stating inviting a diversity of perspectives. 	<p>Response: We believe the process of actively seeking perspectives is unique enough to keep the outcome in the Framework. Since we refer to Social Identity Theory language in other parts of the Framework, we decided to keep the language as originally written.</p> <p>Planned change: No Change</p>
<p>58 Original outcome: Synthesizing divergent perspectives to help move towards a final decision</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider adding “collective meaning making”. - Consider simplifying the language of the outcome. 	<p>Response: We agreed that the language of this outcome is complex, so we changed “synthesizing divergent” to “reconciling conflicting” and kept the rest of the outcome as is to ensure its original meaning.</p> <p>Planned change: Reconciling conflicting perspectives to help move towards a final decision</p>
<p>59 Original outcome: Helping the group stay focused on the common goal</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This outcome is redundant, and we should consider consolidating. 	<p>Response: After reviewing the Framework we did not think this outcome was redundant, so we decided to keep this outcome.</p> <p>Planned change: No Change</p>
<p>60 Original outcome: Helping the group become comfortable with making a decision without full information or agreement</p> <p>Feedback:</p>	<p>Response: We agreed this outcome required further explanation, so we added “while understanding the cost of deciding”.</p> <p>Planned change: Helping the group become comfortable with making a decision, while</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider adding more nuance to this outcome to emphasize the cost of making a decision with full consensus. 	<p>understanding the impact of deciding without full information or support</p>
<p><u>Decision-Making & Connection and Community</u></p>	
<p>61 Original outcome: Recognizing group dynamics and their effect on community</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clarify what we mean by group dynamics and how that affects the community since that is unclear. 	<p>Response: We agreed that this outcome needed further explanation of group dynamics, so we replaced that language with “attitude, behaviors, and hierarchies”. Additionally, we specified what we meant by community in the context of this outcome.</p> <p>Planned change: Recognizing the impact of the group’s attitudes, behaviors, and hierarchies on stakeholders and the broader community</p>
<p>62 Original outcome: Promoting collaboration within groups and with external participants</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No suggested edits. 	<p>Response: No suggested edits.</p> <p>Planned change: No Change</p>
<p>63 Original outcome: Modeling humility and trust for the rest of the group</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This outcome is redundant, and we should consider deleting. - Add “and follow through”. 	<p>Response: We agree that this outcome has already been covered in the Framework and should be deleted.</p> <p>Planned change: Remove Outcome</p>
<p><u>Bridge Building and Collaboration & Integrity</u></p>	
<p>64 Original outcome: Openly acknowledging group dynamics</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider adding “uneven power differentials and working toward building collaboration”. - Clarify what we mean by group dynamics. 	<p>Response: For consistency with outcome 62, we defined what we meant by group dynamics by stating “attitudes, behaviors, and power differentials”.</p> <p>Planned change: Openly acknowledging the group's attitudes, behaviors, and power differentials to foster collaboration</p>

<p>65 Original outcome: Fostering a culture of transparency</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider adding “sense of trust among team members”. - Note that individuals need to decide when to be transparent. 	<p>Response: For consistency with outcome 6 & 22, we changed “transparency” to “openness” since this will be more portable for users.</p> <p>Planned change: Fostering a culture of openness</p>
<p>66 Original outcome: Fostering a sense of trust among team members</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider that garnering trust takes time and commitment. 	<p>Response: Given that earning trust is a process, we changed “fostering a sense” to “building”.</p> <p>Planned change: Building trust among team members</p>
<p>67 Original outcome: Identifying compatible interests when conflict is present</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider using more positive language like “shared purpose”, “common ground”, “hearing both side”, etc. 	<p>Response: We agreed that we could use more accessible and inclusive language for this outcome, so we selected “common ground”.</p> <p>Planned change: Identifying common ground when conflict is present</p>
<p>68 Original outcome: Valuing input from team members, even when it is different from others and one’s own</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider changing “even” to “especially” to make the language more direct. - Consider adding “listening” or “understanding”. 	<p>Response: We agreed that the language could be more direct, so we added “unique” and “especially”. To ensure the outcome keeps its original meaning we added “listening” since not everyone can or will understand someone’s input during a conversation.</p> <p>Planned change: Listening and valuing the unique input from each team member, especially when its different from others and one’s own</p>
<p><u>Bridge Building and Collaboration & Inclusive Engagement</u></p>	
<p>69 Original outcome: Recognizing the importance of sharing ownership in completing critical group tasks</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider adding “cultivating”. 	<p>Response: We incorporated our expert reviewers’ feedback for cultural responsibility.</p> <p>Planned change: Cultivating shared ownership in completing critical group tasks</p>

<p>70 Original outcome: Identifying how others want to be appreciated for their participation to support ongoing and future engagement</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Incorporate language on how values motivate participation. - Clarify what others means in this outcome. - Consider simplifying the language of the outcome. 	<p>Response: While reviewing this outcome we appreciated the original language but wanted to ensure users would follow through on acts of appreciation Therefore, we added “actively identifying and incorporating” which could reveal participants’ values motivating participation. Additionally, we clarified what others meant with “participants”.</p> <p>Planned change: Actively identifying and incorporating how participants want to be appreciated to support their continued engagement</p>
<p>71 Original outcome: Identifying complementary skills and ensuring that teams are diverse</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider what we mean by diverse in this outcome. 	<p>Response: We decided that we meant diversity of skills rather than diversity of identity, so we rephrased the outcome to reflect that intent.</p> <p>Planned change: Building teams with diverse and complementary skills</p>
<p>72 Original outcome: Ensuring that the dominant groups are not overpowering</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider clarifying what we mean by overpower like changing the outcome to “Foster open conversations about power dynamics to ensure that that traditionally marginalized groups have voice and equitable access to participation, decision making, and resources”. 	<p>Response: We decided to fully incorporate the language used by one of our expert reviewers to expand on what we meant by our original language. We just changed “traditionally marginalized groups” to “groups that are marginalized” for consistency with our other changes.</p> <p>Planned change: Foster open conversations about power dynamics to ensure that groups that are marginalized have voice and equitable access to participation, decision making, and resources</p>
<p><u>Bridge Building and Collaboration & Connection and Community</u></p>	
<p>73 Original outcome: Creating a safe environment where participants can share differences of opinion</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider adding “applying inclusive practices”. 	<p>Response: We decided to incorporate suggested edits for cultural responsivity and portability so users can apply different practices to create environments to respectfully engage in discussion.</p> <p>Planned change: Applying inclusive practices to create an environment where</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Add inclusive language about welcoming and sharing not just opinions, but also experiences. 	differences of opinion and experience are shared and welcomed
<p>74 Original outcome: Building consensus with the group in identifying the group’s goals</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider simplifying the language for this outcome. - This outcome is redundant since it appears in other places of the Framework. - Consider using alignment instead of consensus. 	<p>Response: Since this outcome can be consolidated with outcome 76, we decided to delete this outcome.</p> <p>Planned change: Remove Outcome</p>
<p>75 Original outcome: Fostering a sense of trust among community partners</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This outcome is redundant since it appears in other places of the Framework. - Consider adding “a goal and an underlying tenet of the work” 	<p>Response: Since this outcome has appeared in other locations in the Framework, we decided to delete this outcome.</p> <p>Planned change: Remove Outcome</p>
<p>76 Original outcome: Developing coalitions by aligning mutually beneficial goals</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Combine this outcome with outcome 74. 	<p>Response: To consolidate outcome 74 and 76, we added groups to this outcome and reworded the outcome for clarity.</p> <p>Planned change: Identifying mutually beneficial goals for coalitions and groups</p>
<p>77 Original outcome: Appreciating the different learning styles of group members</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider adding “understanding”, “engaging”, “identifying”, or “leveraging”. 	<p>Response: To make this outcome more active, we decided to incorporate “understanding” and “leveraging” into this outcome language.</p> <p>Planned change: Understanding and leveraging the different learning styles of group members</p>
<p><u>Ideas into Action & Integrity</u></p>	

<p>78 Original outcome: Recognizing the inherent risk in promoting change</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider that there is greater risk in not being willing to take risks. - Consider naming types of risks. 	<p>Response: We wanted to state the benefits of taking risks, so we added “recognizing and weighing the risks and opportunities”. By incorporating this language, we wanted to focus more on the positive aspects of risk taking rather than naming risks.</p> <p>Planned change: Recognizing and weighing the risks and opportunities in promoting change</p>
<p>79 Original outcome: Exploring how intended change will be sustained and supported</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No suggested edits. 	<p>Response: No suggested edits.</p> <p>Planned change: No Change</p>
<p>80 Original outcome: Appropriately managing risk</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider consolidated with outcome 78. - Consider adding “developing a process for evaluating approaches consistently” 	<p>Response: We believe this outcome is different enough than outcome 78 that it warrants continuing to stand alone. We did incorporate language related to evaluating selected approaches as suggested by the expert reviewers.</p> <p>Planned change: Appropriately managing risk by continuously evaluating selected approaches</p>
<p>81 Original outcome: Challenging the status quo with facts and logical reasoning about its advantages and drawbacks</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider defining what we mean by status quo. 	<p>Response: We rephrased this outcome to define what we meant by status quo by stating “dominant norms and processes”.</p> <p>Planned change: Considering the advantages and disadvantages of dominant norms and processes by testing them against facts and logical reasoning</p>
<p>82 Original outcome: Demonstrating flexibility in responding to the ways others are impacted by change</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider defining what we mean by flexibility by saying “responsive and adaptive”. 	<p>Response: We defined what we meant by flexibility by stating being “empathetic and adaptive”. We also defined what we meant by “others” with “team members”.</p> <p>Planned change: Being empathetic and adaptive when team members are impacted by change</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Further define what we mean by “others”. - Simplify the language of this outcome. 	
<p>83 Original outcome: Fostering a sense of trust among team members</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This outcome is redundant since it appears in other places of the Framework. 	<p>Response: We decided to delete this outcome since similar language appears multiple times through the Framework.</p> <p>Planned change: Remove Outcome</p>
<p><u>Ideas into Action & Inclusive Engagement</u></p>	
<p>84 Original outcome: Collectively defining and communicating a compelling vision that enables others to pursue change</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider changing the language so it focuses less on the individual and instead on how to work collectively. - Define what we mean by others. 	<p>Response: Incorporated new language like “developing and sharing” to emphasize that visioning should be a collective process.</p> <p>Planned change: Collectively developing and sharing a compelling vision for the pursuit of change</p>
<p>85 Original outcome: Creating a safe environment for people to be open in expressing and working through their fears of change</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This outcome is redundant and could be addressed in other parts of the Framework. - Add “challenging the status quo”. - Consider how this outcome can focus on psychological safety. 	<p>Response: We wanted to change the language of the outcome to focus less on safety and more on inclusive practices since creating safety can begin bordering on intrusive practices. We added language about challenging the status quo with “challenge dominant norms”. We did not believe this outcome is redundant since it talks about fears in change management.</p> <p>Planned change: Creating an environment that allows team members enacting change to surface fears and challenge dominant norms</p>
<p>86 Original outcome: Promoting energy and optimism in order to move ideas into action</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No suggested edits. 	<p>Response: No suggested edits.</p> <p>Planned change: No Change</p>

<u>Ideas into Action & Connection and Community</u>	
<p>87 Original outcome: Partnering with key stakeholders in the identification, development, and implementation of positive change</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider adding “development of shared vision for positive change”. - Add the word “active” to avoid nepotism. 	<p>Response: We agreed with all expert reviewers’ feedback and incorporated all their suggested edits.</p> <p>Planned change: Partnering with key active stakeholders in the identification and development of a shared vision and plan for positive change</p>
<p>88 Original outcome: Maintaining an open atmosphere for questioning processes and impacts</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider adding learning concepts into this outcome. - Consider adding “safe environment” instead of an “open atmosphere” since we cannot assume an atmosphere is open. - Consider adding the word “creating”. 	<p>Response: We wanted to maintain the original intent of this outcome but agree that an open atmosphere is not always possible. We decided to use the word “environment” and adding the word “creating” to ensure cultural sustainability.</p> <p>Planned change: Creating and maintaining an environment for questioning processes, the impact of potential actions, and the impact of actions taken</p>
<p>89 Original outcome: Working with the community in determining where change is needed</p> <p>Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider consolidating with outcome 87. 	<p>Response: We believe outcome 87 encompasses the intent of this outcome. Therefore, we decided to delete this outcome.</p> <p>Planned change: Remove Outcome</p>