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Making Excellence Inclusive: 
Roots, Branches, Futures

In 2012, anticipating the association’s centennial anniversary, AAC&U expanded its mission to encompass both liberal education and the long-term project of making excellence inclusive. This shift was not made lightly. The expansion of our mission built on at least two decades of work to clarify the kind of learning college graduates need most, for a complex world and as citizens in a diverse and still inequitable democracy. It also built on the extensive work that AAC&U has led over the past two decades to help our member institutions, and the higher education community as a whole, create more intentional, hospitable, and educationally empowering environments for the diverse and unevenly prepared students now flocking to postsecondary education.

So what are the connections between liberal education and inclusive excellence? What does the concept of inclusive excellence add to the mission of advancing liberal education?

As I look toward the conclusion of my term as AAC&U’s president, I want to share my own perspective on these questions by exploring the roots and branches of AAC&U’s decision to expand its mission to encompass both liberal education and inclusive excellence. I take great pride in this accomplishment. But I am conscious that this expanded mission calls us to far-reaching new work. In what follows, I want to share with you, our members, the foundations of our expanded mission and my own sense of the complex and demanding journey that lies ahead.

Inclusive excellence must be anchored in clear goals for quality learning

In a knowledge-fueled economy, it is necessary but nonetheless insufficient to provide expanded access to college for groups previously underserved. It is also necessary but insufficient to focus primarily on whether underserved students are making timely progress toward degree completion. Quality learning is—and must be—the sine qua non for students who place their hopes for the future in the benefits of college.

To be specific, graduates will be poised for longer-term success when they possess—in addition to depth in the fields they choose as specializations—broad, big-picture knowledge of the world they are navigating (physical, cultural, historical, socioeconomic); well-honed intellectual and practical skills that prepare them to deal with the complexity of that wider world; proficiency in integrating, adapting, and applying their learning to complex problems; and a grounded sense of ethical and civic responsibility for their uses of knowledge. The forms of learning that allow students to achieve these outcomes also prepare students to adapt responsively and responsibly to change.

Historically and substantively, this design for quality learning is best described as a liberal and liberating education. But, claims to the contrary notwithstanding, liberal education does not belong only to the liberal arts and sciences disciplines. The hallmark learning outcomes of a quality liberal education can and must be cultivated—in context-appropriate ways—across all fields of study, “liberal arts” and career focused alike.

General education is an important component of a quality liberal education. But general education cannot by itself provide the entirety of a horizon-expanding and empowering education. Rather, to foster integrative liberal learning, general education must work in tandem with major programs and with students’ own particular interests, prior learning, and aspirations.

To help diverse learners achieve a high-quality liberal and liberating education, we must seek ways to cultivate the hallmark liberal learning outcomes within the career-attentive fields of study that most
students choose and through dramatically improved approaches to general education. Addressing liberal education goals and learning outcomes across the entire educational experience is a bedrock issue for AAC&U. But many in higher education do not necessarily grasp this part of the inclusive excellence agenda, continuing to treat general education and liberal education as one and the same. The project of advancing quality liberal learning across the entire educational experience remains a work in progress. It needs to become an urgent priority.

**Quality learning necessarily includes diversity learning**

A liberal education is characterized by enduring goals—fostering broad learning, developing the powers of the mind, cultivating ethical and civic responsibility, preparing learners to put knowledge to use. But liberal education is not static. It has become and remained America’s premier higher education tradition because it has constantly adapted its practices to the needs of a changing world.

In our time, some of the most powerful changes in the substance and pedagogy of liberal education have been driven by deep engagement, both with the diversity and pluralism of our world and also with the tensions between Americans’ professed aspirations to democratic justice and the persistence of deep disparities and exclusions within the United States as well as within other societies.

Together, these explorations have led to a new understanding that, in a diverse and still divided democracy, a quality college education must build capabilities that graduates need, not just to navigate a diverse world, but to help create more just, equitable, and inclusive communities. To be specific, given the diversity of our democracy, given the United States’ historic commitment to the values undergirding democracy, and given the inevitable intersection with the global community, a quality education for our time must include rich learning about cultural and societal diversity, including one’s own (typically multiple) sources of identity and community; exploration of the connections between democratic principles of equal dignity and opportunity and the restless quests for “justice-seeking” and expanded social power that have long characterized US democracy and societal movements around the world; and experiences that deliberately build students’ capacity to work productively and collaboratively across differences of many kinds, not just to “understand” our challenges but to help create positive solutions for a shared future.

Diversity learning described in this way builds needed capacities for the workplace and the economy. Indeed, in the two most recent AAC&U surveys, employers have listed “problem solving with people whose views and experiences are different from one’s own” as the very top goal for college learning.

But diversity learning also needs to engage the public problems we face as a democracy and in the global community. AAC&U affirmed this strongly through its work in the 1990s, and built civic learning directly into its LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes at the start of the twenty-first century. We also strongly influenced the inclusion of civic learning and engagement with diverse perspectives into Lumina Foundation’s Degree Qualifications Profile.

Collectively, against a long-term trend toward seeing college only as a source of private benefit and financial “return on investment,” AAC&U has sought to help higher education affirm that all students ought to graduate prepared and inspired to take responsibility for the quality of our shared futures—in the workplace, in the community, and in their own personal contexts.

Conversely, college learning lacks quality when it does not intentionally prepare students with the knowledge and skills required for a diverse and still inequitable world and for their roles in civil society. This is easily stated but not widely understood. In the same way that our society likes to think of itself as post-racial, many like to think of quality learning as diversity opaque or diversity optional. There is
good reason to think that many of those who have embraced the language of “inclusive excellence” really use it as a synonym for compositional diversity. But AAC&U always intended the term to refer to knowledge, skills, and experiences that would help create a more just and inclusive society and that would create better solutions to the problems we need to solve.

**Achieving inclusive excellence requires transformative change**

Providing a quality education to twenty-first-century learners will require far-reaching and transformative change—deploying both high-tech and high-touch strategies—at the institutional and systemic levels. US colleges, community colleges, and universities will need to make far-reaching changes in their institutional, curricular, and pedagogical practices—including their interaction with communities beyond the academy—to ensure that today's diverse and diversely prepared students actually achieve an empowering and horizon-expanding education. Those changes will be facilitated in part by the digital revolution, but they will depend for their effectiveness on human judgment, caring, and community.

The needed changes are not just structural. They begin with shifts in the mindsets that have colluded, or at least acquiesced, for the entirety of US history, in systems of marginalization, inequity, and intolerance. The needed changes—in mindset and in institutional and educational practice—already are being made, at virtually every kind of institution. But the pace of change is much too slow.

Indeed, the eruption of campus protests concerning marginalization and aggression against specific groups serves to underline the possibility that higher education may well have lost ground on issues that were front and center in the 1990s: specifically, the recognition that campus climate itself functions as a signaling device to “new” students, with the signals too often indicating that students from underrepresented groups are neither welcomed nor valued.

As early as the 1980s, AAC&U coined and helped promulgate the concept of a “chilly climate” as an obstacle for women and minorities in higher education. But developing the concept is far different from successfully warming the climate. Making excellence meaningfully inclusive is everyone’s shared responsibility, and higher education still urgently needs leadership and touchstones to track its own progress, institution by institution, in meeting that standard. Moreover, there is a worrisome trend toward a radical personalization of college learning through self-paced digital programs that students do largely on their own. This trend risks draining from the educational context all the potential of living and working in diverse and collaborative communities, with a corresponding loss of needed knowledge. To make excellence inclusive, we must ensure that college learning is collaborative, not solitary.

**Democracy is disfigured when disparities persist**

How did AAC&U build the commitment and the capacity—as a staff and as a community of participating institutions—to envision, advance, and help document higher education’s progress from a community built on exclusive excellence to a community embracing inclusive excellence? It was largely through the AAC&U initiative American Commitments: Diversity, Democracy, and Liberal Learning (1992–2002). Fully as complex in its time as the Liberal Education and America’s Promise (LEAP) initiative and far better supported by multiple philanthropies, relatively speaking, American Commitments decisively shaped the mindset I brought to my presidency—not just about the substance of liberal education, but about how to gain traction on a huge agenda when one’s wallet remains limited.
All involved in the initiative knew, of course, that students occupy a “global” world. But American Commitments asked higher education what it could and should do about US diversity and US disparities, with specific attention to the communities and neighbors who were (and are) relegated to the margins of society, notwithstanding our democracy’s formal commitment to such principles as justice, human dignity, and meaningful opportunity.

In 1995, the American Commitments initiative specifically recommended that each student should explore his or her own sources of identity in dialogue with others; learn about US pluralism and the multiple pursuits of justice that characterize this society; work with selected community partners on “justice-seeking,” meaning movements to expand opportunity and redress inequities; and work on contested issues related to societal diversity in the context of his or her major. Those of us who worked on these concepts in the 1990s know how far US higher education remains today from successfully realizing them.

Many institutions have, of course, established “diversity requirements.” But we know from research that significant numbers of students do not think their education helped them learn either about diversity issues or about important questions in their own society. In other words, requiring the study of diversity is not necessarily building capacity to take responsibility for the future of a shared and diverse democracy. Indeed, the current political scene suggests a house deeply divided on the future of US pluralism, even among college-educated citizens.

Nonetheless, the issues explored in American Commitments continued to influence AAC&U’s later initiatives. Through unwavering determination since 2001, and in the face of a funding climate far less hospitable than in the 1990s to diversity and learning initiatives, AAC&U has continued to promote and advance higher education’s capacity to prepare students for a diverse and globally shared world. Some of our most recent work in this area resulted in the national report A Crucible Moment: College Learning and Democracy’s Future, which was released in 2012 at the White House following a broad mobilization of organizations, scholars, and practitioners to shape recommendations about the future of civic learning across school and college.

The point I want to underscore is that there is a direct lineage between the vision outlined in American Commitments (c. 1995), the vision and recommendations outlined in A Crucible Moment (2012), and the substance of the LEAP Challenge, which AAC&U issued in 2015. The LEAP Challenge urges higher education to expect students to work on significant problems and projects during their college studies and to ensure that students are prepared to succeed with problem-centered inquiry and analysis.

To date, AAC&U has described the LEAP Challenge and students’ Signature Work projects as capaciously (or inclusively) as possible, describing the multiple forms such projects could take, but saying little about the actual substance of the topics students might tackle. Yet, the opportunity is now there for AAC&U members to engage students directly with the public problems we need to solve as a diverse and globally engaged democracy. In other words, preparation to succeed with their Signature Work projects could lead students to work extensively, and with diverse partners, on exactly the kind of civic problem solving that A Crucible Moment envisioned.

I warmly hope that, as we envision the future of our work on making excellence inclusive, we will keep in mind that this mission-level commitment was framed and formed through AAC&U’s deep and ongoing engagement with the aspirations of a just and inclusive democracy and with the distance our society and every society must travel to fulfill those aspirations.—CAROL GEARY SCHNEIDER
Creativity and innovation are at the heart of a contemporary liberal education, and both are central to the educational vision this association has been advancing through the Liberal Education and America’s Promise (LEAP) initiative. The LEAP Principles of Excellence call on educators to “teach the arts of inquiry and innovation,” for example, and the set of LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes, the cornerstone of that signature initiative, includes “creative thinking” among the intellectual and practical skills all students need to gain in order to prepare for twenty-first-century challenges.

Moreover, for nearly a decade now, AAC&U has regularly sponsored public opinion research to examine the extent to which college students, recent graduates, and employers are aware of the consensus among educators that the LEAP outcomes represent the contemporary standard for excellence in undergraduate education; whether they share educators’ belief that these particular outcomes are essential for success in professional, civic, and personal spheres; and how well they believe colleges and universities are doing in terms of helping students achieve those outcomes. The surveys have consistently shown that students, recent graduates, and employers share in the consensus that the LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes represent the kind of learning today’s students need for success.

With respect to creativity and innovation, however, the surveys point to a need for greater emphasis on “the ability to be innovative and think creatively.” The first survey, published in 2006, found that 70 percent of employers and 54 percent of recent graduates believe that greater emphasis is needed. And the most recent survey, published just last year, found that while both students and employers regard “the ability to innovate and be creative” as a “very important” outcome of a college education (69 percent and 65 percent, respectively), there is a wide gap between the perception of each group when it comes to how well colleges and universities are currently doing in this area: 57 percent of college students say they are being well prepared, yet only 25 percent of employers agree.

The Featured Topic section of this issue takes up the challenge presented by those findings: how can higher education more effectively foster outcomes related to creativity and innovation? In the lead article, Leticia Britos Cavagnaro and Humera Fasihuddin describe the skills and mindsets they believe students need to develop while in college, regardless of “whether they join companies, become educators and researchers, get jobs in government or the nonprofit sector, or start their own ventures,” and present several compelling examples from their own work with student innovators. Based on their experience, they argue that, ultimately, a transformation of higher education is needed if it is truly to “prepare students to thrive in the complexity and ambiguity of the twenty-first century.”

In the second article, Fernando Lozano and Amanda Sabicer focus on the new demands today’s economy places on student preparation as the driving force behind higher education’s embrace of creativity and innovation. Drawing from their experience with innovative partnerships between higher education institutions and local community organizations, government, and industry that enable students to apply their learning in “real-world” situations, Lozano and Sabicer identify several key elements for fostering a “creative and innovative ecosystem.”

Taken together, these articles demonstrate how students can be helped to develop “creative thinking” and practice “the art of innovation,” and they suggest promising directions for changes in how undergraduate education is conducted—changes that, if implemented, could go a long way toward ensuring all students graduate with “the ability to innovate and be creative” that they and their future employers agree is essential to success in the twenty-first century.—DAVID TRITELLI
NEW Biennal Lecture to Honor Carol Geary Schneider
To honor the legacy of President Carol Geary Schneider, who will retire on June 30, 2016, the AAC&U board of directors has established the Carol Geary Schneider Lecture on Liberal Education and Inclusive Excellence. The lecture will be delivered biennially at the AAC&U annual meeting in Washington, DC, by high-profile thinkers who help us understand and engage with issues fundamental to both higher education and our democratic society.

2016 Frederic W. Ness Book Award Winner
At the AAC&U annual meeting in January, the 2016 Frederic W. Ness Book Award was presented to Michael S. Roth for Beyond the University: Why Liberal Education Matters (Yale University Press, 2014). Recounting historical debates over the benefits—or drawbacks—of a liberal education, Roth focuses in the book on important moments and seminal thinkers in America’s long-running argument over vocational versus liberal education.

Established in 1979 to honor the president emeritus of AAC&U, the Frederic W. Ness Book Award recognizes significant contributions to the understanding and improvement of liberal education. More information about the award—including selection criteria, information about the nomination process, and a listing of past winners—is available online at www.aacu.org/about/ness-award.

New Officers and Directors for AAC&U Board of Directors
At the annual meeting in January, AAC&U members elected a slate of new officers for the board of directors. James P. Collins, Virginia M. Ullman Professor of Natural History and Environment at Arizona State University, became chair of the board, taking over from Edward J. Ray, president of Oregon State University; Ray will continue to serve on the board’s executive committee as past chair. AAC&U members voted to appoint Elsa Núñez, president of Eastern Connecticut State University, as vice chair of the board. Sean Decatur, president of Kenyon College, will continue in his three-year term as treasurer.

In addition, seven directors were appointed to board: Thomas Bailey, George and Abby O’Neill Professor of Economics and Education, Teachers College, Columbia University; Mark Becker, president, Georgia State University; William J. Craft, president, Concordia College; Ronald Crutcher, president, University of Richmond; Alex Johnson, president, Cuyahoga Community College; Lenore Rodicio, provost for academic and student affairs, Miami Dade College; and Judith R. Shapiro, president, the Teagle Foundation.

A complete listing of members of AAC&U’s board of directors is available online at www.aacu.org/about/board.
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A Moonshot Approach to Change in Higher Education

LETICIA BRITOS CAVAGNARO and HUMERA FASIHUDDIN

GOOGLE FOUNDERS Larry Page and Sergey Brin revolutionized the way we access and use information. And they didn’t stop there. Their bold thinking has led them to explore such “moonshots” as reimagining transportation with self-driving cars and making clean energy accessible to everyone with high-flying wind turbines. According to Google, a project qualifies as a “moonshot” if it meets three criteria: it tackles a huge problem, proposes a radical solution, and involves breakthrough science or technology.1

Technology has accelerated the pace of change in how we live and work, and it also has democratized who can be involved in shaping that rapid evolution. An increasing number of people can easily access the tools to realize almost anything they can imagine. On the flip side of this new world of possibilities are problems of growing complexity, such as climate change, cyberterrorism, and widespread income inequality.

Higher education needs to change in order to equip learners with the skills and mindsets they will need to tackle daunting challenges and to leverage tools of unparalleled potential. Let’s explore these skills and mindsets, which students will need whether they join companies, become educators and researchers, get jobs in government or the nonprofit sector, or start their own ventures. They will need to be comfortable with ambiguity and uncertainty. According to Nick Swayne, executive director of 4-VA, a collaborative partnership between five Virginia universities, “students need to learn to manage real-world situations—not artificial Disneyland-like ones—because they will soon be out in the real world. We need to allow students to get to the edge of the cliff, instead of keeping them away, because it’s at the edge where the learning happens.”2

The problems that expose students to the edge can be called “wicked problems.” According to Horst Rittel and Melvin Webber, professors of design and urban planning at the University of California–Berkeley, a “wicked problem” has innumerable causes, is tough to describe, and doesn’t have a right answer.3 The Association of American Colleges and Universities calls them “unscripted problems.”4

Students can and should tackle wicked or unscripted problems as part of their educational journeys. Yet, by contrast, the problems and case studies prevalent in most curricula are neatly defined and have a previously known answer—often a single right answer. Knowing that an answer already exists completely changes the way students think about a problem. Thus, far from providing “training wheels” for tackling problems in the real world once they graduate, these practice problems are counterproductive for the development of the needed skills and

Students can be the change agents that spark accelerated and lasting impact at their schools
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Creativity, Innovation, and the Redesign of Academia

Lehigh University’s Mountaintop campus occupies an industrial hangar that once belonged to Bethlehem Steel.
attitudes. Table 1 compares both types of problems across different dimensions.

As humans, we have a natural tendency to want to find solutions quickly when faced with a problem, and we become very uncomfortable under the uncertainty and ambiguity that characterizes unscripted problems. Favoring well-defined problems that have a known right answer reinforces the habit of jumping to the first evident solution, or that of avoiding complex problems altogether.

They will need to be problem solvers and problem finders. To come up with solutions that will make a difference, it is crucial to determine whether we are solving the right problem. Consider the following example, as described by Tom and David Kelley in their book Creative Confidence. Students in the Design for Extreme Affordability course at Stanford University’s Hasso Plattner Institute of Design ("the d.school") are placed in interdisciplinary teams to design affordable solutions for daunting problems proposed by nonprofits in the developing world. In 2007, one of those student teams was presented with the problem of infant incubators that are expensive to maintain in rural hospitals in Nepal. Reducing the cost of existing incubator designs by eliminating parts and using less expensive materials was an obvious way to solve the problem. But it’s the non-obvious solution that comes from a deep understanding of a problem that gives rise to true innovation.

With that goal in mind, the students traveled to Nepal to immerse themselves in the world of the people involved in the problem—doctors, nurses, mothers—and better understand their needs and perspectives. What they saw and experienced allowed them to challenge their assumptions about the problem. They found functional yet empty incubators at the hospital, and learned that the babies who needed them were often born in villages so far away that many could not make it to the hospital. The students reframed the problem, from the need for a cheaper hospital incubator to the need to help parents keep their premature babies warm and transport them to the hospital. The solution, a portable baby-warming device called the Embrace Warmer, is currently being used in eleven countries and has received numerous awards. In this case, reframing the problem was the key to reaching a solution that saves lives.

They will need to be empathetic. The Embrace Warmer case also demonstrates the need for a skill that is essential to tackling complex problems: understanding the perspectives of the (usually multiple) stakeholders involved. At the heart of the methodology taught to d.school students is empathy. Commonly and mistakenly conflated with sympathy, empathy can be defined as the ability and disposition to step into the shoes of others in order to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. School problems vs. real-world problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>School problems/case studies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scope/parameters of the problem</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Solution</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What students are required to learn</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skills that are fostered</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ownership of the process</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role of the instructor</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All students should be exposed to important notions about how we learn, as this will influence their behavior and outcomes.
understand their perspectives and motivations. By seeking and understanding the perspectives of the mothers, the Design for Extreme Affordability students were able to focus on an opportunity that was at the root of the problem.

**They will need to be bold thinkers.** Once a problem that matters has been identified, coming up with a solution that makes a difference requires creative thinking. Beyond understanding “what is,” we must envision “what could be.” Critical thinking is another skill that education must bolster in order to prepare students for the complexity of the twenty-first century. Doing so will require educators to dispel the prevalent myth about the existence of two kinds of people: those who are creative, and those who are not.

Is it reasonable to expect that one might master math problems without practice solving them? Or is it possible to become a pro at a sport without setting foot on the field? Why would we concede that we are not creative without doing any work to hone our creative skills? Producing creative work, like anything else, requires intention, deliberate practice, and the belief, by both students and educators, that everyone has the capacity to produce it.

Astro Teller, “Captain of Moonshots” at Google’s parent company, Alphabet, claims that it is easier to come up with a solution that is ten times better than existing solutions than it is to improve something by 10 percent. He calls this “10x thinking.” The logic is that, when aiming for incremental changes, it is inevitable to focus on existing tools and assumptions; by contrast, when we aim for 10x solutions, we must really challenge our assumptions about what is possible.8

According to the 2015 National Survey of Student Engagement, coursework that emphasizes creative skills (e.g., generating new ideas, taking risks, inventing new methods to find solutions) is positively related to student engagement in several areas. However, there are pronounced differences by field of study in the extent to which students felt they could take risks in their coursework without fear of penalty.9 So, the degree to which students in certain disciplines exercise their creativity might vary greatly.

**They will need to be lifelong learners.** In his *Reflections on the Human Condition*, Eric Hoffer wrote, “In a time of drastic change it is the learners who inherit the future. The learned usually find themselves equipped to live in a world that no longer exists.”10 Stepping into the uncharted territory of “what could be” requires curiosity and just-in-time, self-directed learning skills that enable us to dive into areas of knowledge that emerge as we explore problems and imagine possible solutions. Confidence in our learning skills is what can put us at ease when we find ourselves faced with ambiguity.

All students should be exposed to important notions about how we learn, as this will influence their behavior and outcomes. The work of Stanford psychologist Carol Dweck on the difference between a growth mindset and a fixed mindset is especially relevant,11 as is the work of David Yeager, one of Professor Dweck’s graduate students. Currently assistant professor of psychology at the University of Texas at Austin, Yeager showed that incoming freshmen who get, as part of their orientation, an article about the malleability of the brain and how practice makes it grow new connections are more likely to stay on track in their first semester, which is an indicator of graduation rates. If a simple “mindset intervention” has a demonstrable effect on academic outcomes, then integrating these concepts more broadly has great potential to revolutionize the educational system.12 In addition, more often than not, what is evaluated in classes is what the student produces, and that sends a strong signal about what is valued. The use of explicit language and holistic assessment tools like e-portfolios can be leveraged to signal the value of the learning process to students.13

**What learning experiences might produce these outcomes?**

According to research done by Harvard professor Clay Christensen and his colleagues, the skills and mindsets discussed above map well onto the skills and behaviors that characterize the innovative entrepreneurs who have revolutionized the ways in which we live and work.14

Over the past few decades, centers and institutes devoted to innovation and entrepreneurship (I&E) have been proliferating at universities nationwide.15 While many operate within business or engineering schools, they increasingly serve a broader student population. Both within and beyond academia, two broadly applicable I&E approaches have gained considerable traction: “design thinking” and “lean startup.” The design
thinking approach, championed by the d.school among other institutions, can be described as a human-centered and experimentation-driven process to define and solve problems creatively. But the process is only a scaffold for the development of skills and mindsets that can be applied in no prescribed order. The lean startup approach, made popular by serial entrepreneur Steve Blank, is based on the premise that those leading new ventures and initiatives within existing organizations must search for a viable business model through experimentation, customer feedback, and iterative design, and they must do so in a hypothesis-driven fashion that parallels the way scientists work.

While design thinking is commonly associated with innovation and lean startup with entrepreneurship, both frameworks overlap in significant ways. First, both approaches aim at uncovering the needs of the people who will be served by a given solution, product, or service (design thinking labels those people “users” or “stakeholders,” while lean startup calls them “customers”). Second, making ideas tangible and testing them early in the process is a cornerstone of both approaches (“prototyping” in design thinking; creating a “minimum viable product,” or “MVP,” in lean startup). Moreover, both innovation and entrepreneurship are about putting ideas out into the world. Thus, educators who teach these approaches generally resort to a hands-on, active pedagogy and emphasize the development of skills and attitudes (mindsets), rather than just knowledge acquisition.

**What makes I&E learning experiences valuable for all students?**

These experiences give students the autonomy to work on projects that are connected to their passions. Most, if not all of us, can remember a teacher who inspired us to love a subject or discipline. The role of inspiration in teaching and learning is elevated in maxims such as Plutarch’s “the correct analogy for the mind is not a vessel that needs filling, but wood that needs igniting.” This is especially critical in the experience of first-year students. Students’ first contact with a discipline or area of study can either inspire them to dig deeper, or it can turn them off and reduce the subject to a requirement to be checked off. Unless we engage the whole student as a human being with emotions and not merely a rational machine that receives information, we won’t be able to achieve deep learning.

Giving students the autonomy to learn new skills while exploring areas they are or might be interested in is key to fueling their intrinsic motivation and love of learning. At Lehigh University’s Mountaintop campus, which occupies industrial hangars that once belonged to Bethlehem Steel, students from diverse majors and levels come together in the summer to work on projects of their own choosing. While faculty mentors are on hand, the students independently define the goals of their projects and determine how to pursue them. They get resources, can borrow equipment, and are assigned a space in the open building, which they must configure and maintain. Projects in the summer of 2015 ranged from low-energy sustainable farming to the design of exoskeleton appliances to aid in rehabilitation for patients with muscle disorders.

Beyond capstone courses and other projects of similar scope, like the Lehigh Mountaintop experience, how might we integrate this practice into the fabric of the educational experience? In the spring of 2013, the d.school embarked on a year of exploration into possible futures of learning at Stanford—through classes, workshops, and the development of tools that involved students, faculty, administrators, and a diversity of partners. The project, named Stanford 2025, aimed at inspiring further exploration and experimentation by the broader community invested in the future of higher education. For example, the project explored the concept of purpose learning, whereby students would declare a mission, not a major. They would couple their disciplinary pursuit with the purpose that fuels it. “I’m a biology major” would be replaced by “I’m learning human biology to eliminate world hunger.”

They give students opportunities, space, and tools to become better collaborators. Complex problems require approaches from multiple perspectives, so it is imperative that students have ample opportunities to learn to work in multidisciplinary teams. In the Lehigh Mountaintop experience described above, the student teams get their own space in the building and are responsible for configuring and maintaining it. It is important that the space belongs to the team and that the project is on neutral grounds, as this sets the stage for equal participation by
all team members. In the book Make Space, Scott Doorley and Scott Witthoft describe how the d.school uses space to promote effective and creative collaboration by multidisciplinary student teams working on design thinking challenges. Through the intentional use of flexible furniture configurations and vertical surfaces to display and manipulate shared information, the space promotes active and inclusive behaviors. The Learning Spaces Collaboratory is another useful resource that helps educators think deeply about the “qualities and affordances of spaces for learning that reflect communal awareness of societal and institutional goals for what 21st-century students are to become.”

In addition, becoming an effective team collaborator within and across disciplines needs to be embraced as an important learning objective. While working on design challenges, student teams from the d.school’s Creativity and Innovation class spend time at the lab of Neeraj Sonalkar in the Center for Design Research. There, the students’ team dynamics are observed and captured using a custom notation developed by Sonalkar. Afterward, the teams receive a report that describes such aspects as the balance of contributions and the type or interpersonal behaviors, making connections to research findings. This feedback, which is then discussed in class, allows the teams to work on improving their interactions and outcomes.

They give students the opportunity to experience productive failure. When exploring “what could be” and putting bold new ideas out into the world, failure is not only inevitable, but should be embraced as a key part of the learning process. While the default bias in education is to provide learners with guided instruction prior to, or concurrent with, their learning of new skills and concepts, researcher Manu Kapur from Singapore’s National Institute of Education has conducted several experiments showing the value of productive failure. In one of those experiments, students who were allowed to solve complex problems without instructional facilitation significantly outperformed—when tested with higher-order application problems—students who were exposed to a traditional lecture and practice sequence.

They expose students to different ways of thinking and learning. Play is an essential ingredient in how we learn as children. However, as we advance in the educational system, learning often becomes a solemn endeavor in which playfulness has no place. The Maker Movement, tightly linked to l&I and spreading rapidly across the United States and beyond, has the potential to change that misconception. Spurred by easy access to new technologies such as 3-D printing and Arduino, an open-source electronics platform, and facilitated by online platforms and physical work spaces known as “makerspaces,” interconnected communities are demonstrating the value of ways of learning that engage our brains, our hands, and our whole selves.

One in a thousand infants is born with missing fingers. Shea Stollenwerk, a third-grader from Mukwonago, Wisconsin, is one of them. When she saw robotic-looking prostheses on the Internet, she asked her mom whether she could get one for Christmas. State-of-the-art prostheses can cost thousands of dollars and, since children grow too fast, most don’t get one. Shea’s mom reached out to Frankie Flood, a professor at the University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee (UWM) and director of the Digital Craft Research Lab. Under the guidance of Flood and his colleague Andream Blair, UWM students designed and 3-D printed a hand for Shea. They also shared the design with E-nable, a network of volunteers who collaborate on open-source designs and print hands for hundreds of children. With names like “Cyborg Beast” and “Raptor,” these hands are designed to stand out and evoke the superpowers of comic-book heroes, helping these kids shed the stigma of disability.

“The Maker Mindset,” a manifesto by Dale Dougherty, one of the founders of the Maker Movement, Center for Design Research at Stanford University, Dr. Sonalkar observes and captures students’ team dynamics using a custom notation.
Beyond the creative and effective application of technology to solve real-world problems, learning by making can have a profound impact on the learner’s mindset, causing a shift from learning about the world to learning by changing the world.

**Our moonshot: Students as change agents**

In this article, we have discussed the need for today’s college graduates to be prepared to navigate an uncertain future. We’ve argued that innovation and entrepreneurship learning experiences provide a useful foundation for students to collaborate on team-based projects, work on wicked problems, and gain skills needed to bring radical, creative solutions to life. National organizations and researchers have been advocating for change in higher education in this direction for the last several decades, yet the pace of change has been slow.

We believe changing higher education needs a moonshot approach. During the past three years, we have been testing out a bold idea: students can be the change agents that spark accelerated and lasting impact at their schools. At first glance, this might sound counterintuitive; students spend a relatively short time in school compared with faculty and administrators, and they are not directly tied to the machinery that makes strategic decisions about schools’ operations and futures. Yet it is precisely for these reasons that students can be powerful change agents who can challenge the assumptions about how things are done.

Students can be engaged as designers. Compared to several decades ago, customers today have an incredible amount of influence when it comes to rating a movie, their dining experience, or their new cars. We have come to expect that our opinions matter, and we value the opinions of others when making purchases ourselves. Companies, nonprofits, and communities are learning that the best way to ensure a product is successful is to actively engage customers early in the design phase. Engineers call it “agile development,” entrepreneurs call it “lean startup,” and designers call it “design thinking.” Regardless of their differences, they all agree that a state of permanent beta—where a constant flow of information from the customer informs the evolution of products—is best for business success.

The most innovative companies in the world leverage what are called “customer evangelists,” or incredibly passionate users, to co-design offerings hand in hand with product developers, and then champion those products to the user community. Why not in academia?

In fact, the most innovative colleges and universities are doing just that. Olin College of Engineering was established in 1997 with the mission to revolutionize engineering education. From the outset, Olin engaged students as co-designers. Students, referred to as Olin Partners, worked alongside founding faculty and administrators during a “pre-freshman year” while the school was being built in order to shape every aspect of the school, from admissions to curricula. Today, Olin is a model for hands-on, student-centered education that schools from all over the world seek to emulate.

Established schools have taken steps to engage students in the same way. At the University of Pittsburgh, six students partnered with faculty to design a brand new honors engineering course called The Art of Making. The students helped design not only the curriculum, but a “makerspace” classroom suitable for the hands-on nature of the course. In addition, they created a visually appealing website to attract students and served as teaching assistants to help facilitate successful execution. The course met with such success that it is now being expanded outside the honors college.

**Students have the power of peer-to-peer influence.** Student leaders are uniquely positioned to accelerate the pace of change in academia because they have “street cred.” They are at the grassroots with their peers, share the same experiences, and speak the same language. This peer-to-peer effect is a powerful one, giving students the unique ability to present new learning opportunities using language that will resonate with a broad range of students. Kent State University students Robin Bonatesta and Paul Dilyard created a student co-working space at the library, which they called “the Fridge.” The new space is an experiment in providing a place where students can meet and collaborate on projects that span different disciplines. There are no set schedules, no permanent
faculty or staff, and no rules about what students can do there.

In addition to new spaces, a new wave of extracurricular activities has emerged in the form of “hackathons,” which are almost entirely student driven and draw thousands of students from across campuses to exercise their creative abilities and learn new skills. The innovations that emerge may include novel technologies with commercial potential. Student organizers are fostering a culture of creativity and innovation, while also providing a new means for students to pursue their professional interests through hands-on self-directed projects. In March 2015, students at James Madison University organized the first student-led hackathon in just eight weeks’ time, securing sponsorship from several companies. Judges heard pitches from students who had spent forty-eight hours defining opportunities and building prototypes. The top prize went to an epidemiology student who had coded a working database and a smartphone app to allow the crowdsourcing of health information within a community to follow, for instance, the spread of the flu virus.

**Students are not bound by the same constraints as faculty and administrators.** Student change agents volunteer their time to make a difference on their campuses. They do not have the same reporting structures as faculty and are not required to build consensus through committees. As a result, they have much greater freedom to operate and can experiment with ideas that do not require a wealth of resources.

Tanner Wheadon, a student at Utah Valley University applied a prototyping/lean startup approach to create a makerspace at his school. When he first approached the administration, he was told that such an investment might be considered in the five-to-seven-year plan for the school, given space limitations. Undeterred, Tanner set out to prove the value of the idea. Scraping together what little resources he could locate, Tanner purchased an industrial cart and filled it with inexpensive prototyping supplies. He identified a general education course with a couple of unused weeks in the schedule and, using his mobile makerspace, experimented with a design thinking curriculum within that course. As a result of that inexpensive pilot, he was invited to train all the instructors teaching the course on his curriculum. Most recently, he led a design thinking workshop for the president and his cabinet and, as a result, received four offers of space to realize his original vision of a makerspace. The prototyping approach Tanner employed is crucial in defining, testing, and building support for new investments in academia. It can help ensure that we build the right spaces and resources, instead of spending millions of dollars up front on unproven concepts.

Kettering University student Alan Xia, a mechanical and electrical engineering major, had a key insight about lab assignments: students are given fairly prescriptive and rigid instructions on how to complete a set of tasks, which takes out of the equation the exploration and experimentation (and fun!) that are key to learning to think and work like a scientist and an engineer. Also, aside from the designated times when a course is in session, lab spaces are locked and the machines inside just sit there, unproductive. Convening student volunteers, professors, and lab technicians, Alan and other students created Open Lab Days. Once a term, the unused labs are open to all students for the whole day, during which they may work on any project of their choosing. Materials, support staff, and food are provided. Members of the community, including children, are also welcome. Open Lab Days challenge assumptions about who the teachers are. As Alan puts it, “Everyone learns!” Professors and lab technicians, along with students and community members, are both learners and teachers.
Activating student change agents

The student change agents from Kettering, Kent State, University of Pittsburgh, Utah Valley, and James Madison featured in the stories above are University Innovation Fellows. Over the last three years, our program has trained and supported close to six hundred student leaders. The process of becoming a fellow requires nomination by the institution and application by the student. Once accepted, a rigorous six-week online video-conference training prepares the students to survey the learning opportunities related to I&E on their campuses and to identify opportunities for improvement that inform a strategic plan of action. This is followed by an in-person event at Google headquarters in Silicon Valley and at Stanford’s d.school, where the fellows are exposed to design thinking, lean startup approaches, and cutting-edge practices in learning experience design and facilitation. The skills and mindsets acquired during this hybrid training help the fellows in their quest to improve their schools in collaboration with faculty and administrators.

University Innovation Fellows are reaching hundreds of peers on campus, with new physical spaces for collaboration and creation, workshops, courses, and clubs. For faculty and administrators interested in expanding the accessibility of their innovation and entrepreneurship programs, University Innovation Fellows contribute fresh ideas for learning opportunities, as well as the speed and agility to bring those ideas to life. Those who nominate University Innovation Fellows are themselves change agents and find fellows to be powerful collaborators who not only have been trained to effect change, but also can leverage their student perspectives to engage their peers.

Student change agents represent a moonshot approach because they can help achieve the momentum needed to catalyze a movement on campus in a new model for education can push only so hard for change. For these “early adopters,” student change agents are like rocket fuel, accelerating and scaling their efforts. However, gaining the momentum that enables institutional leaders to cross the proverbial “chasm” and achieve widespread change comes down to the bystanders. Faculty who observe a movement from the sidelines fall into two camps: the early majority and the late majority. The early majority will join a movement because they don’t want to be left behind, ultimately engaging the entire campus community to form a tide of support for the change effort.

Transforming higher education so that it prepares students to thrive in the complexity and ambiguity of the twenty-first century will require that we all adopt the 10x thinking that leads to radical solutions. We must be willing to examine the core assumptions at the foundations of the system. One of those assumptions is that students belong on the receiving end, as the customers of the system. Our experience shows that they can be so much more. Our hope is that by 2025, most of the 4,500 accredited institutions in the United States will adopt bold change strategies that nurture and leverage their students as change agents to improve higher education. We invite you to join us in achieving this moonshot.

To respond to this article, e-mail liberaled@aacu.org, with the authors’ names on the subject line.

NOTES
2. Nick Swayne, personal communication with the authors.
5. Tom Kelley and David Kelley, Creative Confidence: Unleashing the Creative Potential within Us All (New York: Random House, 2013). Tom Kelley is a partner at design consultancy IDEO, and David Kelley is founder of both IDEO and the Hasso Plattner Institute of Design at Stanford University (best known as the d.school).
6. For more information about the course, see http://extreme.stanford.edu.
7. For more information about the Embrace Warmer, see http://embraceglobal.org/embrace-warmer.


13. For example, the Stanford d.school’s website uses explicit language to identify the focus on “innovators, not innovations” as part of the point of view of the organization; see http://d.school.stanford.edu/our-point-of-view/#innovators.


16. For more information about Lehigh University’s Mountaintop initiative, see http://www1.lehigh.edu/mountaintop.

17. For more information about Stanford 2025, see http://2025.stanford.edu.


22. The newly launched MakeSchools.org is an online repository of the maker movement in US universities and colleges.


26. For more information about the course, see http://pitt.edu/~mam503/.

27. The name, which started as a joke, grew out of the intention of coming up with a “cool” name for the space that did not include any buzzwords or jargon—such as innovation and entrepreneurship—that might not resonate with all students.

28. For more information about the University Innovation Fellows program, see http://universityinnovationfellows.org.
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Creative Thinking VALUE Rubric

Creative thinking is the capacity to combine or synthesize existing ideas, images, or expertise in original ways; it is developed through experiences that enable the learner to think, react, and work in imaginative ways that are characterized by a high degree of innovation, divergent thinking, and risk taking.

The Creative Thinking VALUE Rubric helps faculty assess creative thinking in a broad range of transdisciplinary or interdisciplinary work samples or collections of student work. The rubric is made up of a set of attributes that are common to creative thinking across disciplines.

The Creative Thinking VALUE Rubric is one of sixteen rubrics developed through the Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education project, part of AAC&U’s Liberal Education and America’s Promise (LEAP) initiative, and keyed to the LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes. For more information about the VALUE project or to download the VALUE rubrics, visit www.aacu.org/value.
Creativity and Innovation

Building Ecosystems to Support Risk Taking, Resiliency, and Collaboration

In the face of contemporary challenges, a liberal education empowers our students—and our future workforce—to ask the right questions and to build the interdisciplinary bridges that may lead to answers.

Rather than diving into a discussion of the new labor market, we begin with an anecdote drawn from Amanda’s experience as a supervisor and senior leader at Los Angeles Cleantech Incubator (LACI), a nonprofit organization established by the City of Los Angeles to accelerate the development of clean technology startups. We’ll call this “Ellen’s Story”:

Last summer, Ellen, an intern working at LACI, approached me toward the end of her summer internship and confessed that she wasn’t sure what she wanted to do after she graduated from college in May. Ellen had narrowed her choices down to law school or business school—or potentially both since, as she explained in all earnestness, two graduate degrees would be better than one when applying for jobs. When I probed why she was considering those options, she admitted her music major, while personally fulfilling, wasn’t going to get her a job. Setting aside the fact that I had hired her (despite her music degree!), I knew the source of her fear was that she felt her focus on music left her unprepared and unattractive in the job market.

Somehow, in the literal world of undergraduate students, there is an assumption that your major prepares you only for employment in that sector.

I looked her straight in the eye and said, “Let me clarify something for you. You don’t just have a music degree, you have a liberal arts degree that has taught you all the critical-thinking skills you need to get a job, and that is what matters.” I probably shouldn’t have been surprised by her stunned expression. As a politics major at Pomona College, I was once in Ellen’s shoes and, looking back, I wish someone had been as explicit with me about the skills I was developing—and about the skills that I had not developed. After years of performing very well in the highly structured educational environment, which provided a clear grading system to measure my success, I was completely unprepared for the more chaotic, unpredictable, and unstructured life after graduation.

Ellen’s story is one of the many we hear from today’s college students and that inspire our partnership.

This article is a summary of the motivation for, and the themes discussed in, the session we facilitated in April 2015 at “Diversity, Equity, and Excellence: College Learning and America’s Unmet Promise,” a LEAP Centennial Forum cosponsored by the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) and the Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce. When we started brainstorming for this session, our conversation focused on how the creativity fostered by a liberal education is linked to the innovation needed in the private sector today. While recognizing the significant social, political, and labor-market pressures to produce more graduates with degrees in STEM fields (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics), we believe that it is the power of a liberal education that gives graduates a distinct advantage in the new economy. In the face of contemporary...
challenges, a liberal education empowers our students—and our future workforce—to ask the right questions and to build the interdisciplinary bridges that may lead to answers.

**New labor market dynamics**

The main goal of our session at the LEAP Centennial Forum was to identify pathways along which colleges can partner with the private sector to enhance students’ creative power. We have observed how essential this is, as the employee-employer relationship has changed dramatically in the last fifty years. While the labor market of our parents’ generation emphasized job-specific skills that incentivized lifetime tenure within one company or industry, today’s labor market rewards those with the ability to create, adapt, and build bridges across industries. As the economist Henry Farber has argued, long-term employment relationships (“the lifetime job”) have become increasingly less prevalent in the private sector. Indeed, economists Robert Topel and Michael Ward have shown that a typical worker will hold seven different jobs during his or her first ten years in the labor market, and firm mobility is the main vehicle for earnings increases and building a professional career. Simultaneously, our nation’s societal and institutional support for the “lifetime job” model has also shifted, as demonstrated by the prevalence of defined contribution retirement plans versus company-sponsored defined benefit plans and by the slow unraveling of the link between health insurance and employment.

The emphasis on worker mobility and the ability to transition across industries and employers is not trivial, and thus we need to support students’ acquisition of transferable skills. The dynamics of the new economy are complex. The incentives for workers and firms to invest in relationship-specific knowledge may be misaligned and result in a less productive workforce. Workers may hesitate to invest in the development of skills that are idiosyncratic to a particular firm or that would increase their productivity with their current employer only, for example, and the firm has no incentive to compensate workers for such an investment, as these kinds of skills cannot be developed elsewhere. Similarly, a firm may hesitate to invest in workers who may potentially leave to seek employment elsewhere.

This is what economists call the “hold-up problem.” In this environment, then, the best strategy for today’s students and tomorrow’s workers is to invest in skills that are not particular to one firm or industry, but are instead transferrable among firms and industries. Thus, the creativity that is fostered by a liberal education not only enhances worker productivity, but it also improves economic efficiency.

In an economy where incentives are distorted and early-career rewards are accrued through job, employer, and industry flows, it is the responsibility of employees to manage their own careers. Employees must initiate their acquisition of new skills, constantly signal the value of these skills for their current or potential employers, and demonstrate their ability to solve business problems creatively. The reality is that, like Ellen, today’s college graduates face fundamentally different labor market conditions than those faced by past graduates.

This brings us to the crux of the question: As educators, are we preparing students for today’s challenges? We already know that colleges and universities throughout the country work diligently to ensure the highest academic standards in transferring knowledge to students. We posit, however, that today’s students need more than rigorous academic training and an impressive accumulation of knowledge to succeed in life after graduation. Through our positions at our respective organizations, Pomona College and the Los Angeles Cleantech Incubator (LACI), we both have integrated creativity, innovation, risk taking, resiliency, and collaboration into student learning experiences. In addition, to ensure students are better prepared for life after graduation, we seek opportunities to expose them to real-life problems and to connect classroom learning with the communities in which they live and work. While there is nothing new about coupling outside communities with academic programming to produce more “real-world” learning opportunities, our two institutions, in very different ways, have taken unique approaches to improving the students’ preparation for their post-graduation lives.

**Creativity in the liberal arts**

Scholars and commentators have long recognized the importance of creativity for economic growth, whether as a mechanism for avoiding recession (e.g., Joseph Schumpeter on “creative destruction”) or as a way to foment economic
growth locally (e.g., Richard Florida on cities and the “creative class”). Yet, although the economic importance of creativity may be widely recognized, we are still wrestling with the role of higher education in fostering creativity.

To accommodate the new demands today’s economy places on student preparation, colleges and universities have embraced creativity and innovation. Indeed, efforts to enhance creativity and innovation are changing the educational landscape of the United States. These efforts can take many names and forms—clinics, design thinking, entrepreneurial accelerators. But we argue here that campus interventions alone are not sufficient.

In a provocative essay in the Chronicle of Higher Education, Peter N. Miller poses the question: “Is ‘Design Thinking’ the New Liberal Arts?” Miller explores how design thinking has been lauded as a way to answer difficult questions that have no straight or easy answers. We agree with Miller’s conclusion that the answer to this question is “not yet.” Miller highlights the importance of understanding the human experience, especially via a liberal education, when addressing these hard problems that have no clear solutions. But we must go beyond that.

Enhanced creativity should be fostered and guided toward answering real-life problems; it should affect the very communities where our schools exist, even as its development prepares students for life after graduation. This is the basic premise of the Susan and Richard Sontag Center for Collaborative Creativity of the Claremont Colleges (aka “the Hive”) and of the partnerships that the Los Angeles Cleantech Incubator has developed with colleges and universities in the Los Angeles area. The main idea is that creativity is not fostered in isolation; rather, creativity is best enhanced when it is part of a collective and diverse ecosystem.

At the Sontag Center, we intend to take advantage of the diversity that is afforded by five different educational institutions in order to accelerate students’ creative capacity. We designed this center based on the core principle that every student must be free to experiment and play, but we did so in order to nurture connections, to cultivate generative mindsets through engagement with ambiguous challenges that have no easy solutions, and to infuse some “doings” into students’ learning experiences. At the center, and through our commitment to the liberal arts, we provide students with a learning environment in which they can experiment and
play. The center is also a place where students can attack ambitious challenges, and where they are comfortable doing so using a variety of approaches. For us, a successful project must have a real impact on real users. It also must be ambitious enough to excite students, while still conforming to the clear constraints that exist within the academic world.

An ecosystem of creativity and innovation is not exclusive to private liberal arts colleges. At LACI, we have started exploring the synergies made possible by our partnership with California State University–Northridge (CSUN). As the largest of the California State Universities, CSUN is a major economic engine in the San Fernando Valley of the Los Angeles region. It has a combined student, faculty, staff, and alumni count of more than two hundred thousand. With a bold vision of expanding CSUN’s role as economic engine and academic leader in the Los Angeles region, and in acknowledgement of the power of partnerships, CSUN’s President Dianne Harrison forged a partnership with LACI to launch an on-campus LACI satellite business incubator called “LACI@CSUN.”

By integrating LACI’s pragmatic, entrepreneurial approach into CSUN’s academic disciplines, LACI@CSUN is reshaping how the university’s stakeholders think about entrepreneurship, employment, and even applied research. LACI staff members, who are former corporate executives and entrepreneurs, are weaving LACI@CSUN programming together with the fabric of the CSUN community through guest lectures, a CEO speaker program, alumni activities, internships, the creation of a comprehensive plan for advancing innovation throughout the university, and the development of new venture competitions. LACI staff members also serve as advisors to CSUN faculty who are interested in commercializing their research and as coaches to CSUN students and alumni who want to develop their business ideas.

Although they are often perceived as either too vocational or nonscientific, such opportunities have the potential to transform students’ educational experiences as well as their communities. It is in the kind of learning spaces created by the Sontag Center and LACI@CSUN that students find links between the classroom and the real world. These partnerships are not a substitute for liberal education, but a complement to it, promoting high-impact educational practices such as community-based learning and senior capstones, where students are challenged to address difficult adaptive problems that have no clear answers.

Fostering innovation in the private sector
LACI’s mission as a nonprofit regional economic development initiative is to create a diverse innovation cluster that leverages the strengths of the Los Angeles region in order to help
accelerate the clean technology commercialization process and to help companies successfully deliver market-ready cleantech solutions—and the jobs that come with them. As a fast-moving, emerging-industry sector, cleantech is a particularly challenging sector to support.

More broadly, today’s dynamic, tumultuous global business environment is often referred to as “VUCA”—volatile, uncertain, complex, and ambiguous. Some business challenges are technical in nature, with well-defined problems suited for traditional, hierarchical approaches to problem solving. To build a bridge, for instance, you would hire someone who clearly demonstrates competency in engineering and project management. However, some problems in business—as in life!—are messy, open ended, and ill defined. When wrestling with these adaptive challenges, it is often hard to identify the right question, let alone the right answer. Solving adaptive business problems, such as how to react to an unexpected new competitor, requires disciplined, creative
Adaptive problems are too complex for any one person or organization to figure out, and too open ended to be solved by analysis alone. From an educational perspective, this is why it is so important for students to learn to handle unstable, unstructured problems nimbly. Adaptive problems require leaps of insight, which usually involve the combination of ideas from different sources in a new way. Many studies on creativity and innovation highlight the importance of diverse perspectives in the search for novel solutions.

At LACI, we are actively working to create a diverse, inclusive ecosystem—at the personal and organizational levels—by putting the cleantech entrepreneur at the center of our work and measuring our success against our entrepreneurs’ progress (see fig. 1). This entrepreneur-centric model (as opposed to an institution-centric model) creates opportunities for more honest dialogue and better stakeholder alignment. It also creates a “neutral space” where cleantech stakeholders throughout the ecosystem can converge and focus on moving the same needle: accelerating the success of more cleantech entrepreneurs. Just as an adaptive problem is most efficiently solved by incorporating diverse perspectives, an industrial sector’s ecosystem is best served by including a variety of organizations that represent different viewpoints and serve different roles within the ecosystem.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ecosystem Elements</th>
<th>Economic Development Examples</th>
<th>Academic Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identification of stakeholders</td>
<td>Entrepreneurs, government agencies, consumers</td>
<td>Students, alumni, faculty, community members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment and leveraging of key assets</td>
<td>Access to specialized research facilities, highly interested investors</td>
<td>Knowledge of stakeholders, ability to experiment and fail, supportive environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>Interns, employees, entrepreneurs, and investors who bring different personal backgrounds, priorities, and skill sets to the ecosystem.</td>
<td>Students from different institutions and who bring different personal stories and backgrounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for experimentation and risk taking</td>
<td>Prototyping laboratory experiments, early-stage investment opportunities</td>
<td>Curricular innovations in semester-long courses, as well as shorter cocurricular courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curated and spontaneous interactions</td>
<td>“Collisions” among entrepreneurs, investor-entrepreneur matchmaking events</td>
<td>Partnerships with local community organizations, government, and industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success metrics and measurement</td>
<td>Number of portfolio companies in the incubator, average annual revenue per company, number of patents filed, amount of investment raised by companies</td>
<td>Number of students involved, number of faculty partners or courses offered, number of community partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Storytelling</td>
<td>Video interviews of entrepreneurs, annual global showcase conference</td>
<td>Student portfolios, capstone exercises</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Key elements for building a creative and innovative ecosystem

**Figure 1. LACI Cleantech Cluster Model**
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LACI’s work to promote the development of a cleantech ecosystem in the Los Angeles region is similar to work of the Claremont Colleges to foster a creativity community in an academic setting. While the institutional language may be different, the goals are similar. And both efforts embrace several key elements for building a creative and innovative ecosystem (see table 1):

- **Identification of stakeholders.** Stakeholders are defined broadly as any person or organization that interacts directly or indirectly with the ecosystem.

- **Assessment and leveraging of key assets.** In order truly to understand how to support and strengthen an ecosystem, you must first assess the ecosystem’s strengths, particularly as compared to other similar ecosystems, and build stakeholder interactions and programming around these key assets.

- **Diversity.** Ensure regular access to a wide variety of honest, respectful opinions and perspectives (usually involving the viewpoints of many different groups of stakeholders).

- **Opportunities for experimentation and risk taking.** Depending on the type of ecosystem you seek to support, risk taking can take many forms. In the world of cleantech entrepreneurs, for example, it may mean spending time and money researching new prototypes in a prototyping laboratory. For cleantech investors, it may mean investing in a company at an earlier stage than the investor is normally comfortable with.

- **Curated and spontaneous opportunities to interact.** In the world of incubators, we call unexpected, spontaneous interactions that result in new ideas “collisions.” To a certain extent, merely the co-location of entrepreneurs in the same office space can spur innovation and creativity. However, more formal settings, such as investor-entrepreneur match-making (similar to speed dating) sessions or networking events for women and people of color, can also play a critical role in boosting connections and productive interactions among stakeholders.

- **Success metrics and measurement.** As human beings, we tend to focus on what is measured. At LACI, our success is ultimately gauged by the success of our portfolio companies, as measured by their achievements in the marketplace.

- **Effective storytelling.** While storytelling might not seem immediately relevant as a key component of an ecosystem, it turns out that, once a wide range of stakeholders is involved, it can be difficult to keep all of them informed, engaged, and motivated to participate. Therefore, strategic communications and stakeholder engagement plans must be developed—for internal and external audiences—to keep everyone up to date and aware of the ecosystem’s progress.

Our experience suggests that even when innovative partnerships arise organically, they are not easy to sustain and develop. For example, the location of different stakeholders in different places generates a spatial challenge, making it less likely that information and ideas will flow across institutions. In a way, college and university campuses should serve as meeting places where students encounter ideas and challenges through transformative experiences.

The Sontag Center and LACI@CSUN are examples of creative partnerships that create spaces where students like Ellen can realize the value of their education by applying what they have learned in the classroom to real-world adaptive problems. Such experiences can be transformative for students, and they make students better prepared to join today’s new labor market.

To respond to this article, e-mail liberaled@aacu.org, with the authors’ names on the subject line.
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About this series
Marking the hundredth anniversary of the founding of the association, this four-part series of commissioned articles explores various aspects of AAC&U’s work over the past century in relation to contemporaneous developments within American higher education more broadly. This article is the fourth in the series.

In the late 1980s, after more than two decades of reform efforts to make the undergraduate curriculum more inclusive of the histories, roles, and experiences of women and minorities, several American colleges and universities were rocked by a series of racist and sexist incidents on campus that revealed the tense relationship between efforts to diversify the student bodies by race and gender, on the one hand, and those on campus who found these efforts threatening and disruptive to the status quo, on the other. Among the most troubling of these incidents were riots pitting white male students against black male students at the University of Massachusetts (Amherst) and fraternity events at the University of Wisconsin in which white male students donned blackface and mimicked minstrel shows and slave auctions at which black women were ridiculed. Underlying these campus-based incidents were judicial battles, beginning with the landmark Supreme Court case Regents of the University of California v. Bakke. The court’s 1978 decision in that case upheld affirmative action policies that allowed race to be one of several factors in determining college admissions policies. Needless to say, the Bakke decision did not settle this most contentious constitutional debate regarding higher education, as American society and the Supreme Court continue to grapple decades later with issues of exclusion and inclusion in college admissions processes. As contentious as these admissions issues were, the narrow and exclusive nature of the college and university curriculum also received heightened scrutiny in the late 1980s.

American philanthropy did not sit as a bystander as courts, colleges, and universities debated these diversity issues. For example, the aforementioned racist and sexist incidents led a national panel of higher education leaders reviewing the Ford Foundation’s grant making in 1988 to recommend that the foundation take a more activist stance to assist colleges and universities redouble their efforts to diversify the content of their undergraduate curricula as well as their student bodies through a series of grants that would highlight “best practices” to transform campuses, making them more genuinely inclusive. This recommendation was warmly received by the foundation’s trustees, who designated a special fund of $1.6 million for a new grants program that was launched in 1990. The president of the foundation, Franklin A. Thomas, celebrated this new program in his 1990 annual review:

To broaden the range of cultural and intellectual diversity in American higher education, the Foundation this year launched the Campus Diversity Initiative (CDI). With the help of a panel of national educational leaders, nineteen grants were made for projects weaving diversity more thoroughly into academic life. The majority of the projects seek to introduce multicultural perspectives into the core curricula, where they may not only affect the educational culture of the institutions but also reach large numbers of students. Many of the projects also combine
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Through its Racial Legacies and Learning: An American Dialogue initiative, and in coordination with the President’s Initiative on Race, AAC&U organizes campus-community dialogues and seminars across the country to address the legacies and ongoing challenges of race.
AAC&U had proven itself to be especially effective in reaching a broad cross section of faculty from a variety of disciplines who were at least open to curricular reform in light of the recent changes in student demographics.

curricula enrichment with faculty development, visiting scholar programs, faculty-student workshops on diversity, cultural activities, archival projects, and undergraduate internships and research grants.

Importantly, several leading college and university presidents had helped develop the program. They cosigned the letter embodying the foundation’s request for proposals, which was sent to two hundred primarily residential undergraduate colleges and universities. It was the first time in its history that the foundation had enlisted the advocacy of presidents to encourage other higher education leaders to submit proposals on this important and timely topic. The response was equally unprecedented: more than half of the institutions invited to apply did so. Eventually, nineteen proposals were recommended by an outside review panel for CDI funding.

In 1991, Edgar Beckham, who was then dean of the college at Wesleyan University and had advised Ford staff in developing the CDI, was hired by the foundation to oversee the initiative. Beckham, who was active in the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U), was the prime mover in 1992 in devising a long-term partnership between Ford, the funder, and AAC&U, the key catalyst responsible for coordinating the work on the individual campuses and disseminating news about the implementation of the CDI projects.

AAC&U was an especially appropriate choice. It was the leading higher education association focused on undergraduate liberal education and had, for nearly a century, sought to be a force for “inclusiveness and interhelpfulness.” By establishing the Project on the Status and Education of Women (PSEW) in 1971, AAC&U had already laid claim to being in the vanguard of higher education associations concerned with the support and protection of women students. Moreover, AAC&U had proven itself to be especially effective in reaching a broad cross section of faculty from a variety of disciplines who were at least open to curricular reform in light of the recent changes in student demographics.

This essay is an attempt to understand the special partnership between the Ford Foundation and AAC&U—its implementation, challenges, and outcomes—and how it affected the more than two hundred US campuses that became part of the CDI effort. Over the course of the 1990s, the Ford Foundation devoted over $10 million to this initiative, with AAC&U serving as the main recipient of the funds. This essay also briefly traces the international dimensions of the foundation’s diversity efforts in the early days of the twenty-first century, as two Ford field offices—one in India and the other in South Africa—developed their own versions of the CDI and worked collaboratively with AAC&U to share lessons learned from three divergent societies grappling with the challenges of addressing “diversity.” All had the goal of helping colleges and universities become more inclusive spaces in which to learn, critique, and practice democratic values. Before looking to international examples, however, it is important to understand the nature of this special partnership in the United States.

The Campus Diversity Initiative in the United States

In the first stage of the CDI, Ford worked directly with the nineteen single-campus grantees. Foundation staff wanted to stay in direct touch with the grantees. But as the initiative grew and expanded to include regional consortia, new studies of how diversity could affect student learning, and other multi-campus interventions, the foundation realized that it needed to partner with a major higher education association to coordinate efforts across a variety of grantees and to “mine” the initiative for lessons learned that could be shared with other institutions and campuses. AAC&U’s president, Carol Geary Schneider, immediately saw the value in partnering with Ford. She, along with Edgar Beckham, realized that diversity could be seen as an educational asset.

This recognition of diversity as an educational asset proved to be an important intellectual breakthrough. Promoting diversity was not simply about making student bodies more inclusive; it also was a means of enriching the learning experience for all students, not just those who came as a result of more welcoming admissions practices and affirmative action. During the early 1990s, many, if not most, American campuses were becoming more racially and ethnically diverse, as well as more diverse in terms of gender, sexual orientation, and religion. This meant that all students, not just minority students,
were in educational settings different from those of their frequently homogenous high schools. Couldn’t this diversification of who was now attending college lead to a richer, more robust engagement with the curriculum than was possible in classrooms where most students shared a more common set of experiences and perspectives? The idea that diversity was an asset, not just a demographic, guided AAC&U’s approach to the CDI, and it was especially attractive to the foundation.

The foundation made its first grant to AAC&U for the Campus Diversity Initiative in late 1992. The proposal for this first grant to AAC&U clearly articulated the association’s goal, which was “to reframe diversity from a problem in society to be solved to an educational and civic asset necessary to create academic excellence and responsible democratic citizens.” The grant enabled the association’s staff to coordinate meetings of project directors, share information across campus sites, create faculty development institutes focused on reforming courses to include diversity content, and work directly as consultants with those campuses that had received direct funds from Ford. In other words, AAC&U became an intermediary between the projects and the funder, helping the foundation shape and interpret what was happening on the ground, while also helping each campus learn what was transpiring elsewhere through the initiative. With foundation funds, AAC&U also convened an annual meeting of CDI grantees.

In 1993, the association adopted a new name for its partnership with Ford. The CDI was not very aspirational in its message. This led AAC&U to reconceive its effort as American Commitments: Diversity, Democracy and Liberal Learning. The name stuck for nearly a decade.

The initial funding provided by Ford helped AAC&U create a network of sixty-three higher education institutions that sought to imbue the general education curriculum with new diversity courses and requirements. It was insufficient to give lip service to the value of a more inclusive curriculum that served a more inclusive student body. General education courses needed to be infused with content that broadened students’ perspectives—especially content focused on race, ethnicity, class, and gender. Importantly, as revealed in Lucy Anne LePeau’s 2012 doctoral dissertation, “Academic Affairs and Student Affairs Partnerships Promoting Initiatives on Campus: A Grounded Theory,” one unique feature of the projects was the effort to combine the forces of academic affairs and student affairs leaders. The Ford guidelines had urged the creation of such partnerships, and for the most part, LePeau found that this suggestion was implemented on many campuses.3

Gathering information from the dozens of Ford-funded projects, AAC&U created the National Panel on Diversity, Democracy, and Liberal Education, which produced three monographs. The association published these monographs in 1995–6 under the following
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titles: The Drama of Diversity and Democracy, American Pluralism and the College Curriculum, and Liberal Learning and the Arts of Connection for the New Academy. Interestingly, the titles all referred to the relationship of campus diversity to broader civic education goals. AAC&U constantly tried to bridge the divide between academic insularity and societal needs. Engaging with diversity issues, according to the AAC&U, would help all college students become better citizens. These publications were widely disseminated. Without a citation search or an independent evaluation, however, it is difficult to know in retrospect how they were received and how useful they were to campus leaders seeking to emulate the best practices of the Ford-funded projects. Certainly, they reached a significant audience of higher education leaders.

One of the more notable national efforts in broadening the CDI’s message about diversity as an asset entailed the commissioning of the first-ever national poll gauging public attitudes toward diversity in higher education. The poll was conducted in the summer of 1998 by the respected Daniel Yankelovich firm, DYG, and it was released in October of that same year at the National Press Club in Washington, DC. The questions posed in the poll were asked of a random sample of Americans. They included, “Does a diverse student body have a positive or negative effect on the education of students?” And, “Should colleges and universities offer courses on bigotry and prejudice?” In addition to the national poll, the initiative commissioned several state polls.

The results of the polls were especially rewarding to the Ford Foundation and AAC&U. As the press release headline noted, “two in three Americans say that it is very important that colleges and universities prepare people to function in a diverse society.” Moreover, the poll found that “nearly three in five (58 percent) say our nation was growing apart, and 71 percent say that diversity education on college and university campuses helps bring society together.” These findings echoed the goals of the CDI. Representatives of both Ford and AAC&U underscored the partners’ commitment to enhancing campus diversity as an educational and pedagogical tool. As Carol Geary Schneider observed, “diversity asks us to address the link between education and a developed sense of responsibility to one another.”

Eventually, Ford encouraged AAC&U to design a new, highly innovative web-based dissemination component as part of the CDI. While coordination of the individual grantees remained a key goal of the foundation’s partnership with the association, staff at both Ford and AAC&U determined that the initiative needed a stronger, more immediate dissemination strategy to promote the value of the “diversity as an asset” agenda. Caryn McTighe Musil, AAC&U’s project director for Diversity and Learning, the shorthand name for the effort, worked with a private public relations firm and the University of Maryland to create a webpage called DiversityWeb and a quarterly print and online journal called Diversity Digest, with Debra Humphreys serving as founding editor. Both entities sought to glean the best of the campus work and share it virtually and in traditional print format with subscribers. The University of Maryland managed the website until AAC&U took it over and redesigned it in 1999. By that time, Diversity Digest had a mailing list of nearly eighteen thousand individuals across higher education. In 2007, AAC&U relaunched the quarterly under the new title Diversity and Democracy.

Following in the footsteps of the Yankelovich diversity poll, AAC&U published the findings of its own national survey of colleges and universities in the fall 2000 issue of Diversity Digest. This survey examined efforts to reform general education with new content focused on diversity. The AAC&U survey was funded by the James Irvine Foundation and was sent to every accredited college and university in the country. AAC&U received 543 completed surveys from a wide array of institutional types and regions of the country. The most striking statistic revealed that 63 percent of colleges and universities reported that they either had a diversity requirement in place or that they were in the process of developing one. The trend was consistent with the Ford-funded opinion poll of registered voters in which 68 percent supported “requiring students to take at least one cultural and ethnic diversity course in order to graduate.”

In short, college and university leaders and the public at large seemed to agree that a more diverse student body necessitated a curriculum that was more diverse in its content.
students to cultures, races, genders, and diversity issues that they had not typically encountered. Of course, it’s one thing to support diversity efforts in principle, but it’s quite another to encourage students to engage with the diversity controversies that inevitably arise when students find themselves challenging one another’s deeply held beliefs, values, knowledge systems, and comfort levels in classrooms and in lecture halls.

Thanks to the efforts of the CDI and countless other diversity initiatives undertaken outside the Ford/AAC&U framework, American higher education in the second decade of the twenty-first century is more inclusive in terms of student demographics and curricular requirements. Yet, that does not always translate into a campus climate that is more accepting of differences based on race, gender, ethnicity, or religious affiliation. But at least colleges and universities are not ignoring the nature of life in a diverse democracy and increasingly interconnected world. Indeed, in this era of ubiquitous social media, colleges and universities can no longer assume that they can control the flow of information, scholarship, and research that comes 24/7 into the residence halls and computers of students. It is better to engage with these outlets than to pretend that they don’t exist or influence how students navigate their undergraduate experiences.

In this regard, even the US-based CDI grantees had to confront their own biases related to the meaning and implementation of diversity efforts when the Ford Foundation’s higher education staff decided to launch CDI-type efforts in India and South Africa in 1996 and 1997, respectively. From the beginning, efforts to support diversity initiatives overseas were not considered isolated projects; rather, these country-based projects were linked to one another in conference formats, and AAC&U served as the overall coordinator of information sharing across the United States, India, and South Africa.

**The Campus Diversity Initiative goes international**

The first international conference of CDI grantees was held in January 1997 in New Delhi, India. Twenty-three delegates from the three participating nations—India, South Africa and the United States—examined the relationship between what diversity means in each country and the historical context out of which its meaning had emerged. They also explored public policy issues relevant to each country’s national circumstances. To get a sense of how diversity was being addressed, delegates visited colleges participating in the Indian initiative. The New Delhi grants enabled two dozen institutions to participate in their CDI initiative. Half received $50,000 each, and the other half received smaller grants of $10,000 each. In South Africa, the Center for Higher Education Transformation (CHET), a nonprofit higher education agency committed to the systematic reform of higher education, became the AAC&U-like coordinator of the CDI initiative. And through CHET, the CDI in South Africa ultimately involved several campuses.

As participants quickly learned at the India convening, the issue of gender proved to be one of the more fascinating parts of the first tri-national diversity discussion. In India, women overwhelmingly attended single-sex women’s colleges at virtually the same historical moment
as the United States was moving away from the model of single-sex women’s education. In other words, India was practicing the theme of institutional diversity, while the United States was becoming more homogenous in terms of institutional type. For example, in India, the number of colleges exclusively for women increased from 647 in 1982–83 to 1,070 by 1993–94. This trend was virtually the reverse in the United States, where the number of women’s colleges declined precipitously beginning in the 1970s. For example, in 1960, there were three hundred women’s colleges in the United States; by 1998, there were approximately eight left. Interestingly, in both the United States and India, the number of exclusively men’s colleges was decreasing.

Meanwhile, in South Africa, all higher education institutions were coeducational by the 1990s. Thus, the disparities between men’s and women’s access to universities were not determined by institutional type, but rather by internal institutional policies. Beyond gender, the most significant diversity issue in all three contexts related to disadvantaged classes or specific subgroups of people. In India, society was stratified by divisions of caste, class, religion, region, and language as well as gender. Interestingly, the word “race” was not commonly used by Indian CDI participants and leaders. That did not mean that pernicious forms of oppression in India, based on caste categorizations, did not exist. Perhaps caste in the Indian context served as a proxy for race. But beginning with Indian independence in 1948, it has been official policy in the nation to practice a form affirmative action, which provides for the reservation of enrollments for members of Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, and other Backward Castes (their language, not mine). As one higher education analyst wrote in 1999, “while the policies themselves are progressive, and designed to undo the accumulated distortions of the past, a wide gap exists between policy and practice.”

By contrast, South African and US participants in CDI projects and at AAC&U annual convenings focused on the subject of race. It is easy to understand the salience of race as a marker of disadvantage in these two national contexts. In many ways, the United States and South Africa have somewhat similar historical narratives—slavery; the policies of segregation and apartheid; the promulgation of whites-only higher education institutions; and the existence of separate colleges and universities for blacks in both societies, through the middle of the twentieth century in the United States and through the early 1990s in South Africa. Of course, in the South African context, people of color—including black Africans and Asians—were the overwhelming majority, whereas in the United States that was not the case.

When thinking about race, however, the notion of “diversity” had very different meanings in the two other national contexts. As CDI participants learned at a second tri-national convening, held in Durban, diversity in South Africa was used to justify the fact that racial groups should be separated and treated differently. The fact that the majority of citizens were black Africans who were oppressed under white minority rule could be traced back to “diversity.” It was this demographic that gave the Apartheid state the excuse to create separate institutions of higher education for different racial groups.

Indeed, the word “diversity,” American CDI participants at a 1999 conference learned, was a contaminated term in South Africa. It was devoid of progressive political content and didn’t reflect inequalities of power and resources. To South Africans who had been fighting racial categorizations, “diversity” was a word used by the state to reinforce exclusions based on race. A more appropriate progressive stance—one

AAC&U has managed to continue its commitment to an inclusive curriculum through subsequent projects and organizational efforts
employed by the African National Congress—was rooted in the ideology of non-racialism and national unity.

These differences in understanding of the meaning of “diversity” proved to be one of the major lessons learned in the tri-national meetings and convenings of the CDI. And, looking back, perhaps the American participants learned the most from these horizon-expanding conversations. The discussions succeeded in decentering the US experience, proving that one nation’s approach might not be the only way to transform higher education to make it more inclusive—not only in terms of students served, but also in terms of goals and aspirations.

**Conclusions about the partnership between Ford and AAC&U**

Sadly, apart from the aforementioned LePeau dissertation, which only looked at the processes of implementing partnerships between student affairs and academic affairs staff, there is no comprehensive evaluation of all aspects of the Campus Diversity Initiative. Indeed, as LePeau concludes, “Fifteen years later, campuses continue to wrestle with ways to meet the needs of the diverse landscape of students enrolling in higher education. Issues of equity, access, and inclusion of students representing multiple identities continue to challenge educators in higher education.” This means that it is difficult to know the lasting impact of this work. We know that many of the campus-based projects in the United States were deemed successful by local higher education leaders and Ford Foundation staff, based on internal reviews or evaluations conducted by third parties. But, sadly, many of these reviews were anecdotal and, thus, not as rigorous as we might have hoped.

That said, one successful outcome of the initiative is the fact that AAC&U has managed to continue its commitment to an inclusive curriculum through subsequent projects and organizational efforts. This speaks to the critical importance of choosing a partner institution that was in sync with the goals of the Ford Foundation. Another outcome, the gradual involvement of several other US philanthropies in evaluating issues of diversity and campus climate, testifies to the influence this work has had on donors.

Finally, while words like increasing diversity and inclusion are widely employed to talk about reforming US higher education, they often have the effect of rendering invisible issues of power, privilege, and discrimination. As the eminent historian Joan Wallach Scott has recently written, “It is not ‘diversity and inclusion’ that will remedy the problems but programs aimed at racism, sexism, and homophobia. Let’s name the problems for what they are.”

---

To respond to this article, e-mail liberaled@aacu.org, with the author’s name on the subject line.
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The Neglected Learner
A Call to Support Integrative Learning for Faculty

The last two and a half decades have featured increasingly louder calls to change and expand the structure, practices, and culture of higher education. Messages touting the importance of engagement now proliferate on the grounds that reciprocal relationships with community partners add “value to the community and the scholar’s discipline.” Many first-order institutional changes, such as revised institutional mission and vision statements, signal a trend toward engaged campuses that respond to the needs of local and global communities. The academy also faces external demands to adapt to a world of shared knowledge creation and to contribute more deliberately to our immediate communities. Students and families, legislators, and business and industry leaders demand cost-effective higher education that produces graduates with not only technical expertise, but also critical-thinking and problem-solving capacities, collaborative savvy, enhanced communication skills, and the ability to navigate ambiguity and change. These calls for greater engagement in communities, across disciplines, and between the traditionally bounded domains of teaching, research, and service “reflect a fundamental epistemological position underlying the shift in the locus of education to include the community.”

Central to all such changes are the faculty members whose scholarship, pedagogy, and training must adjust to these new demands on the university. Gaps appear, however, between where universities want to be, where the public expects universities to be, and how to support a critical mass of faculty in pursuit of the institutional change needed to get there. On the one hand, integrative learning and engaged work have emerged as key strategies for student success. Integrative learning promises to prepare students to respond to complex, unscripted problems with informed judgments that draw on interdisciplinary connections, experiential knowledge, cocurricular learning, and more. On the other hand, faculty learning has been overlooked as a cornerstone of these efforts. Ample research has demonstrated the value of collaborative, integrative student learning. Moreover, Ernest Boyer’s charge to enlarge the vision of scholarship to include integrative scholarship, applied scholarship, and the scholarship of teaching and learning rings ever truer amid contemporary changes in higher education.

Nevertheless, faculty reward structures, professional support, and messages from senior faculty and other academic leaders tend to limit possibilities among faculty for collaboration, integrative work, and engaged scholarship. We see little evidence that universities have developed practices that support integrative and engaged faculty learning. Rather, we see growing misalignment between the support that faculty receive and the current trends in, and the future of, higher education. Therefore, we argue that current practices and structures in higher education neglect faculty as learners and...
that the ambitions of liberal education at engaged universities can only be actualized if integrative learning for faculty becomes foundational.

**Faculty as (neglected) learners**

Successful members of the academy are exemplars of outstanding lifelong learning, so why must we understand faculty as neglected learners? We argue that faculty members represent neglected learners because we see only limited evidence that institutions have devised new practices and support structures to better align faculty’s day-to-day work with institutional goals and the future of higher education. Many institutions have already initiated what Larry Cuban calls first-order changes, as mission statements increasingly reflect the values of integrative learning and engaged work. Although institutional missions call for collaborative work and engagement, the everyday practices of faculty life and the culture and practices of higher education often undermine the aspirations for engagement and integrative scholarship and teaching. Fundamental second-order transformations—nonreversible, systemic changes that broaden the framework for faculty development—are required to support the calls for integrative learning and engaged scholarship. Current models and practices of faculty support fall short of the requisite second-order changes that our various constituencies demand. Instead, formidable institutional challenges often stymie engaged and collaborative scholarship and, ultimately, prevent faculty from engaging in integrative learning themselves.

The traditional model of faculty work imagines a solo researcher with strong disciplinary allegiance. Institutions reward the disciplinary expertise of faculty who establish scholarly reputations around clearly and narrowly defined research identities. Faculty success and evidence of excellence derive from publishing in disciplinary journals, writing monographs, or receiving external grants that will garner individual, and thus institutional, prestige and accolades. This paradigm constructs and maintains a tripartite division of faculty effort into domains of unequal value—research, teaching, and service—with research typically dominating the hierarchy. Interdisciplinary learning, innovation in teaching, and applied research in service to one’s community are positioned as career risks and liabilities.

Graduate education bolsters this traditional framework, training doctoral students to be lone researchers and to privilege the track to a tenured professorship, complete with ever-heightened research demands, as the best or the only viable path in academia. Doctoral education emphasizes disciplinary allegiance and socializes future faculty to embrace traditional divisions of labor—research, teaching, and service—with self-directed research at the top of the hierarchy.

The definitions, structures, and outcomes of faculty work have been steadily pushing against this dominant paradigm. Increasingly, faculty appointments disrupt these traditional models and dissolve the constraining boundaries of research, teaching, and service: for example, research scientist, professor of practice, and public scholar. Faculty must increasingly work as valued team players, rather than as solo scholars. Funding agencies and thought leaders demand new frameworks for inquiry that will facilitate translational, problem-based, and interdisciplinary work. Furthermore, in response to greater expectations for accountability, relevance, and civic engagement, faculty are more likely to engage with nontraditional collaborators and develop new ways to partner with the various communities they serve.

Faculty outputs are also being transformed as more faculty engage in interdisciplinary work, develop partnerships with nonacademic collaborators, and generate co-constructed knowledge.
success and excellence. Faculty are encouraged to “protect” research time in order to ensure that it receives the largest allocation. Teaching and time with students must be similarly restricted to avoid “stealing” effort from one’s scholarship. Junior faculty are cautioned to “just say no” to anything beyond the minimum service requirements. Mentoring programs, chair workshops, and time management guidance often reinforce distinct divisions between research, teaching, and service. There has been significant growth in administrative functions for faculty, yet university service is not rewarded and is, instead, devalued. Traditional practices frame faculty effort as a zero-sum game; effort spent on one activity depletes productivity in another domain. The growth of a contingent, part-time faculty workforce further compartmentalizes and creates hierarchies for faculty work according to rank and effort; adjunct faculty teach, tenure-track faculty focus on research. This neglected group of part-time faculty learners, already on the margins of the institution, misses the benefits of learning through scholarship, through pedagogical development, and through institutional support for more innovative approaches to learning and scholarly work.

Institutions impose the demands of collaborative work on an environment designed to support and reward individualistic work. Faculty are told both to justify their relevance to local, sometimes nonacademic audiences, and to demonstrate rigor in their scholarship according to the standards of their disciplines. They are expected to meet the demands of these competing masters, while only one side will garner tangible benefits for their careers and advancement in their institutions. A lack of tangible institutional rewards, particularly promotion and/or tenure, for engaged work and a wider range of scholarly products discourages faculty learning and growth in areas of engaged scholarship and integrative work. The hierarchal organization of research, teaching, and service animates debates about what kind of faculty work will “count” toward positive evaluation and promotable evidence of excellence. Moreover, work that does not fit neatly into the standard “buckets” of labor can cause confusion for tenure and promotion committees and external reviewers. When institutions revise performance guidelines to include contemporary forms of scholarship, senior faculty on evaluation and review committees continue “to apply narrow interpretations of what constitutes scholarly activity,” despite the revisions.

These examples of misalignment bear consequences not only for faculty learners interested in integrative, engaged work, but also for institutional leadership and student success. Expectations for faculty to assume administrative and compliance-related functions have grown. Yet faculty are not rewarded for taking on such tasks and are discouraged from doing so. This disdain for leadership weakens faculty governance, and shrinks the pool of future leaders in higher
education. As described previously, faculty are instead encouraged to develop national reputations in discipline-specific research. Institutional leadership and service to support the local community’s problem-solving efforts are not typical pathways for career success. Inadvertently, then, institutions discourage and dis incentivize faculty investment in their particular institutions and local communities. This limited connection to place compounds the lack of alignment between faculty practices and institutional goals for integrative learning among students.

Most high-impact practices—such as internships, experiential learning, community engagement, and other out-of-classroom learning options—require strong relationships and collaborations with community partners in a particular location. If these practices are truly to have an impact, faculty must be invested in, and engaged with, the community in order to design the learning experiences and to ensure that the lessons learned translate to the student’s academic and career pursuits. However, when community-engaged work ranks low on the list of priorities for a faculty member’s career success, the potential shrinks for rich and integrative student learning experiences. If our development efforts do not foster engagement and integration across the multiple dimensions of faculty work, then there is less likelihood that faculty will make these connections on their own or be able to help students integrate learning across their academic experiences.

In sum, faculty enter the profession with a great deal to learn; yet institutions traditionally expect that “a scholar (i.e., faculty member) would and could easily self-educate to keep abreast of new developments and to maintain high skill levels.” However, the changing demands of higher education render untenable the presumption of the self-taught, autonomous scholar. Traditional models of faculty work, reward, and support fail to help faculty adapt to the future of higher education. The changing landscape of higher education demands that faculty work beyond their disciplines with non-academics and students; yet, institutional reward structures continue to privilege productive scholars who establish expertise in narrow disciplinary niches, and faculty support practices provide limited mentorship in interdisciplinary and translational research and in community engagement.

Institutions expect faculty to teach in a way that achieves assessable learning outcomes and aids student engagement and retention efforts through high-impact practices and integrative learning. While institutions increasingly provide pedagogical development for faculty, this professional development is considered separately and apart from the other roles and responsibilities that faculty assume. Furthermore, institutions ask faculty to contribute to governing and administering the university but provide little support for understanding the background, culture, and context of a fiscally and organizationally complicated system. Institutions hope that, over time, some faculty will become future leaders, yet faculty development efforts rarely take a long-term view of crafting careers. In the midst of these paradigm shifts, higher education neglects faculty members as learners by failing to provide vital guidance on what it might mean to be an integrated scholar.

**Linking faculty learning and institutional change**

Faculty working amid demands for engaged scholarship and interdisciplinary integration require their institutions to discover new practices for development, support, and professionalization. In reflecting on Boyer, Edward Ayers noted that “Boyer showed that our work could be stronger if we took advantage of all the resources within our reach, if we joined different ways of knowing, if we joined service and learning, scholarship and teaching.” Institutional support for faculty learning must similarly be revised and updated in order to change patterns of faculty behavior and commitment and to effect second-order change that attends to learning for all members of the university. All stakeholders will benefit when colleges and universities develop a faculty model that accounts for student success, institutional objectives and mission, external needs, and professional support and career advancement.

To change academic institutions and cultures, however, something more than an “initiative” or “program” is needed. The question must change from “What enhancement do faculty need to be better teachers or scholars” to “How can we better align the work of the faculty with the goals of the institution?” To realize the vision of a twenty-first-century institution, more faculty must be encouraged and supported in the integrative, engaged work that will animate such a university. Institutions must move from first-order
change in the form of new programs or adjusted models of faculty development to transformative second-order change that would fundamentally alter higher education. This kind of irreversible shift requires a new model of faculty work.

The concept of integrative learning, so far reserved for students, provides a powerful lens for conceptualizing a new faculty model. Integrative learning describes a deep learning process that invites students to “build across the curriculum and cocurriculum, from making simple connections among ideas and experiences to synthesizing and transferring learning to new, complex situations within and beyond the campus.” Engaged scholarship can be understood as a faculty equivalent of integrative learning. Engaged scholarship requires co-constructed, decompartmentalized knowledge—both deep and broad—that reaches beyond the boundaries of the university and solves community problems, thereby fulfilling the civic mission of higher education. Applying the elements of integrative learning to faculty work could address current challenges in promoting and achieving translational scholarship and interdisciplinary collaboration. Faculty, too, require support as integrated learners and scholars if they are to help their institutions respond to calls for a more responsive higher education model. Integrative learning for faculty links lab, classroom, office, committee, and community, joining conversations about developing an area of excellence, a career, and a life.

If integrative learning were to become central to the work of the university—and to faculty work, in particular—it would call into question what institutions accept as knowledge and how they judge success. While traditional academic models treat knowledge as disciplinarily constrained, expert-driven, and confined within the walls of the university, integrative learning privileges co-constructed, decompartmentalized, shared, and applied knowledge. Adopting a model of integrative learning for faculty would mean disrupting the normative “buckets” of faculty work: research, teaching, and service. A faculty model of integrative learning would encourage new criteria for excellence that blur and transcend these bounded categories and that reframe a zero-sum game of effort allocation as one of integration that results in more than the sum of the parts. This model also would call on institutions to help faculty learn how to navigate the languages, frameworks, and methodological preferences of colleagues outside their own disciplines.

The longstanding institutional reward structures that reinforce narrow pathways to, and models of, excellence also must be transformed to recognize and support engaged work. With such institutional affirmation, collaborative and engaged scholarship, as well as the risks typically associated with working across disciplines, would become opportunities for success, rather than threats to promotion and tenure. Thus, an integrative-learning framework for faculty would create space for the innovation and risk taking required for engaged scholarship.

Engaged scholarship and its scholarly products may neither comport with traditional norms of scholarly output nor lend themselves to traditional peer review procedures. Thus, a model of integrative learning for faculty would force reconsideration of our definitions of “expertise” and “expert.” Reframing these concepts has implications for how we assess faculty work and how we think about processes of peer review. While integrative learning celebrates both breadth and depth, traditional notions of expertise reward focused depth. The argument here is not that institutions need to abandon such notions of “expertise”; rather, we should also recognize expertise that balances deep disciplinary knowledge with breadth of application and connection. In other words, institutional reward structures must incentivize interdisciplinary collaboration that results in publication outside of disciplinarily sanctioned outlets or high-quality scholarly products that may be unrecognizable to disciplinary peers. Expanding institutional norms of expertise would require
complementary models of peer review that reconsider who counts as an expert and what counts as evidence of expertise. Community-based projects and applied scholarship must be recognized as peer-reviewable applications of expertise. Moreover, a model of faculty integrative learning must acknowledge that not all our peers are academics, and that community partners might emerge as expert reviewers for products that have impact beyond the university. Academic leaders should work to develop guidelines for community partners that would help these collaborators effectively assess and review faculty work.

Such expanded understandings of “expert” and “expertise” productively challenge academic notions of prestige and reputation, and they require reimagining the traditional currency of academia. Faculty engaged in team-taught project-based learning, for example, blend applied research, excellence in teaching, and service to both university and community. A well-facilitated and guided project experience for students might yield a product that has great value for a community partner.

If the educational outcome has value outside the university, then the institution should also value the work by supporting and rewarding the faculty who integrate classroom innovation with collaborative, applied research.

Responding to neglected learners with an integrative-learning framework would help institutions create stronger connections among their communities of scholars and prepare them to better address messy real-world problems in their communities.

An example of this institutional commitment to integrative learning for faculty might be universities convening and sponsoring shared work sessions that include campus members, community participants, and disciplinary colleagues. Currently, faculty attend conferences primarily as experts who present their research or collaborate with like-minded scholars on problems relevant to their research agendas. Conferences make these conversations happen in real time, but off site. A faculty model of integrative learning would call on institutions to bring faculty members’ disciplinary learning back to the campus and community, with regular report-outs or poster sessions that showcase this institutional investment in travel and conference attendance. Such cultural shifts have the potential to support engagement in an institution and to enhance a sense of belonging, characteristics as important for faculty success and well-being as they are for student success and well-being. Developing more drop-in, low-commitment, informal poster sessions, TED-style talks, and similar convenings that provide ample opportunities to connect across disciplines would complement and support the changing dynamics of faculty work. Such opportunities focus on connection and communication throughout the organization in order to promote boundary-crossing collaboration.

Similarly, institutions could facilitate the creation of team and networked projects. For example, institutions could develop cross-functional teams that enlist whole departments, units, and community partners to address retention issues, the use of decision analytics, enrollment management, curricular revision, the development of high-impact practices, or translational research problems in and with the community. These projects are not necessarily long-term committee assignments but are deep retreat-worthy conversations that would reconnect learning with the professional context of faculty work. These learning conversations should be more inclusive and involve staff, adjunct faculty, and students. Such models would encourage more attention to context and place as well as a greater investment in, and connection to, immediate communities. They would help faculty forge stronger connections among disciplines as well as to their immediate settings.

Making connections between one’s individual career aspirations and broader institutional goals fills a gap that hampers both faculty and administrators. We need to do a better job of aligning what the campus hopes to achieve with the rewards, incentives, communications, and related support designed for faculty. We believe that many faculty are interested in
connecting their careers with their campuses and communities, but they feel ill-equipped to take on this challenge. These strategies move faculty learning from remediation or individual enhancement to faculty learning as institutional investment. We could develop incentives and rewards in the form of grants for mentoring or forming learning communities—providing a stipend for enrollment as fellows, for example, with the requirement to pay back and teach others—and, ultimately, have these efforts count in promotion and tenure reviews.

The goals of a liberal education cannot be achieved if faculty are not integrative learners. Importantly, a model of integrative learning for faculty would enhance institutional efforts to help students integrate learning across their degree and cocurricular engagements, as faculty would bring their own experience with, and perspectives on, integration back to the classroom. They would communicate the importance of integrative learning to their students and mentees, thereby sustaining second-order change and a cultural shift in priorities.

**Conclusion**

Viewing faculty as neglected learners opens up new conversations about how best to assist them in ways that also meet the challenges and goals of higher education in the twenty-first century. Faculty and the institutions they serve would benefit from this shift in focus because their colleagues are changing, their students are different, their disciplines are expanding and deepening, and their campuses are faced with external forces that require them to leave the lab or classroom and become engaged in on-the-ground problems. If we were able to address the needs of faculty as neglected learners, we would be more likely to achieve institutional goals because those goals would be more closely aligned with faculty development efforts. Furthermore, we would be better able to foster cultural change on formal and informal levels, resulting in more interdisciplinary, collaborative, innovation-friendly campuses. Such a culture would ultimately benefit students, faculty, and the communities we serve.

In fact, a campus would be better able to attend to the neglected learning of faculty if it operated more like a “learning organization”—one that engages in intentional, transparent, and planned reflection and communication. Research suggests that an institutionalized culture of learning is one that encourages a level of risk that does not typically exist in a university. We argue for strategies that make boundaries more permeable and that make learning—for everyone, including faculty—better aligned with campus goals.

To respond to this article, e-mail liberaled@aacu.org, with the authors’ names on the subject line.
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13. See, for example, the work of the Delphi Project on the Changing Faculty and Student Success (http://www.uscrossier.org/pullias/changing-faculty-student-success).
“Glocalizing” the Campus

FOR THE PAST SEVERAL YEARS, I have been attending Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) conferences and institutes regularly in order to glean useful ideas for improving general education and, more recently, for infusing global learning into the undergraduate curriculum. With each conference and institute attended, I have increased my knowledge and repertoire of potential practices to be adapted to my home institution, the University of South Florida (USF). Speaking honestly, though, I have found the “adapting” part to be challenging at times, because USF is a large research university with over 40,000 students and nearly 1,800 instructional faculty. How does one advance global learning on a campus of that size?

After having worked on this issue for the past five years, I have come to realize that the challenge with global learning initiatives lies not with any institutional characteristic but with global learning itself. Definitions of global learning vary slightly, but all invoke a broad spectrum of knowledge, skills, and attitudes. As a result, global learning does not fall squarely within the domain of any one department—or even two or three departments. Global learning requires a concerted group effort to provide students with a variety of experiences that develop a diversity of competencies. Therein lies the challenge for institutions of any size.

In what follows, I offer suggestions for advancing global learning on campus that are derived from my experience leading the development of a university-wide global learning initiative at USF. Called the Global Citizens Project, the initiative links key areas of the curriculum and cocurriculum to develop a network of global learning experiences, a process I refer to as “glocalizing the campus.” The network, created through shared global learning outcomes and reinforced through new and existing structures and systems, enables students to learn and practice desired competencies in different contexts. While still a work in progress, the Global Citizens Project is an example of how global learning can connect different corners of a campus of any size. To set the stage for a discussion of specific aspects of the initiative, I begin by briefly describing the context in which USF’s Global Citizens Project was developed.

Global engagement at USF:
Parameters and possibilities

The establishment of the Global Citizens Project marked a significant step toward accomplishing the first goal of USF’s strategic plan, which calls for the preparation of “well-educated and highly skilled global citizens through our continuing commitment to student success.” With its mission as “a global research university dedicated to student success,” USF values “global research, community engagement, and public service.” The university supports faculty and student global engagement through USF World, an administrative unit in the office of the provost that is dedicated to internationalizing the USF System. In short, the importance of global engagement is firmly established at the highest levels of the administration.

Activities that advance USF’s global mission are, therefore, encouraged. This is particularly important given that we serve 30,374 undergraduates, 92 percent of whom are from Florida. The typical incoming student has never left the country; many have not ventured out of the state. Our current study abroad participation rate is 3.35 percent and increasing every year. However, 40 percent of our students are Pell Grant recipients and over half are transfer students, so studying
to Advance Global Learning
abroad is often not considered a viable option for a variety of reasons.

External pressures complicate USF’s global mission. For example, state legislation holds that once a student surpasses 110 percent of the credit hours required for the degree, he or she must be levied a surcharge for any “excess” hours. This makes it imperative that students stay focused and minimize credits that do not count toward the degree. As a result, study abroad, foreign language study, and other credit-bearing global learning opportunities are sometimes viewed as “extras.”

To address some of the perceived internal and external obstacles to global learning, USF proposed to develop an explicitly global general education curriculum as part of our application to AAC&U’s Shared Futures: General Education for a Global Century initiative in 2010. Our selection led to the pilot of what became USF’s Global Citizenship General Education Program. From 2011 to 2015, the two-year program offered participating students global general education courses and a guaranteed $2,000 study abroad scholarship. While successful with the inaugural cohort of twenty-five students (as measured in terms of completion rates and program satisfaction), the difficulties posed by the lock-step nature of the curriculum when scaling up in subsequent years taught us that a more flexible approach was needed. This proved to be a valuable lesson for the Global Citizens Project.

**USF’s Global Citizens Project**

The Global Citizens Project (GCP) is a five-year effort to enhance USF students’ global competencies. The goal is to graduate well-educated and highly skilled global citizens. Undertaken as part of the university’s reaffirmation of accreditation, the project is comprehensive and well resourced. However, my experience leads me to believe that, even in situations of limited to no funding, the “glocalizing” approach we use can be implemented incrementally. The most important step is to define a common set of global competencies that can be infused into different educational experiences, both curricular and cocurricular. The global competencies are the essential links connecting the different experiences, which are then reinforced through structural and systemic means. Below, I present the GCP competencies and our plan for achieving them.

The Global Citizens Project defines a global citizen as someone who engages meaningfully and effectively with diverse people, places, events, challenges, and opportunities. The definition is based on a core set of global skills, attitudes, and behaviors, which we have incorporated into a working developmental model of global citizenship (see fig. 1). At the heart of our model lie three primary competencies: global awareness, global responsibility, and global participation. For each of these competencies, we recognize both affective/conative and cognitive dimensions and have defined six accompanying learning outcomes: self-awareness, willingness, and practice within the affective/conative domain; and knowledge, analysis, and synthesis within the cognitive domain. These six learning outcomes are the core of USF’s Global Citizens Project; all GCP activities are directed at enhancing student learning relative to the outcomes.

To achieve our learning goals, we have developed three interconnected strategies, which together create multiple, scaffolded opportunities for students to engage in different global learning experiences. The first strategy is to infuse the GCP learning outcomes into the general education curriculum. Specifically, all courses that fulfill general education requirements in the social and behavioral sciences, humanities, fine arts, and an area we call “human and cultural diversity in a global context” must address two of the cognitive GCP learning outcomes and incorporate supporting course content, activities, and assignments. The objective is to introduce students to global learning in the first two years of study.

To implement this strategy, new review criteria have been incorporated into the regular recertification process all general education courses must undergo every five years. The review criteria build on and strengthen existing global dimensions of the general education curriculum and, therefore, do not represent something entirely new. Course revisions necessary to meet the new global criteria are being completed by faculty gradually, based on the five-year recertification schedule. The university’s general education council, a standing committee of our faculty senate, reviews these recertification proposals as part of their regular review process.
The second strategy targets the majors. Here we are encouraging departments to infuse the learning outcomes of the Global Citizens Project into the coursework of the majors and to develop supporting high-impact practices (e.g., service learning, study abroad/away, and undergraduate research) and cocurricular experiences, thereby turning the major into a Global Pathway. The objective is to provide students with opportunities to practice and apply global competencies within their disciplines of study. In this manner, students also gain an understanding of the enhanced value that a global perspective brings to the disciplines.

To advance the Global Pathways strategy, a new certification process has been developed that enables academic departments to demonstrate the various ways in which their programs align with the Global Citizens Project and, thus, market their programs as Global Pathways. Departments are offered incentives and support to engage in this work. In addition to course releases and faculty stipends, participating departments receive priority for funding to develop global undergraduate research and service-learning courses as well as priority consideration for leading study abroad programs in preferred locations.

Our third strategy encourages and rewards students’ participation in global learning experiences through a new undergraduate award program. USF’s Global Citizen Award can be earned through a combination of curricular and/or cocurricular experiences addressing the GCP learning outcomes. Students choose two experiences in which they wish to participate from a list of options that includes globally certified coursework, foreign language study, study abroad/away, undergraduate research, service learning, internships, and community service. Attendance at eight on-campus global events is also required. Upon earning the
award, students are identified as global citizens on their transcripts and become eligible to apply for a $2,500 study abroad scholarship, among other incentives. The objective of the award is to provide students with opportunities to reinforce their global competencies.

The award requirements parallel the Global Pathways structure so that students can earn the award as they complete requirements for the major. Faculty are therefore offered incentives to certify major and elective coursework as Global Citizens courses, which students can use toward award requirements. The university’s undergraduate council, which is a standing committee of our faculty senate, is responsible for certifying these undergraduate courses and has developed a certification process and criteria mirroring those used by the university’s general education council for general education courses. Campus partners, such as the offices for community engagement, undergraduate research, and career services, help vet and
approve the global nature of other award activities using established criteria.

To spearhead and oversee implementation of all three strategies, the Global Citizens Project office was created and is staffed by a director, an assistant director, two professional development specialists, an assessment specialist, an administrative support specialist, and five graduate assistants. The assistant director manages the Global Citizen Award using USF’s learning management system. Working with USF’s teaching center, the professional development specialists assist staff and faculty with global programming and course design. The assessment specialist works with USF’s institutional effectiveness office to refine our model of global citizenship and develop a comprehensive assessment plan to measure student learning.

**Development of the Global Citizens Project**
The Global Citizens Project infuses global learning outcomes into different campus activities and links those activities through new structures (Global Pathways and the award) and existing requirements (general education and the majors). We developed this approach slowly over two years, as the various committees involved navigated the internal and external challenges of our institutional context. Directly addressing those challenges ultimately strengthened the plan.

Development of the Global Citizens Project began in summer 2013 under the direction of a thirty-one-member steering committee appointed by the provost and composed of administrators, faculty, staff, students, and alumni representing all facets of the university community. Subcommittees worked on specific aspects of the project from 2014 to 2015. A faculty team dedicated to curricular development and a student affairs team dedicated to cocurricular development proposed the three strategies to enhance students’ global learning. Three implementation teams—also composed of key stakeholders, including academic advisors and student government representatives—drafted plans for carrying out the strategies proposed by the development teams.

Importantly, as the development teams began their work, it became apparent that a set of guidelines was needed in order to avoid the potential pitfalls involved with brainstorming strategies (e.g., excess credit hours). First and foremost, we agreed that we must keep undergraduate student learning at the forefront of our efforts. We found that many related activities were worthy of attention, but if they were not directly tied to enhancing students’ global competencies, then they were deemed to be outside the scope of the project.

Another important guideline was that no new requirements or other activities that could lead to excess credit hours would be instituted. For this reason, we decided against a credit-bearing certificate program and instead created a flexible award so that any student, regardless
of major or year, can participate without acquiring excess credit hours. In the end, these two guidelines reinforced each other, because we found that when our discussions slipped into a focus on strategies (and not learning), we tended to brainstorm new requirements or fall back on study abroad. By keeping the emphasis on student learning, we found creative ways to work within existing requirements and systems.

The emphasis on student learning meant that it was important to craft measurable learning outcomes that were specific to USF and our institutional mission and values. So while the steering committee conducted reviews of the literature on global competencies, ultimately we turned to existing global dimensions of our general education curriculum in order to draft an initial set of learning outcomes, which faculty focus groups then refined. Faculty, staff, and student surveys regarding the qualities of a global citizen also informed this work, as did AAC&U’s Global Learning VALUE Rubric.

In the process of drafting the learning outcomes, it also became clear that our learning outcomes should be meaningful to all, but specific to none. In other words, the outcomes needed to be defined in such a way that all disciplines and departments could have a role in the Global Citizens Project without delegating any one aspect of learning to the domain of a particular unit. In this way, developing students’ global competencies is everyone’s responsibility and opportunity. For this reason, foreign language skills and intercultural competency, for example, are not singled out as separate learning outcomes; rather, they are woven throughout the outcomes.

Finally, there was a strong sense on campus that we were already “doing global.” It was therefore imperative to recognize these accomplishments and find ways to build upon this foundation. As a result, the affective/conative learning outcomes of the Global Citizens Project derive from existing learning outcomes defined by our residential life unit as part of the residential curriculum. For this reason, too, the requirements for the Global Citizen Award incorporate the many global activities already occurring on campus. In the end, our steady focus on student learning and direct acknowledgement of the challenges posed by our institutional context led us to draw on our strengths and connect existing resources in new ways.

Suggestions for “glocalizing” your campus
While our approach to advancing global learning on campus was borne out of our specific institutional context, the process of linking local resources to create a network of global learning experiences is broadly adaptable. The advantage is that the process allows you to work within existing parameters, while compelling you to seek new possibilities. Whether or not you adopt this approach, there are generalizable lessons that can be applied to your home campus:

• Keep student learning at the forefront of your efforts. Losing sight of your purpose will divert your attention from what matters most—your students. Also, having a good sense of what you want your students to learn will free you to be creative with the kinds of opportunities you might develop.

• Form partnerships across campus that benefit all parties. Global learning is not possible without collaboration. Involve representatives from many different stakeholder groups during all phases of planning, development, and implementation. Learn what is important to them, and integrate their priorities into the overall plan.

• Define a shared set of global learning outcomes. Learning outcomes that are meaningful to different constituencies offer a common goal toward which all can work and a common ground upon which to build critical partnerships. Refer to your institution’s mission statement or strategic plan for
guidance. By aligning your global learning outcomes with institutional values, you will be able to demonstrate how global learning and associated activities benefit your institution. At USF, research and engagement to “improve lives and strengthen communities” is part of our mission. As a result, there is a strong practice and application dimension to our global learning outcomes. In fact, we use the term global citizen to emphasize responsibility and action.

- **Develop collective strategies that bridge disconnected units.** Strategies that connect unlikely partners encourage creative thinking about existing structures, systems, and activities. Moreover, collaborators will appreciate the new level of visibility afforded their programming. For example, our student affairs’ successful iBuddy program, which connects domestic and international students for friendship and cultural awareness, is gaining more recognition among faculty as a result of its inclusion in the Global Citizen Award. This curricular program, and others like it, will become increasingly connected to courses and curricula as departments globalize their majors.

- **Capitalize on institutional strategic priorities to infuse global learning where it does not yet exist.** These areas are likely to have resources and activities into which global learning can be integrated. For example, USF’s offices for community engagement and undergraduate research now reserve stipends for faculty willing to create globally focused service-learning and research opportunities.

- **Forge new paths to connect existing sites of global learning.** In this way, it becomes possible to acknowledge what is already happening on campus, while creating something new and exciting. USF’s Global Citizen Award grew out of such an endeavor and is bringing together academic affairs and student affairs in unprecedented ways.

The list of recommendations above suggests that advancing global learning on campus entails demonstrating the same skills and attitudes that we aim to develop in our students: a readiness to engage with diverse groups, an openness to new ideas and different perspectives, the ability to see connections and establish new ones, and the willingness to collaborate for mutual benefit. Global learning initiatives offer us the opportunity to model for our students essential competencies in this increasingly interconnected world. Creating an interconnected campus has the potential to advance our global learning efforts even further.

To respond to this article, e-mail liberaled@aacu.org, with the author’s name on the subject line.
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**NOTES**


2. While similar in concept to internationalization at home, I use “glocalize” to emphasize the goal of global learning, as defined by Whitehead and Hovland.

3. In this respect, glocalizing the campus is similar to an across-the-curriculum approach, but all campus activities and areas are considered potential sites of global learning, which are explicitly linked through various means.


5. Ibid., 8.

6. USF is part of the University of South Florida System, which is composed of three separately accredited institutions. USF serves as the main campus and is located in Tampa, Florida.

7. The Global Citizens Project is USF’s Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP). A QEP is a requirement for reaffirmation of accreditation by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges.


9. For information about the VALUE rubrics, or to download individual rubrics, see http://www.aacu.org/value-rubrics.
In 1970, full-time faculty comprised more than 75 percent of the academic workforce. Today, they comprise just over 50 percent; the remaining positions are filled by adjuncts. This trend portends great uncertainty about the future of academic employment, not to mention well-justified alarm at the working environment it promotes in the present. At an average of $2,700 to $3,200 per course, adjuncts’ earnings typically fall well below those of their tenured, tenure-track, and contract counterparts. Questions about the long-term sustainability of an adjunct-dependent higher education system and the fairness pertaining to sharply divergent employment conditions need seriously to be addressed.

Many of these concerns are concentrated in specific subject areas. English/literature, philosophy, history, and modern languages far outpace the hard sciences, engineering, professional degree programs, and even the social sciences in their use of adjunct faculty. On its surface this uneven distribution across academic disciplines portends an acute affliction to the humanities core of the traditional liberal education model, particularly as it relates to fields with highly saturated job markets. Yet in other ways, the traditional liberal arts model of nonprofit higher education actually enjoys a modest insulation from a trend that is much more pronounced at other institutional types, and particularly the for-profit sector.

The adjunctification of the American professoriate is often attributed to a number of familiar causes: instructional budget reductions (sometimes coupled with administrative growth), the erosion of tenure and other job benefits, the failure of colleges and universities to keep pace with growing student enrollments, and even the disruptive economic effects of the “great recession” that began in 2008. Despite the apparent conventional wisdom embodied by each of these explanatory factors, growing empirical evidence actually points to the boom in for-profit higher education as the primary, though not the only, driver of the most recent phases of adjunctification. The disproportionately heavy use of adjunct faculty by for-profit institutions, combined with the rapid growth of the for-profit sector beginning in the 1990s, has led to an unprecedented expansion in the number of adjunct positions overall. And yet, despite heightened attention to the adjunctification phenomenon, we may now be witnessing signs of a modest contraction of the adjunct market in the wake of the bursting of the for-profit bubble.

**Statistical trends in adjunct employment**

While concerns about adjunctification in US higher education are not new, they have grown in intensity in recent years. In early 2015, adjunct labor activists called attention to what they deemed unfair pay and working conditions by organizing a “National Adjunct Walkout Day.” Although increased awareness of the issue has spawned new efforts to map the characteristics of the part-time academic workforce, the unavailability of accurate metrics and data sources related to adjunct employment remains a challenge for researchers. In 2012, the Coalition on the Academic Workforce commissioned the most comprehensive survey of adjunct faculty to date in an attempt to shed light on characteristics of adjunct employment.¹

Not all statistics are as they seem on the surface, though, and substantial confusion often characterizes public discussion of trends associated with the reliance on adjunct faculty. For example, a number of reputable media outlets have reported that adjuncts comprise as much as 76 percent of the academic workforce—an inaccurate claim that actually represents the total percentage of “contingent” faculty, a category that also includes...
all faculty in untenured and nontenure-track positions, whether full or part time. Others use the terms “adjunct” and “contingent” interchangeably, failing to acknowledge that each group faces unique and, in some ways, highly divergent challenges. The long-term job security of those in full-time non-tenure-track positions remains a concern; however, it is dangerous for statistical reporting purposes to conflate these contingent faculty with adjunct faculty. The wage gap between the two groups is significant; the median salary of full-time contingent faculty was $47,500 in 2010, and most enjoy full-time employee benefits that are not available to adjuncts. The most reliable data on part-time employment suggest that adjuncts currently comprise between 40 and 50 percent of the postsecondary instructional workforce in the United States, though this figure also varies widely by the type of institution and highest level of degree granted.

Rather than a simple rise in the number of adjuncts and a corresponding decline in the number of full-time faculty, a closer look at academic employment data reveals a significantly more complex picture. Adjunct growth has been highly concentrated in the for-profit sector for the past two decades, and it has proceeded at a much slower pace in more traditional sectors of the academy. This concentration reflects a number of characteristics that are unique to for-profit higher education, including the sector’s distinctive economic situation. Part-time employment growth remains an issue for traditional nonprofit colleges and universities, though its dynamics are far less reflective of the commonly presumed pattern of “replacement” for formerly full-time faculty positions. In general, closer attentiveness to institution-specific patterns is necessary both to understand the adjunct phenomenon and to accurately diagnose its implications for the future of higher education in the United States.

**For-profits and the recent roots of adjunctification**

The decline in full-time positions as a percentage of instructional staffing has been ongoing since the early 1970s. As figure 1 illustrates, the most precipitous drop actually took place between 1970 and 1977. This drop in the percentage of full-time faculty is usually attributed to the rise of community colleges, which employ relatively high numbers of part-time faculty. The percentage of full-time faculty underwent a slow yet steady decline between 1993 and 2012, dropping from 60 to 50 percent, before rebounding slightly to just over 51 percent in 2013.

---

**Figure 1. Percentage of full-time faculty employed in US colleges and universities**

![Figure 1](https://example.com/figure1.png)

However, this percentage comparison obscures another important trend. The total number of full-time positions has more than doubled, from 369,000 in 1970 to 791,000 today (see fig. 2). Interestingly, this growth pattern has continued uninterrupted since 1986. Moreover, it accelerated slightly after 2001 and, contrary to another common misconception, does not appear to have diminished during the financial crisis of the late 2000s. The observed decline in the percentage of full-time faculty actually derives from the fact that the number of part-time positions has expanded at a faster rate, swelling from 104,000 in 1970 to 752,000 today. This growth pattern is much less stable and has tended to come in sudden waves and with occasional reversals. While the overall number of part-time positions has essentially grown to match the number of full-time positions, there is no sign that full-time positions are on the decline numerically.

What, then, is causing the most recent wave of adjunctification in US higher education? The single largest factor appears to be the parallel boom in for-profit higher education. The US Department of Education’s IPEDS survey has consistently shown that for-profit colleges and universities employ part-time or adjunct faculty almost exclusively. Tenure is essentially nonexistent at most of these institutions, and adjuncts comprise nearly the entirety of the for-profit instructional workforce. The most recent study on institutional lines shows that over 93 percent of for-profit faculty are hired on a part-time basis (see table 1). By contrast, adjuncts comprise only one-third of the instructional faculty at traditional four-year institutions.

### Table 1. Part-time faculty by institutional type and degree level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Part-Time Faculty</th>
<th>Institution Type</th>
<th>Degree Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-Year Colleges</td>
<td>Doctoral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&amp; Universities</td>
<td>27.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Master’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Profit</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-Year Colleges</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For-Profit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colleges &amp;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Universities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

colleges and universities (the percentage is slightly higher at private institutions than at publics) and about two-thirds of the faculty at community colleges.

The extreme disparity in adjunct dependence between for-profit and nonprofit higher education points to a disproportionate role in the observed adjunct boom. While for-profit metrics are more difficult to obtain, a clearly parallel expansion in the for-profit sector occurred between the 1990s and 2011. This period corresponds to several landmark events in the history of for-profit higher education. The Apollo Group, parent company of the for-profit University of Phoenix, took its stock public in 1994 and rapidly expanded its branch campuses. The Corinthian Colleges group was founded shortly thereafter in 1995. For-profit student enrollment peaked around 2010–11, followed by a precipitous decline that is still underway and includes the bankruptcy of the Corinthian system in early 2015. Direct evidence of for-profit effects can be seen in figure 3. A near-perfect correlation appears between the growth in the number of for-profit campuses and the growth in the overall number of adjuncts in the same period.

The trend in faculty employment in for-profit institutions follows a nearly identical pattern. As shown in figure 2, approximately 470,000 part-time faculty positions were added between 1991 and the adjunct peak in 2011. (Note that this figure does not account for the approximately 22 percent of adjunct faculty who teach at two or more campuses, which makes some double-counting inevitable.) During this same period, the instructional positions at for-profit institutions alone increased by nearly 130,000 positions, almost all of them part-time. In a sharp reversal of fortunes, for-profit universities shed more than 10,000 positions between 2011 and 2013. The bankruptcy-induced closure of almost one hundred Corinthian campuses and the drop in for-profit enrollment amidst greater accreditation and financial pressures practically ensures that this pattern will continue in the near future.

Since for-profit institutions comprised no more than about 11 to 13 percent of all US higher education institutions at their peak, it is difficult to understatede the disproportionate weight of their position in the adjunct realm. By comparison, the for-profit university boom was the likely driver of over a quarter of all adjunct growth in the last twenty years.

The adjunctification of the professoriate has continued in other sectors of US higher education, albeit at a slower pace. A substantial portion of this increase in the use of adjuncts may be attributable to a continuation of the growth of the community college sector that began in the 1970s. As we have seen, part-time employment

---

Figure 3. Number of for-profit campuses vs. total number of part-time faculty

rates at two-year associate’s degree-granting colleges are about twice that at traditional nonprofit four-year institutions, comprising about 65 percent of all faculty. Community colleges accounted for roughly 130,000 new faculty over the same period as the for-profit boom. While it is difficult to determine a more precise institutional distribution of the growth in adjunct faculty given the data limitations, it does appear that traditional four-year nonprofit institutions have been comparatively less susceptible to the adjunctification trend over time.

The role of tenure and full-time status in the contingency debate
Unsurprisingly, the growth of part-time faculty employment has accompanied a decline in the overall percentage (though not the absolute number) of tenured and tenure-eligible faculty.\(^7\) As with part-time employment patterns, differences in institutional type weigh heavily on the availability of both tenure protections and tenure-eligible positions. As figure 5 (see page 56) illustrates, well over 90 percent of public four-year colleges and universities have tenure systems in place. In fact, the percentage of four-year publics with tenure reached an all-time high of almost 96 percent in 2013–14. Tenure systems are somewhat less common at community colleges and private four-year institutions, hovering at around 60 percent for both. By comparison, tenure systems are virtually non-existent in for-profit higher education.

The percentages of tenured faculty within institutions that offer tenure have changed somewhat. Recall from table 1 that traditional four-year institutions employ significantly lower percentages of part-time faculty (34 percent) than do community colleges (65 percent) and for-profits (93 percent). Excluding for-profit institutions, the percentage of full-time faculty with tenure declined by about 5 percentage points across all other institutional types between 1993–94 and 2003–04 (see fig. 6 on page 57). Yet since 2005–06, the percentage of full-time tenured faculty has stabilized at both public and private four-year institutions, and it has increased at community colleges. Note that figure 6 includes full-time tenured faculty only; it does not account for full-time tenure-track or tenure-ineligible full-time appointments. Yet it does show that, as a percentage of all full-time faculty, the tenured faculty has not declined significantly over the past decade, including during the recent financial crisis.

By looking at all full-time faculty positions, as opposed to only those with tenure, a clearer trend emerges—a trend that runs counter to another conventional theory of adjunctification. A 2015 report by the Campaign for the Future of Higher Education asserts that retiring full-time
Faculty are being replaced by new adjunct hires as a way of handling increased student enrollments. Though a common claim in the adjunct literature, this “replacement” theory is directly contradicted by student enrollment data. A very different pattern emerges when trends in the total number of full-time teaching positions are compared to student enrollment growth since 1970.

As figure 7 illustrates, the ratio of enrolled students to full-time faculty has remained remarkably stable at about 25 to 1, fluctuating only slightly over time. Furthermore, when data from the adjunct-dependent for-profit sector are excluded, the ratio today sits near parity with the 1970 level. As of 2013, the total number of full-time positions has grown to 2.14 times the 1970 level. The total number of enrolled students, excluding those who attend for-profit universities, sits at 2.19 times the 1970 level. In short, the total number of full-time positions has actually kept pace with student enrollment growth.

This pattern suggests that adjunct faculty actually serve another important role in reducing the average class size and increasing the number and diversity of courses offered. These factors can improve institutional rankings as well as marketing appeal, indicating that adjunctification is actually more of a supplementary phenomenon to a full-time growth ratio that has remained constant for forty years.

Interpreting recent data trends

In light of continued uncertainties surrounding academic employment, the expanding role of part-time faculty in the US higher education system will likely remain a subject of controversy and concern. The analysis presented here suggests that greater attentiveness to the nuances of the academic job market, including the role of institutional characteristics in employment trends, is warranted.

In particular, the most recent phase of the long-term adjunctification in US higher education requires further unpacking to account for the central role played by the for-profit higher education boom that began in the 1990s. The rise of the for-profit sector appears to have rapidly accelerated the use of adjunct faculty over a twenty-year period. By contrast, traditional four-year institutions have remained more resistant to adjunctification than the total percentages of full- and part-time faculty suggest when considered alone. Interestingly, the for-profit-driven adjunct boom mirrors other recent patterns in for-profit higher education. For example, a 2015 study by the Brookings Institution found that the for-profit sector accounted for...
vastly disproportionate levels of student loan defaults compared to traditional higher education.

Two additional characteristics highlight the important role of the for-profit phenomenon in the adjunctification of US higher education. First, part-time instructors at for-profit institutions are paid significantly less than their counterparts in traditional higher education institutions. With a median rate of only $1,560 per class, for-profits pay just over half the going adjunct rate at most nonprofit colleges and universities. This sizable salary differential suggests that the for-profit effect on the adjunct market is also greatly exacerbating the broader set of grievances associated with adjunct compensation.

Second, we are presently witnessing the bursting of the for-profit bubble, following its peak around 2010–11. Backlash against student loan practices and a push for stricter accreditation standards have taken a toll on the for-profit education industry, leading to a decline in enrollment and, in cases such as Corinthian, financial insolvency. If they continue, the current troubles of for-profit higher education likely portend a partial reversal of the adjunctification trends. Indeed, the latest statistics suggest that such a reversal may be underway already, as the percentage of part-time faculty (fig. 1), the total number of part-time faculty (fig. 2), and the for-profit inclusive student-to-full-time faculty ratio (fig. 7) all decreased in 2013, coinciding with the for-profit contraction (figs. 3 and 4).

Related patterns in full-time academic employment, including full-time contingent faculty, indicate steady, uninterrupted growth. While this pattern has accompanied an erosion of tenured faculty as a percentage of all full-time faculty over the past forty years, data from the last decade suggest that tenure has stabilized somewhat—particularly if one excludes the for-profit sector, where tenure is practically non-existent.

Given that full-time positions continue to expand in absolute numbers, recent data trends point to a larger issue with the supply of academic labor. The number of job applicants continues to exceed the number of available full-time positions, even as the total number of full-time positions in many fields has more than doubled since 1970. In part, this labor supply issue stems from an ongoing overproduction of PhDs, although a closer look at the current adjunct sector also reveals that even PhD holders are in a distinct minority among currently employed adjuncts (see table 2 on page 58).

The growth in adjunct positions reflects the academy’s absorption of both a glut of new PhDs and an influx of nonterminal-degree-holding
applicants for part-time instructional positions. This latter group was likely a direct beneficiary of the for-profit-induced adjunct boom that occurred between 1991 and 2011 even as the positions it offered were non-ideal. In an already saturated academic job market, we should expect to see a significant employment advantage for candidates with a PhD over those who hold only a master’s degree or equivalent. A PhD-driven credentialing expectation will likely function as the most visible barrier to upward job mobility among adjuncts who lack terminal degrees, though it is also likely to exert downward pressures within the adjunct market as the for-profit contraction plays out and competition increases for a smaller number of adjunct positions.

Ironically, the recent surge of adjunct awareness and accompanying unionization efforts may have less to do with a “boiling point” effect, premised on the overall percentage growth over the past four decades, than it does with the for-profit-induced adjunct market contraction that has occurred over the past four years. Adjuncts who lack terminal degrees and who teach at less-prestigious institutions will likely be the most vulnerable—not for want of upward mobility to full-time positions, though that credentialing barrier still exists, but for want of additional adjuncting work at their previously existing levels.

A more pressing and simultaneous concern for the liberal arts model may also derive from the rapid growth of graduate degree output in the humanities. While adjunct growth is significantly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2. Part-time respondents, by educational attainment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than baccalaureate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certification or licensure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFA of MLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JD, MD, or MBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABD*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Valid responses</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Missing (no response)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total respondents</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Institutional types refer to the Carnegie 2010 basic classification; Percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding. *“ABD” refers to candidates for the doctorate who have completed “all but dissertation.”

Source: Coalition on the Academic Workforce, *A Portrait of Part-Time Faculty Members: A Summary of Findings on Part-Time Faculty Respondents to the Coalition on the Academic Workforce Survey of Contingent Faculty Members and Instructors (Coalition on the Academic Workforce, 2012), 23, table 9.*
more subdued in not-for-profit four-year colleges, adjunct use may still be a common feature of certain disciplines more than others. As previously noted, English departments employ a disproportionately large number of adjuncts even compared to other humanities disciplines. Over 16 percent of the respondents to a 2012 adjunct survey came from English/Literature. History is a distant second at 6.6 percent, followed by 5.3 percent in other modern languages and 4.8 percent in philosophy and religion. To the extent that many afflicted subjects form a core component of a well-rounded liberal education curriculum, future adjunct alleviation strategies would benefit from a closer examination of why PhD production in certain fields consistently outpaces full-time faculty job growth.

Adjunct trends illustrate an important dynamic of academic employment at a time of both growth and uncertainty. Yet it is in the nuances of these trends that a clearer picture of the employment market begins to emerge. There is significant evidence that a number of seemingly intuitive explanations for adjunctification—college and university budget cuts; the ongoing erosion of tenure, both perceived and actual; and fallout from specific events, such as the recent financial crisis—are, in fact, less determinative of recent anxieties than are developments in the largely overlooked for-profit sector. Once the uniquely distortive effects of employment patterns in the for-profit sector have been taken into account, the adjunct phenomenon begins to reflect a comparatively gradual pattern with conventional roots in the high supply of faculty applicants for a growing, yet still limited, number of full-time positions.

To respond to this article, e-mail liberaled@aacu.org, with the author’s name on the subject line.

NOTES
1. Coalition on the Academic Workforce, A Portrait of Part-Time Faculty Members: A Summary of Findings on Part-Time Faculty Respondents to the Coalition on the Academic Workforce Survey of Contingent Faculty Members and Instructors (Coalition on the Academic Workforce, 2012), 2.
3. See Coalition on the Academic Workforce, Portrait.
11. See Daniel Grant, “For Artists, MFA or PhD?,” Inside Higher Ed, May 24, 2013, https://www.insidehighered.com/advice/2013/05/24/phd-challenges-mfa-requisite-degree-arts-professors-essay. Changing expectations around the MFA degree in artistic disciplines are illustrative. Increased competition for academic jobs has led to a growth in fine arts PhDs in recent years.
Our experience suggests that it is possible for two institutions to maintain and nurture separate identities, while at the same time getting real benefits, academic and economic, from working closely together thinking about their futures. Most of these institutions either went coeducational on their own or merged with another school to form a new coeducational university.

Our institutions contemplated merging then, too, but chose a different path because we believed there were significant benefits of being a college for women (CSB) and a college for men (SJU). Yet we also believed there were great benefits to our students, both women and men, of working more closely together than we had historically. Our motivations were initially to provide a better education to our students, yet in that process we found the kinds of economies many institutions are seeking today.

The College of Saint Benedict and Saint John’s University

The College of Saint Benedict and Saint John’s University have a collaborative relationship that is unique in American higher education. CSB and SJU are both nationally ranked Catholic, residential, liberal arts colleges. The combined enrollment of more than 3,600 students makes CSB and SJU among the largest of the nation’s liberal arts colleges. It is impossible to do justice to our partnership, which we call a coordinate relationship, in the space we have here, but over the decades we have fully integrated three areas: admissions, communications, and academic affairs. Yes, we share one academic program: faculty teach on both campuses, we have one faculty senate, we share one provost and academic affairs office, and we share one academic affairs budget—among several other jointly funded areas.

In addition, our students share one academic program in which they meet identical academic requirements and attend classes together on both campuses according to a single academic calendar. The two institutions approach prospective students and families through a joint admission office offering the advantages of two distinct campuses as well as a singular, cohesive academic experience and a coeducational social environment. This integrated learning experience combines a challenging liberal arts curriculum

MARY DANA HINTON is president of the College of Saint Benedict, and MICHAEL HEMESATH is president of Saint John’s University.
with extensive opportunities for international study, leadership, service learning, spiritual growth, and civic and cultural involvement.

Yet, CSB and SJU are two independent colleges. We provide a unique collegiate experience for young women at the College of Saint Benedict and for young men at Saint John’s University. We share a commitment to the development of the whole person, while also meeting the unique needs of both women and men in single-gender and coeducational experiences. Each college features its own physical campus, residence halls, dining halls, and traditions. We have separate student development programs, independent athletic programs, two advancement offices, and separate governing boards.

**Building a partnership**

Very early in our coordinate relationship the first tentative steps toward the integration of academic programs yielded immediate benefits. Cross registration had been possible for some time, as at many schools. But by beginning to intentionally combine academic departments, CSB and SJU immediately gave students access to more faculty and a wider range of expertise and class offerings. The colleges saw economies both through less duplication of faculty and
course offerings and through higher enrollments in traditionally small classes like Classics and upper-level science offerings. Behind the scenes, benefits were derived by simplifying the academic administration. Other parts of the academic enterprise followed the integration of departments. We moved toward a single library administration, one registrar and, as technology needs grew over the years, to a single information technology department.

It was our philosophical and later practical movement toward a joint academic enterprise that yielded the most significant benefits. In fact, the natural place where most partners should, but rarely do, look for benefits is academic affairs. We know that the integration of our academic strands is what makes the coordinate relationship work, not just in terms of our public commitment to one another but also because within the fiercely competitive environment for higher education, the coordinate relationship between the College of Saint Benedict and Saint John’s University has enhanced educational opportunities for the students of both colleges. Our partnership enables us to bring resources together to ensure the success of all students and the long-term viability and vitality of each institution.

We absolutely have, and will continue to maintain, our separate identities, but we also have a third identity, that of partnered institutions, a CSB/SJU identity that is as important to our students as being a “Bennie” at Saint Benedict’s and a “Johnnie” at Saint John’s. Those three identities all provide distinct benefits to our students. And, most significantly, it is the student experience and outcomes that are most important on any campus.

A shared mission focused on student outcomes
How does our unique partnership support improved student outcomes? Because we achieve efficiencies by operating together in critical areas, including our entire academic enterprise, we are able to deploy resources in an individualized and custom manner in support of our students more efficiently and effectively than either institution would alone. The partnership and the advantages it conveys to our students have allowed us to serve, and achieve excellent outcomes for, diverse groups of students.

For example, our overall first- to second-year retention rate has averaged 89 percent for several
years. Collectively, 28 percent of our students are first-generation college students, and American students of color comprise 20 percent of our student body. Nearly 80 percent of our students graduate in four years, and 99 percent are employed either in graduate school or in full-time volunteer service within one year of graduation.

Because of our partnership, we are able to achieve these extraordinary student outcomes with very limited financial resources. Among the top one hundred liberal arts institutions, the College of Saint Benedict has the second smallest endowment. Saint John’s University has the seventeenth smallest. Our success clearly has not been the product of robust financial circumstances. To the contrary, because of limited resources, we have been forced to find and utilize collaboration and coordination to improve outcomes. Hence, our partnership has reaped the economic benefits many colleges hope for, though it, of necessity, began with a commitment to student learning.

**Concluding thoughts and cautions**

So how does one go from two wholly separate institutions to coordinate and interdependent schools? It is first worth noting that this integration did take decades. The benefits of integration are typically not found overnight, if our experience is any guide. There are institutional histories to remember, campus cultures to adapt, and personalities with which to contend. While there are benefits to working more closely, there are also costs, and the critics will be quick to identify them. To be successful leaders on both campuses, the leadership must be deeply and publicly committed to the changes, be patient, and be openly willing to give up some control and accept some costs for their campuses.

Our arrangement of interdependence, a permanent one, periodically benefits from adjustments in how each institution functions. Our administrators and two boards review our governance practices, structures, and operations on an ongoing basis, and over time effect changes in them, in order to ensure a dependable and efficient model to pursue the mission of each institution and effectively maintain our partnership.

We have often heard our higher education colleagues decry our relationship as too complicated—the stakes are too high, the loss of independence is too great. Yet we would argue that for a partnership to truly have meaningful benefits to both institutions, and especially to the students we serve, both partners must accept real risk to their institutional independence and separate identities.

It is this last point that we think is most relevant for institutions seeking to partner today. Partners have to trust each other enough to give up control of some crucial academic decisions. Today at CSB and SJU, we make all faculty hiring decisions jointly; we have a shared academic budget and multiple high-level joint administrators, including a common provost; and we tenure jointly. We are not independent institutions, in the common understanding of that phrase.

We encourage others thinking about partnerships to understand that to provide both economic improvements and mission-oriented benefits, institutions must think about how to integrate portions of their most precious components, starting with academic programs. This may generate significant controversies among administrators, faculty, students, and alums as the relationship must be negotiated at multiple intersections. And, it demands ongoing care for a relationship that can be challenging to navigate.

While in theory any partnership can be unwound, the reality of a true partnership is that it is very difficult to go back and there should be an enduring commitment to making the partnership work. Institutions that are prepared to move down this road must acknowledge that they may not be able to go home again. On the other hand, the changing environment for higher education already has made it eminently clear that home won’t be what it used to be for most institutions. Our experience suggests that it is possible for two institutions to maintain and nurture separate identities, while at the same time getting real benefits, academic and economic, from working closely together. It is not easy, but with the many challenges facing higher education, it may be an option more institutions will explore as they realize that buying in bulk, the Costco partnership model, is not the salvation of higher education.

To respond to this article, e-mail liberaled@aacu.org, with the authors’ names on the subject line.
Making Excellence Inclusive

FRANK TUITT

In 2005, the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) released a series of articles that called for higher education institutions to move away from a fragmented focus on diversity and begin thinking about how to promote inclusive excellence (IE) in postsecondary institutions. Specifically, these authors challenged leaders to move from rhetoric to action by involving the entire campus community in the work of infusing diversity and excellence.¹ As a relatively new faculty member (2004) whose scholarship aim was to support traditionally white institutions (TWIs)² in their efforts to create inclusive classroom and campus environments, I was eager to apply IE as a conceptual framework and advance it through publications, trainings, and presentations.

Little did I know that a few years later (2011), shortly after being promoted to associate professor with tenure, I would be tapped to become the new associate provost for inclusive excellence at my institution. In accepting this opportunity, I was charged with continuing efforts to make excellence inclusive and move IE from an institutional value/goal to an institutional practice. Like many institutions around the country that embraced IE as a conceptual model for advancing diversity, equity, and inclusion, we (IE advocates) were successful in our efforts to move beyond a sole focus on numbers and instead strive for a comprehensive application of diversity that is embedded throughout every aspect of the organization—or so we thought.

Fast-forwarding ten years to 2015–16, TWIs have witnessed a significant increase in campus activism regarding the conditions facing minoritized communities in higher education. Specifically, minoritized students (and their allies) at some of the United States’ finest TWIs (including my own) have been speaking out in resistance to their daily encounters with microaggressions, macro-validations, and other not-so-subtle acts of racial discrimination. The range of student demands that has emerged across these institutions has served as a serious wake-up call for campus leaders. The unfortunate reality is that despite our best intentions, we have not been successful in our efforts to respond to the needs of an increasingly diverse campus environment.

What these challenging times have revealed for me is that making excellence inclusive is only truly actualized when our students’ lived experiences in our institutions exemplify diversity, equity, and inclusion throughout daily interactions. Having had the opportunity to participate in campus meetings, statewide conversations, and national discussions regarding the current crisis, I now attribute our collective failure to meet the challenge of creating inclusive campus environments for minoritized students to our inability to undergo significant structural and organizational changes that result in meaningful institutional transformation. Specifically, I believe there are three IE traps, or missteps, that have determined the success or failure of IE organizational transformation efforts in higher education.

Trap #1: Believing IE programs would transform institutional systems, structures, and overall campus culture

In these challenging times, a consistent student demand has focused on increasing the funding to support more IE initiatives, which is simultaneously predictable and ironic—predictable in the sense that adding programs to address student concerns is a typical response by TWIs, and ironic because the resources allocated to advancing IE have increased significantly. I believe that one of...
in Challenging Times
the traps we have fallen into in higher education is implementing IE initiatives that have little to no impact on the system and structures that drive university life. When focusing on our institutions’ readiness and capacity for organizational change, adding a plethora of IE programs seemed like a logical strategy. However, this approach limited our potential to promote sustained and systemic change, and it left intact inequality regimes that negatively affected life on campus for minoritized students.

Although IE programs can and have responded to the individual needs of the minoritized students who participate in them, rarely do they have an impact on campus systems and structures. Instead, they result in islands of innovations that are isolated rather than pervasive. These programs, though important, are usually not linked to institutional structures and systems, which severely diminishes their ability to transform campus culture. Such practices are the equivalent of putting Band-Aids on cuts, while leaving the sharp instrument that created the cuts in place.

The recent protests on our campuses challenge us to embrace an approach to organizational transformation that is more aggressive and intentional—where campus leaders and change agents strive to transform our institutions. Perhaps, instead of simply adding more IE programs, TWIs should commit to an interruption of business as usual and begin interrogating existing cultural systems and structures that affect the organizational climate. This interrogation will allow TWIs to better understand how their systems and structures need to be modified to improve the campus conditions for minoritized students. When TWIs can better understand the impact of their institutional structures (policies and practices), they have the potential to create more equitable conditions and outcomes for minoritized students.

Trap #2: Being seduced by the “happy talk” of inclusive excellence and forgetting to focus on racial justice

IE has provided TWIs throughout the country with an appealing way of framing our efforts to merge diversity and excellence. Correspondingly, today IE can be found in campus mission statements, marketing materials, and position titles, as well as in the conference themes of major national organizations. IE has replaced its predecessors, “diversity” and “multicultural,” as a seemingly palatable term for driving equity and inclusion efforts. One unintended consequence of the widespread adoption of IE on college campuses is that it allowed our institutions to move away from a focus on race and racism as a central component of diversity and inclusion efforts. This is doubly ironic since AAC&U, a major catalyst for advancing the concept of inclusive excellence, itself contended in its 1995 signature report, The Drama of Diversity and Democracy: Higher Education and American Commitments, that “of all the sources of unequal power in the United States, race is the razor that most brutally cuts and divides.”

AAC&U re-released that same report, with updated information about racial disparities, in 2011. Unfortunately, the unwillingness to confront racial disparities directly has resulted in a post-racial approach and/or race-neutral alternative for framing campus initiatives designed to create inclusive educational environments. Moreover, in the absence of a clearly defined race-conscious operational framework to guide organizational change, institutional stakeholders have filled the gap with color-blind ideologies that associate equality with sameness, resulting in incremental change at best.

Several of the students’ demands speak to a need for TWIs to do a better job in acknowledging the existence of race and racism through the curriculum, campus training, or institutional policies. The reality is, just like the #BlackLivesMatter movement, the campus activism occupying our institutions today has been unapologetic about its focus on race and racism, and it challenges us to make a paradigm shift and commit to racial justice. Making excellence inclusive will not occur if institutions are incapable of moving beyond light IE programming that promotes “happy talk” and good feelings about diversity.

In my experience, many units on our campuses want to appear to be supportive of diversity, but only to the extent that it does not make them feel bad or guilty. This desire to engage in “happy talk” programming is not surprising, considering that change agents try to meet campus partners where they are developmentally. However, this approach to IE will only make a difference if it can move participants beyond a
surface-level understanding of race and racism toward an institutional analysis of privilege and oppression. Organizational transformation efforts that continue to be depoliticized in order to make them more desirable will limit the ability of TWIs to radically transform the status quo of everyday business.

Trap #3: Believing the hype of the magical CDO and failing to develop accountability structures that engage all stakeholders in organizational transformation efforts

Evans and Chun have suggested that in TWIs, there are only a handful of key people who have the potential to advocate for change, create and assess innovative strategies, and facilitate organizational transformation efforts. A growing trend and common response to student protests in higher education is to appoint chief diversity officers, or CDOs, to assume the lead role of architects of diversity and inclusion. However, it did not take me long to realize that positioning CDOs as the sole architects of IE efforts at my institution would not produce progressive outcomes. This common response of creating an office or persons with diversity in their titles often designates them as the only ones who are expected to do the work. This fallacy allows others in the organization to relieve themselves of any responsibility to address IE, even if that matter falls within their scope of responsibility.

The tendency to see IE work as belonging only to the individuals who have IE and diversity in their titles can be reinforced by staff members who fail to recognize that if true organizational transformation is to occur, they cannot be the only stewards of IE at their institutions. The reality is, when we isolate diversity work to a specific person or unit on campus, we reinforce the notion that unless diversity work is in an individual’s job description, it is someone else’s problem or, more commonly, someone else’s fault. This lack of collaborative leadership and infrastructure to guide and facilitate the organizational transformation process and direct campus IE initiatives at all levels of the
Institution significantly stifles our attempts to build momentum and sustain change efforts. Making the advancement of IE everybody’s business and getting all segments of the campus actively involved has to be a top priority. When individuals and groups at all levels of the institution see themselves as CDOs, work together to form accountability structures, and are able to navigate competing demands and expectations around organizational transformation efforts, TWIs are more likely to produce meaningful progressive outcomes that have an impact on institutional culture, reduce institutional stress, and improve the overall quality of communication throughout the campus environment.

Overall, making excellence inclusive in these challenging times will require that we avoid the above IE traps. These traps remind us that the modern university cannot be radically changed by “simply” adding more racial diversity, creating safer campus spaces, addressing the cultural competency of our faculty and staff, and redesigning the curriculum to include a stronger focus on race, privilege, and oppression. Though these are good places to start, if we do not link these initiatives to the structures and systems that drive university life, they will not become embedded in the fabric of our institutions. Having been engaged in this work for many years, I have become more and more frustrated by our inability to respond in meaningful ways to the needs of minoritized students and, ultimately, to affect how they experience being members of our campus communities. However, I remain hopeful because of the energy and wisdom that current students are displaying, and I believe that together we can actualize our IE aspirations to create inclusive campus environments that respect and care for the souls of our students.

To respond to this article, e-mail liberaled@aacu.org, with the author’s name on the subject line.

NOTES
2. I advocate the use of “traditionally” as opposed to “predominantly” white institutions because “PWI [predominantly White institution] would not include those higher education institutions whose campus populations have been predominantly white but now have students of color in the numeric majority. I argue that even though institutions like MIT and Berkeley have more students of color than Whites on campus, the culture, tradition, and values found in those institutions remain traditionally White.” Tuitt, “Removing the Threat in the Air: Teacher Transparency and the Creation of Identity-Safe Graduate Classrooms,” Journal on Excellence in College Teaching 19, nos. 2–3 (2008): 167–8.
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Liberal arts colleges are more important, and even more practical, than ever. But they face enormous and unprecedented challenges — challenges related to their purpose, their role, their value and, ultimately, their sustainability and viability as institutions.

There is tremendous opportunity in those challenges. We are called to innovate, to embrace risk in new ways and to define a future for our students and our institutions that clearly positions the liberal arts as a critical part of our social, political and economic future. We are called to lead.

**Join us!** Mark your calendars for *Liberal Arts Illuminated: Pathways, Possibilities, Partnerships* to be held **July 11-13, 2016**.

*Hosted by:*

[College of Saint Benedict and Saint John's University](http://www.aacu.org)