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Classrooms should be liberatory spaces where people are nurtured and content comes to life

—Kelly Maxwell and Patricia Gurin

Creating Inclusive Classrooms: Perspectives from Faculty Development
From 1818 R Street NW

2 President’s Message
4 From the Editor
5 News and Information

Featured Topic
6 Overview: Faculty Development for Inclusive Educational Environments
   By Patricia Gurin and Kelly Maxwell
10 Using Dialogue to Create Inclusive Classrooms: A Case Study from a Faculty Institute
   By Kelly Maxwell and Patricia Gurin
16 Rallies, Protests, and Institutional Change: How Consultants Can Address Campus Climate
   By Kristie A. Ford
22 Advancing Diversity and Inclusion through Strategic Multilevel Leadership
   By Kathy Takayama, Matthew Kaplan, and Alison Cook-Sather
30 Institutionalizing Inclusion in the In-Between
   By Peter Felten
34 Diversity Work in Contentious Times: The Role of the Chief Diversity Officer
   By Kathleen Wong(Lau)

Perspectives
38 Intersectionality and Liberal Education
   By Johnnella E. Butler
46 “Why Are All the Black Kids Still Sitting Together in the Cafeteria?” and Other Conversations about Race in the Twenty-First Century
   By Beverly Daniel Tatum
56 Leveraging a National Opportunity to Create a New Model for Civic Engagement
   By Hanna Rodriguez-Farrar and Ashley Finley
62 Cocurricular Arts Programming and an Integrative First-Year Experience
   By James Creech and Maryam Zomorodian

My View
68 Shaping the Public Narrative about Teaching and Learning
   By Patrick Sullivan
Liberation Politics: Identity, Protest, and the Aims of Liberal Education

One of my favorite summer reads of 2017 was Jean Hanff Korelitz’s satirical novel *The Devil and Webster*. Korelitz’s protagonist is Webster College’s seventeenth president, Naomi Roth. The institution’s first female and first Jewish president, Roth is a feminist scholar and women’s studies professor, single parent, and former college activist and AmeriCorps VISTA volunteer. She is appointed to her position from the faculty after playing a critical leadership role in responding to a national media frenzy stemming from a student’s announcement that, after entering the college as Nell, he now identifies as Neil, a trans man, and has no intention of moving out of the women’s dormitory where he has been living. Her handling of the controversy prompts her fellow presidential search committee members to encourage Roth to step off the committee and become a candidate.

Six years into her presidency at the small, elite liberal arts college in Massachusetts—despite her authentic leadership, based on a demonstrated commitment to shared governance, freedom of expression, collaboration, cooperation, and transparency—Roth finds herself the target of a burgeoning protest. Indeed, her own daughter is among those who are demanding action and redress when a popular African American faculty member from the anthropology department, Nick Gall, is denied tenure. Omar Khayal, a charismatic student leader, is Professor Gall’s most ardent defender. Known for his courage and tenacity as a Palestinian refugee who lost his family to war and sought community at Webster, Omar becomes a symbol of the identity politics currently prevalent on college campuses—and in our nation, too, as signaled by the recent presidential campaign and the ongoing political discourse.

Korelitz’s central question is whether it is possible to affirm individual identities and at the same time exercise the moral imagination necessary to speak across differences, creating a community bound together by a common educational purpose and mission. One of Roth’s frustrations is that she reaches out to the protestors, who have formed an encampment on the campus green at a place called “the Stump,” and invites them to meet with her to discuss their grievances, only to find that they have no interest in dialogue. Their terms are unconditional and nonnegotiable, and they regard having to recount their concerns as a form of revictimization. *New York Times* columnist David Brooks recently described this phenomenon: “Group victimization has become the global religion—from Berkeley to the alt-right to Iran—and everybody gets to assert his or her victimization is worst and it’s the other people who are the elites.” Thus, Roth’s career as an activist supporting racial and social justice is inconsequential once she takes on the role of an administrator.

Yet, even if the protestors appeared at her doorstep, the president realizes that under the circumstances, she could never go beyond listening, other than to express compassion for their concerns and gratitude for their leadership. Because the tenure process is confidential, she is proscribed from revealing that Gall was denied tenure for violating principles of academic integrity, including through serial plagiarism. As a result, she must rely on the protestors to trust that she is acting in good faith and that her decision to uphold the tenure committee’s recommendation is not grounded in racism.
Through her protagonist, Korelitz highlights the increasing moral distress experienced by college presidents operating within institutional and organizational cultures that coerce them into behaving in ways that they believe are unethical, convinced that they have no choice. Under these circumstances, one would ask, How much individual injustice should be countenanced for the sake of long-term institutional reform? However, in this particular moral dilemma, another ethical principle is at play—namely, strong role differentiation. Strong role differentiation is the notion that the professional roles we play sometimes exempt us from otherwise binding moral responsibilities. Just as doctors and lawyers maintain patient and client confidentiality, Roth is convinced that her overriding moral responsibility is to uphold the sanctity of the tenure process. Of course, as a moral principle, strong role differentiation can be justified only if the institutions it serves are just. And the ultimate disconnect between Roth and her students is that this new generation of activists seeks to tear down the monolithic administrative structure of which she is a part, viewing it as a monument to white hegemonic forces.

As I was reveling in Korelitz’s complex and familiar depiction of the conundrums encountered by Roth, I began thinking about a controversy that arose last year at Seattle University when a dean recommended that students read Dick Gregory’s autobiography. In response to those who were offended by the book’s title, which consists of a racial slur, Gregory writes in Inside Higher Ed, “While I strongly support their right to air their grievances, I ask these students to ask themselves if the scale of their movement is appropriate for a curriculum discussion. Can students adequately connect a recommendation to read my autobiography with their larger curriculum issues?” He goes on to note, “I frequently speak on college campuses and explain that we were fighting for liberation, not education. A liberated mind requires a deeper historical and analytical understanding about the good, bad and ugly regarding America’s past, and its future.” In the aftermath of horrific violence resulting from white supremacists descending on Charlottesville, Virginia, and continuing disputes over the legitimacy of Confederate memorials, Gregory’s charge to focus on liberation as the goal of education takes on a new sense of urgency.

The articles in this issue of Liberal Education confront the challenge of fostering that deeper historical and analytical understanding essential to a liberal education. The authors highlight the many innovative ways in which faculty, with support from administrators, are integrating the curricular and cocurricular to create spaces in which vibrant, inclusive academic discourse is encouraged as the foundation for true liberation.—LYNN PASQUERELLA

NOTES
Among the characters whose voices drive the plot of In the Heights, the Tony Award-winning musical by Lin-Manuel Miranda and Quiara Alegría Hudes, is Nina Rosario, a first-generation college student and daughter of immigrants who has returned to the Washington Heights neighborhood of New York City after a difficult first year at Stanford. In moving solos, Nina describes the structural, economic, and cultural challenges that led her to withdraw from college, and her deep-seated fears of disappointing her family with the news.

Stories like Nina’s are all too common among students who find that the educational environments they have entered were not designed with their experiences in mind. Meanwhile, the legacy of exclusion in higher education is becoming ever more difficult to ignore given the country’s growing diversity and the heartbreaking scenes that have played out across higher education in the past year, two topics touched upon in this issue of Liberal Education.

Indeed, colleges and universities are struggling to find harmony within cacophony as they contend with how to signal their commitments to both inclusive learning environments and freedom of expression while many students, including those registered under the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program, fear for their futures.

Faculty make no direct appearance in Miranda and Hudes’s script. But they are essential players in students’ actual lives, key to creating the inclusive educational environments students need to thrive while grappling seriously with experiences and ideas that may be deeply unfamiliar to them.

Within classrooms and across other sites of learning, administrative support is key to providing faculty and other educators with the tools they need to foster educational environments that are at once inclusive and challenging for all students. With faculty development opportunities like the ones described in this issue, educators can create contexts for learning where every student can succeed.

Special thanks are due to Patricia Gurin and Kelly Maxwell, who worked with our contributing authors and with David Tritelli, former editor of Liberal Education, to plan this issue’s Featured Topic section on creating inclusive classrooms. Patricia and Kelly’s contributions as special editorial advisors, and David’s as past editor, were vital to convening this issue’s complex chorus of voices from faculty development.

As recent events have illustrated, it is critical that educators not only hear these voices but also listen with the goal of understanding and take the actions necessary to extend the promise of liberal education to all students. As a dissonant chorus criticizing equity and inclusion efforts swells across the national stage, it may be time to hear opinions expressed across gaping divides—but it is not the time to cloak our commitment to equitable liberal learning in silence.

In Washington Heights, Nina is ultimately supported by a choir of resonant voices, an entire neighborhood willing to spend energy and money to ensure that she experiences all that higher education has to offer. We must ensure that the same is true for all students on our campuses.—KATHRYN PELTIER CAMPBELL
Ten Institutions Selected to Address Racial Hierarchies
AAC&U has selected ten institutions to serve as sites for the first Truth, Racial Healing & Transformation (TRHT) Campus Centers. With generous support from Newman’s Own Foundation and the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, AAC&U will guide the development of the TRHT Campus Centers as part of a multi-year initiative to educate, prepare, and inspire the next generation of leaders to advance justice and build equitable communities. Participating institutions are Austin Community College; Brown University; Duke University; Hamline University; Millsaps College; Rutgers University–Newark; Spelman College; The Citadel, The Military College of South Carolina; the University of Hawai’i at Mānoa; and the University of Maryland Baltimore County. Learn more at http://www.aacu.org/trht.

Purposeful Pathways: Faculty Planning for Curricular Coherence
The Teagle Foundation has awarded AAC&U a grant for a three-year project to guide faculty-led curricular change and build communities of practice around quality and completion at the University of Houston–Downtown, Winston-Salem State University, the University of Nevada–Las Vegas, and the Community College of Philadelphia. Building on a previous planning project, participants will reenvision curricular change as a scalable, faculty-led process that engages stakeholders from across an institution and will develop resources to establish broader communities of practice focused on quality and completion. To learn more, visit http://www.aacu.org/purposeful-pathways.

AAC&U Members Recognized for Excellence in Assessment
Five institutions have received an Excellence in Assessment (EIA) designation for their commitment to the comprehensive assessment of student learning outcomes as a means of driving internal improvement and advancing student success. The EIA program is sponsored by the Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA), a public college and university transparency initiative led by the Association of Public and Land-grant Universities (APLU) and the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU), in partnership with AAC&U and the National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment (NILOA). The designees are Bowling Green State University, James Madison University, Middlesex Community College, Rio Salado College, and Southern Connecticut State University.
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Faculty Development for Inclusive Educational Environments

PATRICIA GURIN AND KELLY MAXWELL

Higher education needs to create intentionally inclusive learning environments—classrooms, residence halls, organizations, research laboratories, community-service projects, sports teams—within institutions that promote broad, deep, and meaningful interactions across race, ethnicity, and other dimensions of diversity.

Higher education is facing numerous challenges, from reauthorization of the Higher Education Act to reductions in state funding. Parents and students concerned with the costs and returns of postsecondary education in the face of high levels of student debt are calling on colleges and universities to prove their affordability and demonstrate their accountability. At the same time, legislators charged with fostering economic growth are asking higher education to illustrate its role in building a skilled workforce. Meanwhile, controversies and debates related to the enrollment of undocumented students, sexual assault on college campuses, and academic freedom have demonstrated the need for critical, engaged learning related to these topics. Additionally, internal and external stakeholders are prompting institutions to address new and persistent challenges related to access, retention, and success among an increasingly diverse student population, and to develop new strategies for creating inclusive classrooms and other campus environments.

The last of these issues—developing inclusive classrooms and educational environments—has become a top priority across higher education as racial and ethnic diversity among college students increases. Between 2009 and 2020, enrollment in all postsecondary institutions is expected to increase 25 percent for black students, 46 percent for Hispanic students, and 25 percent for Asian students, but only 1 percent for whites, with a one-percent decrease for American Indian/Alaskan Native students. By 2020, these shifts in enrollment are expected to result in a postsecondary student population that is 56 percent white, 16 percent black, 16 percent Hispanic, 7 percent Asian, less than 1 percent American Indian/Alaskan Native, and 4 percent of international origin. These changes within higher education parallel population changes in the country at large: 2011 was the first year in which a majority of babies born in the United States were not white. In 2015, for the first time, a majority of K-12 public school students were “minorities”; by 2023, about half of high school graduates will be of some racial/ethnic background other than white, largely due to growth in the Hispanic population. Thus faculty will need to connect with large numbers of students who historically have not been broadly included in our colleges and...
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universities, while fostering connections and collaborations across diverse groups of students.

A recently published book, Our Compelling Interests: The Value of Diversity for Democracy and a Prosperous Society, highlights the importance of higher education—and especially of faculty—in facilitating collaborative, bridge-building connections among students from varied ethnic and racial backgrounds. The volume’s contributing authors raise two fundamental questions: (1) Will the rapidly rising demographic diversity (what William Frey calls the “diversity explosion”)—brought about by immigration, birth rates that differ across racial and ethnic groups, and the aging of the white population—result in growth, vitality, and social cohesion, or stagnation and social fragmentation? (2) Will this rapid demographic diversification occur alongside continued residential and school segregation by race and ethnicity, as well as group-based inequalities in wealth and income? The authors vary in how optimistic they are about whether the United States will have the political will to enact policies that ensure egalitarian social relations and sustain democracy in conditions of demographic diversity. They all agree, however, that high-quality education is key to decoupling diversity and inequality. This is particularly true of higher education, because college and university campuses are the primary setting where students who have grown up in segregated environments can interact and learn from one another.

Higher education’s increasing racial and ethnic diversity is central to its potential role in determining whether societal diversity and inequality can or will be decoupled. But fulfilling that crucial role requires more than simply bringing diverse groups of students together in the same location. Positive outcomes do not flow automatically from the fact of diversity itself. Higher education needs to create intentionally inclusive learning environments—classrooms, residence halls, organizations, research laboratories, community-service projects, sports teams—within institutions that promote broad, deep, and meaningful interactions across race, ethnicity, and other dimensions of diversity. Faculty are central to ensuring that classroom structures and pedagogies engage all students in learning, problem solving, and collaborating across differences.

This issue of Liberal Education focuses on faculty leadership in developing inclusive college classrooms, with contributing authors offering a variety of different perspectives on this work. In our article on the University of Michigan’s Faculty Dialogues Institute, we examine dialogue as a sustained opportunity for diverse groups of students to learn together, and we offer specific strategies for classroom situations that faculty have described as “contested,” “hostile,” and
“fragile.” Kristie Ford provides advice drawn from her work as a consultant who helps institutions create intergroup dialogue classes, programs, or workshops. Kathy Takayama, Matthew Kaplan, and Alison Cook-Sather write about their experiences at campus teaching and learning centers, offering four case studies that illuminate institutional change efforts from the level of the individual faculty member or classroom (micro) to that of the department or college (meso) to that of university-wide leadership (macro). Finally, Peter Felten and Kathleen Wong(Lau) discuss their respective institutional roles as they shift between contexts, from the teaching and learning center to the provost’s office and from the classroom to the president’s cabinet.

These authors offer instructive guidance for readers wondering how, through efforts at any level of engagement, to create campus climates that are welcoming for all students. Through narratives informed by their unique standpoints, they suggest a path forward for faculty development that supports diversity, equity, and inclusion.

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

NOTES


Using Dialogue to Create Inclusive Classrooms

A Case Study from a Faculty Institute

Classrooms should be liberatory spaces where people are nurtured and content comes to life. But students and faculty frequently note the charged nature of the classroom, especially when course content focuses on aspects of identity such as race and ethnicity or dynamics related to power and inequality. Some students, particularly those from underrepresented groups, report that classrooms are among the most difficult spaces on campus. They describe feeling invisible, not listened to, and as though they do not belong; students of color are sometimes singled out as spokespersons for their entire race and regularly experience racial microaggressions. Faculty of color and female faculty describe challenges in the classroom as well: they report not receiving the respect or deference that many white male faculty enjoy; students challenge their authority and subject-matter expertise more readily; and they receive lower course evaluations, due in part to bias and stereotyping.

These arduous dynamics were the motivation for a Faculty Dialogues Institute offered by the Program on Intergroup Relations (IGR) and the Center for Research on Learning and Teaching (CRLT) at the University of Michigan. Like many faculty teaching workshops, this institute aimed to help faculty create effective classrooms that are fully inclusive of today’s students; but it took a unique approach by focusing specifically on intergroup dialogue strategies.

Intergroup dialogue is a methodology created at the University of Michigan more than twenty-five years ago. When applied in the classroom, it challenges “banking” approaches to education by teaching about power and inequality while empowering students to participate equitably in the dialogue space. In intergroup dialogue, individuals from at least two social identity groups engage in deep listening, ask questions with the goal of understanding multiple perspectives, draw on both course content and others’ identity-based experiences to deepen learning, and reflect collectively on what has been learned in order to create more inclusive spaces and strengthen understanding of course material.

With our CRLT colleagues Theresa Braun-schneider and Crisca Bierwert, both experts on building inclusive classrooms, we offered a three-day institute that emphasized intergroup dialogue as a methodology for challenging the dysfunctional dynamics outlined at the beginning of this article. Relying on nominations by chairs of the departments of American Culture, Women’s Studies, Afroamerican and African Studies, and several other social science and humanities disciplines, we invited faculty members from the University of Michigan to apply to participate. At the institute, as in intergroup dialogue more generally, we intentionally created diverse dialogue groups to encourage active participation and balance power dynamics.
Framing the institute goals

In their applications, participants wrote about their motivations for attending the institute. Across the four cohorts, five themes emerged.

All participants wrote about the challenge of connecting course content to student experiences. One wrote, “I would like to learn how to draw from students’ experiences and emotional responses to material and connect them to conceptual frameworks I am covering in the class.” Another wrote, “I place a heavy emphasis on critical thinking and the evaluation of evidence … however, I suspect the seminar discussions could be even more engaging if I could draw more on student knowledge and experiences.”

A second theme was how to foster both critical thinking and empathy. One person described wanting “to help my students to grow as thinkers and as empathetic human beings through substantive and engaging discussion of difference.” Another wrote, “As a teacher, I fervently hope that each of my students will walk out of my classroom with increased capacity for critical thinking, greater empathy for others, and more substantive knowledge of the world in which we live.”

A third theme, creating an inclusive classroom, focused on ensuring a classroom environment where students learn from others who differ from them in various ways. One participant wrote, “One of the biggest challenges I find is creating a space where students from very different backgrounds can question and reflect upon their own experiences in a critical and constructive way without feeling threatened, isolated, defensive, or embarrassed by their own positions, especially in contrast with others.”

A fourth theme, using inquiry methods and building inquiry skills among students, reflected a desire to help students notice and challenge dominant narratives (such as color blindness, or the claim that one “does not see” skin color) that often go unnoticed in classroom discussion: “I find that today’s students … come from well-to-do neighborhoods where their school systems have taught them to ‘not see’ difference in order to avoid offense. Thus, one of my most urgent needs is to learn about new methods of inquiry for student engagement.” Several participants noted that students rarely ask questions in class—and when they do, the questions are nearly always directed at the faculty member. These faculty members saw building inquiry skills as an especially important course goal because the content of their courses inevitably involved controversy, and thus required students to learn how to interrogate material through different and often opposing viewpoints.

A final theme was dealing with faculty members’ own racial and gender identities in classroom dynamics. Many participants wrote about the risks attached to being open about their social identities when teaching about race or inequality. For example, one wrote, “It is widely known that white, cisgendered, heterosexual men are more convincing to students than other instructors when it comes to explaining the corrosive effects of white supremacy in the United States, especially as such instructors might be regarded as disinterested, as not benefiting from the critique of racial hegemony.”

These five themes framed the institutes’ goals: (1) to integrate student knowledge and experiences with conceptual frameworks and course content; (2) to hone inquiry and listening skills; (3) to turn contentious, tense moments into learning opportunities; and (4) to ensure inclusivity.

Institute design

We aligned the institute design directly with the themes and goals described above by emphasizing dialogic approaches to creating inclusive classrooms. These approaches include understanding how dialogue differs from both discussion and debate, setting expectations, making use of narrative, engaging in inquiry, and turning contentious moments into learning opportunities. We emphasized practice by having participants teach something from their course curricula, and we facilitated participants’ collective reflection about the experience.

Understanding dialogue. Appreciating the distinctions between dialogue, discussion, and debate is crucial in an intergroup dialogue setting.
While these forms of communication can all stimulate learning, dialogue prompts students to analyze the assumptions underlying their own and others’ comments, to examine why different people have different perspectives, and to probe one another’s ideas. To help faculty practice all three types of communication, we placed institute participants in three groups and gave each group a variation of the same prompt: Dialogue [or debate or discuss] the merits of the city’s policy to prohibit smoking in public places. Each group demonstrated its assigned communication style through role playing. In contrast to the tense debate and the noncommittal discussion, the dialogue invited a variety of perspectives, helped the group dig deeper, and allowed participants to examine the multiple viewpoints present in the room or represented through the readings.

Setting expectations. Building dialogic class-rooms begins with setting norms, which can mean inviting students to help establish guidelines for engagement. Yet only one-third to one-half of faculty participants at the institute reported having intentionally set expectations for the kinds of classroom discourse they sought to establish, and even fewer invited students to participate in this process. To model what faculty could do in their own classrooms, we talked about creating norms for the institute so all felt engaged and willing to participate. We handed out sample guidelines, conducted small-group discussions, and identified which guidelines would be particularly helpful in the institute context. After the full group agreed to a set of guidelines, we conducted a meta-facilitation to demonstrate how one might use this exercise to establish classroom norms at the beginning of a semester.

Making use of narrative. Shared narratives about meaningful personal experiences are important components of intergroup dialogue. To illustrate the power of storytelling, we used a generative listening exercise that allowed faculty participants to examine their strengths, skills, and capacities through narrative. In this exercise, a speaker shares two experiences, and a listener identifies qualities the speaker has conveyed—perhaps unknowingly—in telling the two stories. At the institute, we asked faculty to pair up and share an example of effective teaching and an example of less effective teaching, with the listener identifying strengths and capacities that were implicit in both stories. This exercise helped participants discover strengths they could rely on even in challenging teaching moments and reflect on how to structure their classrooms in relation to those strengths.

Building inquiry strategies. Data collected through a large multisite study of intergroup dialogues in higher education have revealed the relative effectiveness of four facilitator behaviors: inquiry, reflection/redirection, listening/support, and adversarial advocacy. Of the four, inquiry—the act of eliciting new information through questioning—promoted the most robust dialogic communication among students in intergroup dialogue classes. Reflection and redirection also produced opportunities for dialogue. Perhaps surprisingly, passive listening and support on their own were associated with less dialogue; more predictably, adversarial advocacy—where the instructor takes a strong position opposing a student’s point of view—shut down participation among students. At the institute, we encouraged faculty to consider how they might apply these findings in their classrooms by asking dialogic questions and helping students practice dialogic inquiry with one another. In small groups, faculty considered their own classroom approaches and the types of questions they typically ask their students:
Do they promote a question-and-answer approach that requires factual or “correct” answers, or do they promote inquiry that allows new questions and dialogue to emerge? How might they shift their practice to offer more opportunities for inquiry, especially opportunities for students to ask questions of one another?

Turning contentious moments into learning opportunities. There is no single way to approach contentious situations in the classroom, and the social identities of those involved—both students and faculty—can influence these situations. To help faculty participants practice turning contentious moments into opportunities for learning, we drew from their application statements to present challenging classroom scenarios, using the Forum Theatre approach adapted from Augusto Boal’s Theatre of the Oppressed.1 Institute leaders played the roles of students, while faculty participants played faculty addressing contentious moments in the classroom. Faculty could call time outs and ask someone else to replay the scenario or pick up the scene at a given moment. Participants often cited these role-playing exercises as among the most challenging and the most supportive aspects of the institute; these exercises helped them gain confidence in their ability to intervene in moments of conflict.

Practice. Practice in a challenging yet supportive environment is essential to gaining confidence with new strategies. Therefore, a whole day of the institute focused on practice of the dialogic strategies covered in previous days. Faculty participants broke into small groups, each led by an institute co-leader, to facilitate a classroom discussion or dialogue with four other participants role-playing as students. Participants selected short passages, images, or video clips that posed the kinds of challenges they hoped to address at the institute. All participants practiced teaching other participants the content they had chosen, and all received feedback on their use of dialogic strategies to teach their specific content and effectively engage students.

Collective reflection. Group reflection is a key component of the dialogue process, and one that is easily adaptable to any classroom setting. At the conclusion of each day of the institute, we offered an opportunity for participants to make individual and collective meaning out of that day’s exercises by reflecting on questions such as What did we learn in today’s session? Did something come up that you hadn’t thought about before—or that pushed you to think in a new way? How do the different experiences that have been shared connect to our social identities and to what we do in our classrooms? These opportunities for reflection reinforced the interconnectedness of institute exercises, emphasized the exercises’ effect on institute goals, and helped faculty make meaning across the exercises. They also modeled the use of reflection as another effective pedagogical tool.

Overall impact
In evaluations of their own learning completed at the end of each institute, participants across all four years indicated that the following activities were very helpful (with average ratings of 4.5 to 5 on a five-point scale): facilitating students’ learning from one another; developing dialogue strategies and skills that can be used to deepen discussions of identity and power; building inquiry for student engagement; moving back and forth from the analytical to the personal and staying grounded in both personal experience and the course framework; practicing handling moments in the classroom when one is unsettled or uncertain; and bringing out-of-class experiences into the course in ways that enhance learning. Participants also wrote about the importance of developing a community with other faculty members who are trying to promote critical thinking and empathy while helping students learn about identity, power, difference, and social justice. Many also stressed the importance of developing a language for discussing pedagogy, teaching strategies, and issues related to faculty identities. Nearly all participants wrote positively about the structure of the institute, and they especially valued the opportunities to model and practice dialogic ways of engaging students. They appreciated that the institute included time for reflection and activities that helped them realize their strengths as teachers in situations that they described as “highly charged,” “complex,” “complicated,” “contested,” or “delicate.”

Immediately after the final year of the institute, we sent participants from all four years a follow-up survey asking which dialogic approaches they were using most or least in their teaching. (Notably, at this point, faculty who had participated in the earlier institutes were reflecting on several years of teaching.)
Respondents mentioned that they were still employing classroom guidelines or norms that set the tone and expectations, collective reflection activities probing what students had learned in individual class sessions, student work in pairs or small groups, activities that facilitate students’ ability to connect course content to their experiences, in-class writing assignments that prepare students for discussion, and activities that build comfort with what dialogue is and how to use it. They also continued to use difficult moments as opportunities to facilitate student learning.

Participants’ free responses were particularly telling. One wrote, “I have become more open in my commitment to dialogue and discussing it with the class.” Another said, “The Institute made me so much more determined to interact with students in a more genuine dialogue; it also made me more aware of my limitations in facilitating dialogue, and I would like to develop these skills more, with more support.” Several participants mentioned not only a new openness to dialogue, but also greater comfort with exploratory approaches more generally. One wrote, “I have become freer to try out different ways of reaching students so they understand the material better”; another, “I’m more skillful at integrating diverse perspectives.” Several mentioned being more open to student experiences. One wrote, “It has made me open to connecting material to student lives. I avoided that before.” Another noted, “I’ve really tried to acknowledge that there will be ‘hot moments’ in class discussions, and that this isn’t a bad thing, or a thing to be avoided.”

These responses from institute participants show that the use of dialogic tools in the classroom can produce powerful changes in how faculty engage their students, resulting in opportunities for deeper learning. Intergroup dialogue produces greater understanding of inequality and builds opportunities for empathy and collaboration. Even in traditionally structured classrooms, dialogic tools can help bridge differences. By establishing norms, listening deeply, using inquiry skills, and reflecting on collective learning, faculty and students can transform traditional classrooms into liberatory learning spaces where all students’ voices are valued and conflict can be productive for all, rather than harmful for members of marginalized communities.

To respond to this article, email liberal_education@aacu.org, with the authors’ names on the subject line.

NOTES
1. For more on classrooms as liberatory spaces, see Paulo Freire, Pedagogy of the Oppressed: New Revised 20th-Anniversary Edition (New York: Continuum, 1998); for more on the idea of nurturing in education, see bell hooks, Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom (New York: Routledge, 1994).
2. Some of these accounts come from campus-specific reports. See Stacy Anne Harwood, Shinwoo Choi, Moises Orozco, Margaret Browne Huntt, and Ruby Mendenhall, Racial Microaggressions at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign: Voices of Students of Color in the Classroom (Urbana-Champaign, IL: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2015) and Kelly E. Maxwell, “Summary Findings from Community Conversations on Race” (unpublished report of the Understanding Race Project, University of Michigan, 2013) as examples. For more on micro-aggressions, see Guy A. Boysen, “Teacher and Student Perceptions of Microaggressions in College Classrooms,” College Teaching 60, no. 3 (2012): 122–29.
3. These descriptions are widely cited. See, for example, Roxanna Harlow, “‘Race Doesn’t Matter, but . . .’: The Effect of Race on Professors’ Experiences and Emotion Management in the Undergraduate College Classroom,” in “Race, Racism, Discrimination,” special issue, Social Psychology Quarterly 66, no. 4 (December 2003): 348–63; and Chavella T. Pittman, “Race and Gender Oppression in the Classroom: The Experiences of Women Faculty of Color with White Male Students,” Teaching Sociology 38, no. 3 (July 2010): 183–96.
4. As described by Freire in Pedagogy of the Oppressed (1998), “banking” approaches assume that faculty experts “deposit” knowledge to students, who then store or “bank” that knowledge.
Rallies, Protests, and Institutional Change

How Consultants Can Address Campus Climate

KRISTIE A. FORD

Student-led rallies and protests continue to gain attention nationwide, due in part to the use of social media. Debates over free speech, acts of protest during the national anthem, and mascot choices or building names reflecting racist histories all illustrate the tensions present on many college campuses. Lack of faculty and staff expertise in engaging with a student body that is increasingly diverse across race, gender, and other social identity groups has prompted students to demand mandatory trainings for college employees. In response, some higher education institutions are hiring external consultants to help address their ongoing campus climate issues.

As a sociologist with expertise in race, gender, and social justice education, and as a trained intergroup dialogue facilitator, I consult widely with colleges and universities across the United States. Over the last six years, I have worked with approximately twenty higher education institutions and delivered over forty workshops on teaching and learning as well as diversity, inclusivity, and social justice. Each year, the demand for workshops focused on inclusive classrooms or intergroup dialogue pedagogies increases, with requests coming from schools that vary across a range of factors, including geographic location, size, institutional type, and constituencies’ demographic background.

In this article, I draw on my experience as a consultant to synthesize common themes and elaborate on the challenges and opportunities associated with diversity-focused work within higher education. More concretely, I discuss (1) the role of a consultant, (2) common faculty and staff challenges related to teaching across different social identity categories, and (3) a case study of one institution that is proactively dealing with these challenges.

The role of a consultant

According to Harkins, Ray, and Davis, “consultants, who have been invited into the system to address diversity issues, have an [sic] unique opportunity and a special role (translator) to implement strategies that restore social justice for long-term systemic change.” But what can consultants responsibly promise to deliver?

Typically, hosts invite me to their institutions to address one of two topics: (1) teaching in an inclusive classroom or (2) intergroup dialogue pedagogies. In both cases, an initial phone meeting helps me form an understanding of the institutional context, the precipitating factors leading to the request, the intended audience, the short- and long-term goals, and the time frame for the proposed workshop. During this conversation, I often find disconnects between these various elements; for example, my hosts may be constrained by scarce financial resources and competing time commitments, and therefore may emphasize efficiency. It is not uncommon for hosts to ask me to train a large group of faculty and staff in all the skills necessary to address diversity and conflict within the classroom via a single two-hour workshop. Similarly, my hosts might ask me to condense an intergroup dialogue training—a slow, intentional process typically spanning two to four days—into a half-day session. When I receive these requests, my first task is to clarify what the hosts hope to achieve, set realistic expectations, and convey what I am (or am not) able to deliver given their various constraints. Ideally, this process prompts hosts to reevaluate and reframe their needs within more attainable parameters. Occasionally, however, I decline requests if the goals and time frame seem misaligned.

In my practice, it is important for me to continually ask: What can I responsibly deliver within the stated time frame? And who is the best person to help the hosts achieve their goals? I pose these questions to myself in light of what I know about when and why consultants are...
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typically invited to visit an institution. In my experience, many institutions invest in external expertise even when comparable internal capacity exists for a range of reasons: (1) consultants are often differently respected for their expertise, authority, and voice; (2) the tenure and promotion process does not recognize this kind of work; (3) social justice work can be politically fraught, especially for untenured faculty or faculty from marginalized social identity groups (e.g., people of color, women, and LGBTQI individuals); and (4) professionals not affiliated with the institution can challenge the group without fearing backlash from their close colleagues.

While there are clear advantages to seeking external guidance, there are also disadvantages to relying—or over-relying—on consultants. Too often, institutions call on consultants only after a major campus climate incident has occurred; reactive requests like these can limit the effectiveness of the work. In these cases, institutions may be focused primarily on managing their image and may seek a quick fix to persistent, embedded racism (or other -isms) for the sake of appeasing students or controlling social media messaging. In short, for some, consultations are a short-term solution, a Band-Aid approach that fails to address ongoing systemic issues.

Moreover, many institutions do not have a plan for follow-up or ongoing implementation after a consultant leaves campus. These institutions are the least successful in realizing their goals. While I usually visit a campus at least twice and remain available via phone or email afterward, I am not embedded within the institution on a day-to-day basis. Therefore, part of my role is to help colleges and universities determine next steps in my absence: how will they maintain momentum after I leave campus?

A train-the-trainer model is one way of building internal expertise and ensuring that the work extends beyond the length of the initial workshop. However, this model requires a serious investment of time and resources, and institutions contemplating it should ask: Who are the internal point people or leaders moving forward? How are we incentivizing their work (e.g., through stipends, course releases, or value added in the tenure and review process)? What institutional structures (e.g., established programs or offices, administrative supports, student workers, budget lines) can help advance these leaders’ efforts?

Institutions should consider these and other questions when seeking consultants to lead workshops on inclusive classrooms or intergroup dialogue. In the next section, I discuss the common challenges that faculty and staff encounter in these workshops.

Common faculty and staff challenges

By and large, faculty and staff who attend workshops on creating inclusive classrooms are well-intentioned educators trying to learn (or relearn) best inclusive practices as their institutions become more diverse. They report being afraid of saying the “wrong” thing or unknowingly committing microaggressions, being unsure of how to intervene when students make inappropriate comments in the classroom, and feeling unprepared to facilitate conversations about conflictual topics. Many enter these workshops wanting a specific toolkit to apply to various classroom situations. They ask questions like, “If XYZ happens, what do I do?” They want a clear-cut rubric or template for navigating any
and all situations that might emerge. Part of my work, then, is to reframe these expectations. Since there are many ways to be an effective educator around diversity-related issues, and it is impossible to anticipate every possible scenario, I focus on building content knowledge (e.g., a current social justice vocabulary), instructor self-reflexivity (e.g., the ability to ask who one is and how one’s social identities affect one’s work with students), mindfulness of group dynamics (e.g., awareness of who has voice within the classroom and how one can disrupt dominant narratives), and humility (e.g., a capacity for learning from one’s inevitable mistakes).

While building capacity in these areas may seem like a straightforward task, some faculty and staff, often those who occupy privileged positions within the academy, resist self-reflexive learning through strategies like humor, intellectualization, or disengagement. These educators may want the answer, and they may assume that our pedagogical approaches to inclusive teaching can be disconnected from our own subjectivities and our positionalities. This approach allows them to avoid the feelings of vulnerability that might accompany discussions of their missteps or gaps in knowledge. As educators, we have built our careers on knowing—on becoming experts in a particular field and educating others. So, what is at stake if we admit that we are unsure, unaware, or even ignorant about particular topics? What will that realization cost us both personally and professionally?

In my workshops, I model the idea that we are all fallible by sharing this story: After three years of working with a female-identified student, I learned from this student, whom I will call Dan, that he is transgender and now uses male gender pronouns. While I consciously knew that Dan identified as a trans man, my unconscious mind took longer to catch up. One day in class, I caught myself referring to Dan as “she.” I quickly corrected myself, but the damage was already done. Afterwards, I accepted responsibility for my error and apologized to Dan privately. He was very understanding, indicating that many faculty had made the same mistake that week—as the transition was recent—but that I was the only person who had reached out to him afterwards.

I do not share this story for the purposes of self-congratulation, but instead to reveal an instance where I had to negotiate ever-changing diversity-related issues. It is a daunting task, and one that educators’ advanced degree programs rarely prepare them for.

To assist faculty and staff in addressing common challenges, I also tell workshop participants about the postconsultation practices of one institution that took a proactive, long-term approach to change, building on work done with an external consultant. I describe this case study below.

A case study for institutional change
The Northwestern University Change Makers, led by Alecia Wartowski and Njoki Kamau at the university’s Women’s Center, have created a sustained, long-term model of faculty and staff development. Every October, beginning in 2013, they have offered a two-day kick-off workshop for faculty and staff, which I lead in collaboration with Charles Behling, former codirector of the Intergroup Relations program at the University of Michigan. They ask participants to commit to monthly follow-up meetings that focus on goal setting, personal self-reflective work, content knowledge (e.g., stereotype threat, microaggressions, and change-management
theory), skill building (e.g., role playing), and empowerment. Through readings, related events, and ongoing dialogue, participants learn to focus on the small incremental changes that they can make within their spheres of influence to promote more inclusive communities on campus and beyond.

As consultants, Charles and I provide a strong foundation that the Change Maker cohort builds upon throughout the rest of the academic year. Although the follow-up work is organized and sustained in-house, we remain in communication with Change Maker leaders, providing feedback on group dynamics, offering additional resources and exercises, and answering emergent questions. This approach maintains momentum for and expands upon our work as external consultants.

Ongoing assessment of the Change Maker effort has revealed promising outcomes. For instance, evaluations of the 2014–15 cohort revealed that

- “100% of respondents felt confident or very confident about their ability to educate themselves about how diversity issues impact people in the workplace”;
- “96% of respondents felt confident or very confident about their ability to challenge the biases that affect their own thinking”;
- “96% of respondents agreed with the statement, ‘I am more hopeful about my ability to help Northwestern become more inclusive’”;
- “91% are engaging in new or different conversations about privilege and inclusion on a daily, weekly or monthly basis”; and
- “82% of surveyed participants believe that they have acted differently around issues of privilege or inclusion on a daily, weekly or monthly basis.”

Preliminary data from 2015–16 indicate similar attitudinal and behavioral changes related to four central themes: “connecting with others, comfort with dialogue skills, heightened awareness of social identities, and taking action.” As two participants stated:

I am a different person because of my Change Makers (CM) experience. I thought I understood social justice issues and I certainly believed I was no racist. Through Change Makers I came to understand, deeply, how another human being’s experience of the world can be impacted by their social identity/ties. Before CM, I was a nice white lady who tried not to stir the pot. Now, I am determined to be an agent for change. I speak up. I engage in difficult conversations that I would have previously avoided. I look for ways to create equity. A few years ago, my husband and I went to hear Ta-Nehisi Coates speak at Loyola University. It was shortly after he wrote his piece, “The Case for Reparations.” He said something at the time that really has stuck with me and with my husband. He said that his eyes are open, and because they are open, he can no longer live in the lie. I no longer live in the lie that this is a country with equality and justice for all. I didn’t know how uncomfortable I was living in that lie until I was free of it. Now, I am free to work for change.

We all have biases and stereotypes about other people. By educating ourselves and committing to change from within, we can then implement change University-wide. As these quotations suggest, change must begin within; from there, it can expand to the places where—and the people with whom—one works. At Northwestern, participants’ workplace actions have included “initiating conversations about diversity in the classroom, becoming a mentor for marginalized students, advocating for diversity on hiring committees, and pursuing opportunities to learn more about equity.”

Even with an approach to diversity and inclusion work as comprehensive as Northwestern’s, however, challenges are inevitable. The
Change Makers program still struggles to get institutional buy-in for self-reflective work, which means that participation in the program does not count in faculty members’ tenure and promotion files. In addition, busy faculty and staff may struggle to commit the intellectual and emotional time necessary to realize their social justice goals. Change Maker leader Wartowski nonetheless remains optimistic about the possibilities of the sustained consultant model. In a 2016 article on the program, she is quoted as saying: “As we have more people that go through the program, my hope is that we eventually reach a critical mass or tipping point where this is who we are and what we do.”

**Conclusion**

As US colleges and universities continue to figure out the best way of responding to rallies, protests, and student concerns, consultants are playing a pivotal role in helping educators think deeply about how to achieve inclusive and just learning environments. Central to this work are faculty and staff who are directly and indirectly educating students about diversity-related institutional values and practices through their words, actions, and inactions. Therefore, it is crucial that faculty, staff, and students forge partnerships that can help transform the educational experience for all members of the collegiate community. Used effectively, external expertise can serve to further these efforts. In the end, however, the most difficult work with the highest potential yield must begin and end with faculty and staff members’ ongoing commitment to change.

*To respond to this article, email liberated@aaau.org, with the authors’ names on the subject line.

**NOTES**


3. Intergroup dialogue is defined as a facilitated, face-to-face encounter that aims to cultivate meaningful engagement between members of two or more social identity groups that have a history of conflict, according to Ximena Zúñiga, Biren (Ratnesh) A. Nagda, Mark Chesler, and Adena Cytron-Walker, “Intergroup Dialogue in Higher Education: Meaningful Learning about Social Justice,” special issue, ASHE Higher Education Report Series 32, no. 4 (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, March 2007).


5. Ibid., 135–56, for a discussion of faculty resistance to self-reflexive learning.


Calls to advance diversity and inclusion on our campuses often stem from different constituencies, including presidents, faculty, and students. How do we as educational developers charged with enhancing teaching and learning at colleges and universities respond to these calls in ways that satisfy the needs of various stakeholders, ensure successful outcomes, and enact our values? Advancing diversity and inclusion involves working at multiple levels, from the individual faculty member to the entire institution. Bridging these levels of work requires managing complexity. In this article, we describe how five institutions have employed the dynamic relationship between university-wide leadership efforts (the macro level); interactions and initiatives within the school, college, or department (the meso level); and efforts by individual instructors and activists (the micro level) to create change at their institutions.

A range of disciplines, from health care to organizational development—as well as various areas of work within higher education, such as the study of teaching and learning—have generated scholarship focused on the micro, meso, and macro levels of complex systems. Each case described below highlights catalysts for, considerations regarding, and approaches to advancing diversity and inclusion through these levels of leadership. We have framed these cases in relation to the mandates, challenges, and possibilities within their respective contexts and have aimed to make visible the complexity of the ongoing work in each instance. While the cases show that catalysts for change can emerge at any level, they also indicate that lasting institutional change relies on strategic expansion across all levels. At the end of the article, we present a set of questions that may provide a starting point for readers to review their own institutional contexts for advancing diversity and inclusion.

The University of Michigan

The catalyst: In 2013–14, a viral Twitter campaign about being black at the University of Michigan (#BBUM) put a national spotlight on the negative experiences of students of color. The campaign challenged the institution to redouble efforts to address issues of climate and renew its focus on diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI). Student activists repeatedly articulated a desire for faculty to be better equipped to handle microaggressions in the classroom, and improving the climate became a key factor in the university’s search for a new president, which was then underway.

Upon entering office in 2014, President Mark Schlissel elevated Vice Provost Robert Sellers to chief diversity officer. Together, they set in motion a five-year, campus-wide DEI initiative, inviting all campus units to create strategic plans tailored to their own contexts that would yield measurable progress toward three goals: (1) creating an inclusive and equitable campus; (2) recruiting, retaining, and developing a diverse community; and (3) supporting innovative and inclusive scholarship and teaching.

Macro level: Clear and persistent leadership from the president, provost, and deans has been key to the university’s progress. The central administration quickly recognized that the Center for Research on Learning and Teaching (CRLT) could play a valuable role in operationalizing teaching-related elements of the initiative.
through Strategic Multilevel Leadership
Over the previous two decades, CRLT had worked closely with administrators, faculty, and other educators to address a range of diversity issues and encourage inclusive teaching, and university leadership saw that the center’s institutional reach and expertise could be significant meso-level levers for enacting change and bringing a macro-level commitment to fruition. Perceiving increasing alignment between CRLT’s priorities and those of the larger institution, CRLT consultants seized the opportunity to contribute to institutional change efforts, while also recognizing the challenges inherent in working across a large, decentralized university that generated forty-nine DEI plans by unit (i.e., by school, college, department, center, or office). With only twelve instructional consultants on staff, the center’s leadership (Executive Director Matthew Kaplan and the center’s coordinators for diversity and inclusive teaching, Theresa Braunischneider and Tershia Pinder-Grover) knew it would be important to think strategically about the best way of building capacity without depending largely on the center for sustainability.

At the macro level, the vice provost convened a task force with representatives from CRLT, the School of Education, and the Program on Intergroup Relations to propose a model for inclusive teaching training. Rather than creating a single experience for all instructors, the task force designed a flexible framework for new faculty that could eventually be scaled up to support all faculty. The task force created a matrix of inclusive teaching skills and opportunities for acquiring those skills; CRLT then applied the matrix to its existing programs, such as the teaching academy for new faculty in the largest undergraduate college.

**Meso level:** To build capacity at the meso level, CRLT designed two new initiatives. First, the center’s coordinators for inclusive teaching met regularly with faculty liaisons for inclusive teaching (faculty members appointed to lead professional development efforts in the schools and colleges). CRLT’s coordinators introduced these faculty liaisons to the flexible framework described above and gathered their feedback on the model. In subsequent sessions, faculty liaisons developed facility with inclusive teaching practices and gained confidence in serving as resources for colleagues.

Second, with funding from the vice provost, CRLT launched an annual Faculty Communities for Inclusive Teaching (FCIT) program awarding $1,000 grants for collective faculty projects. Each year, CRLT organizes the grant competition, convenes and consults with grantees, and hosts a poster session where each cohort shares results with the campus. FCIT projects have ranged from development of materials (e.g., non-heteronormative texts for language courses and a guide to combating Islamophobia on campus) to events like a departmental lunch series. Faculty have reported that this modest investment has jump-started their projects and widened the circle of colleagues involved in advancing diversity and inclusion.

**Micro level:** Although administrative leadership can spur action, lasting change depends on the ability of individual instructors to create truly inclusive classroom environments. Accordingly, CRLT has expanded its programming in three ways. First, with a range of campus partners, the center offers an Inclusive Teaching @ Michigan (IT@M) series consisting of fifteen to seventeen workshops. Drawing more than 350 faculty and teaching assistants, the series is designed to fit into the rhythm of the academic year: it occurs in May, after classes have ended but when faculty are still present and have time for professional development.

Second, many units wrote CRLT into their DEI strategic plans as a provider of customized workshops at faculty meetings and retreats. Planned jointly with department leaders, these
workshops speak directly to a unit’s teaching context, often using case studies based on challenges faced by students or faculty. These unit-based programs reach faculty not drawn to campus-wide events like IT@M, allowing the center to engage with those who would not voluntarily seek out professional development in this area.

Finally, by compiling robust web-based materials and rebranding CRLT’s main phone number as an inclusive teaching hotline, the center created resources for administrators to share with faculty. Instructors indicate that these resources help them decide whether and how to address specific flashpoints related to hate speech, violence, or threats.

While CRLT has capitalized on macro-level opportunities by implementing its new meso- and micro-level programs, the center’s experts are keenly aware of remaining challenges, including lack of faculty time, varying levels of commitment, competing agendas, and the desire for immediate change. Internally, CRLT grapples with capacity issues and the emotional toll that DEI work takes, particularly for staff from the historically underrepresented and targeted groups whose experiences are often the topic of high-stakes discussions in diversity programs.

**Bryn Mawr and Haverford Colleges**

**The catalyst:** In 2006, Bryn Mawr and Haverford Colleges received a grant from The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation to develop a Teaching and Learning Institute (TLI). During the same year, five faculty members from different departments at the two colleges expressed a desire to make their classrooms more inclusive of and responsive to student diversity. TLI opted to use the grant funding to address the challenges these faculty members had articulated.

TLI leadership met with several focus groups consisting of students who identified as people of color, members of groups underrepresented on campus, or allies. These students advised TLI to create partnerships wherein individual students would work with individual faculty members to explore how faculty could make their classrooms more inclusive and responsive to student needs and identities. During the spring 2007 semester, TLI followed the students’ advice in launching a pilot program with five students and five faculty members, laying the groundwork for what would eventually become TLI’s signature program, Students as Learners and Teachers (SaLT).

**Micro level:** Each week during the pilot semester, the student consultants (the name they chose for themselves) visited their faculty partners’ classrooms, took detailed notes, and met with their faculty partners to discuss what the faculty members were already doing and what more they might do to support a diversity of students in their courses. The TLI director (Alison Cook-Sather) met with the student consultants weekly to explore the meanings of “diversity” and “culture,” examine the insights generated through their particular positions and perspectives, and identify strategies for drawing on these insights to inform the efforts of the faculty partners. The director also met
occasionally with faculty participants, although most support for faculty exploration and analysis took place through the faculty-student dialogues. The student consultants offered a range of insights that contributed to the faculty partners’ efforts to make their classrooms more inclusive of and responsive to diversity. Consultants affirmed approaches that faculty were using—both consciously and unconsciously—and proposed alternatives that might improve their teaching. These forms of feedback made faculty more aware, confident, and receptive to student perspectives on pedagogical practice, and ultimately enriched faculty approaches to advancing diversity. As one faculty member explained, “Listening to and talking with [my consultant] after class widened my interpretations and often cleared the way for me to listen and see more sensitively and with expanded or adjusted context in subsequent classes.”

Student consultants described experiencing a range of benefits as a result of this practice: improved understanding of others’ experiences in the teaching and learning process; deeper critical thinking about teaching, learning, and culture; a greater sense of comfort and confidence; and a sense of agency as students and, in some cases, as teachers. Each of these outcomes influenced their experiences as students, their relationships with other faculty, and their sense of their place and capacity within their institutions.

**Meso level:** Faculty interest in the pilot led TLI to create optional seminars to which all faculty could apply. These seminars connected faculty with student consultants for one-on-one, semester-long partnerships focused on developing more inclusive and responsive classrooms. Seminar participants also had access to a curated reading list, including a report that TLI created for broad use on campus based on the approaches identified during the pilot project.

Through the seminars and the wider sharing of the report, faculty from different departments engaged in dialogue across their disciplines and gained access to input from a diverse group of students. Faculty who participated in the seminars and partnerships informed their colleagues about the benefits of this work, thereby spreading the word among individuals and influencing the wider campus.

Eventually, TLI expanded both the seminars and the partnerships, normalizing the work of advancing diversity in the process. For some stakeholders, this normalization was particularly meaningful: for example, two women of color in one faculty-student pair were able “to share the vulnerability of being a student who didn’t feel that her background and approach to study were shared by her peers, as well as announce [sic] the things we wish professors had spoken to us about.” As faculty and students develop a language and the confidence to explore these issues, they simultaneously forge and require new links between their individual experiences and institutional efforts.

**Macro level:** Based on feedback from early faculty participants, the provosts at Bryn Mawr
and Haverford Colleges decided that, starting in the fall 2008 semester, all new faculty should have the opportunity to work in one-on-one pedagogical partnerships with students and engage in dialogue with faculty colleagues. This ongoing institutional-level commitment to the SaLT program ensures that all incoming faculty at both colleges have the option of participating in a pedagogy seminar and a semester-long, one-on-one student-faculty partnership in exchange for a reduced teaching load in the first year. Student partners who participate in the program claim a wide variety of identities as members of equity-seeking groups, thereby both modeling diversity and ensuring a focus on its advancement in their partnerships.

The college further demonstrates its significant institutional commitment to supporting faculty by offering workshops and conversations open to all faculty during orientation week and throughout the year. All these forums regularly address how to create more inclusive and responsive classrooms through dialogue across differences.12

Columbia University

The catalyst: In 2015, Columbia University issued an institutional mandate to increase diversity across faculty ranks, establish mentorship initiatives to retain and promote under-represented faculty, and create a more inclusive educational climate. This strong reaffirmation followed a succession of initiatives across the institution, as well as the appointment of a new vice provost for faculty diversity and inclusion in 2014. To further support these commitments, the university established a new Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) that provides a venue for collaborative dialogue among academic and administrative stakeholders and prompts the cultivation of inclusive learning climates.

Macro level: The founding CTL director (Kathy Takayama) partnered with senior administrators to support university initiatives advancing institutional goals for diversity and inclusion. One example was a career-development series sponsored by the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Diversity and Inclusion, through which junior faculty engaged in an integrative, learning-community-based approach that emphasized diversity and inclusion in conjunction with career success. Sessions focused on topics such as navigating the road to tenure, work-life balance, mentorship, and teaching.

As part of this initiative, the CTL led a workshop to foster introspective dialogues about teaching challenges encountered by faculty. The center also hosted a university-wide Inclusive Teaching Forum that brought together faculty, undergraduate and graduate students, staff, and administrators to cultivate inclusive learning environments. Drawing on the scholarship of intergroup dialogue,13 the collaborative forum engaged the Columbia community in articulating experiences, identifying challenges, and partnering to bring its members’ collective perspectives and expertise to bear on developing best practices and approaches for learner-centered inclusion.

Meso level: The CTL director established partnerships with several of the university’s sixteen schools to facilitate retreats where faculty could explore topics such as implicit bias, stereotype threat, and inclusive classroom climates. In some cases, these retreats led to new curricular transformation efforts.

The CTL also worked with the Office of the Executive Vice President for Research to offer grant workshops that help faculty frame their research in terms of its broader impact. For example, the CTL offered workshops prompting faculty to focus on how their research projects might offer educational pathways and training opportunities to students from groups under-represented in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics. These opportunities have created new avenues for tenure-track faculty to integrate inclusive approaches in their teaching and enhance the impact of their scholarship.

Micro level: CTL workshops have created pathways for the center to connect with faculty who otherwise would not prioritize this engagement. The center has provided individual faculty members with access to expertise in assessment and evaluation and has strengthened the connections among faculty research, teaching, and mentorship, with the goal of enhancing the learning environment for students from groups historically underrepresented in higher education (e.g., women and students of color in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics). The CTL also has worked with faculty and graduate students to provide spaces for discourse and action supporting the creation of inclusive classrooms. The relationships that form through these approaches have led to new
partnerships between faculty and the CTL, often inspired by faculty interest in co-creating workshops that address diversity challenges within faculty’s own disciplinary contexts.

Northeastern University

The catalyst: In the 2016–17 academic year, Northeastern University launched a new academic plan, which integrates diversity and inclusivity across planned actions in support of the university’s strategic vision. The plan highlights the role of diversity and inclusion in cultivating agile learning networks that would further strengthen Northeastern’s work related to its signature pedagogy, experiential learning.

Micro and meso levels: Northeastern’s Center for Advancing Teaching and Learning Through Research (CATLR) embraced the new academic plan by intentionally considering questions about diversity and inclusivity, together with integrative learning, when engaging in its own program development and review processes. CATLR then initiated new partnerships and programs to support the academic plan. The center director (Kathy Takayama, who joined CATLR after leaving Columbia University) identified initial steps to engage in outreach to administrators, faculty, and graduate students at the micro and meso levels.

With a focus on experiential learning, CATLR aims to address the challenges educators face across the multiple contexts framing students’ experiences within and beyond the classroom. With this mission in mind, the center developed Teachable Moments workshops, now offered several times throughout the semester, designed to engage faculty, graduate students, and staff in exploring their experiential understandings of implicit bias and privilege and creating pedagogical frameworks that support productive dialogue.

CATLR also has collaborated with other units to integrate diversity within the curriculum by drawing on those units’ areas of expertise. For example, Teaching with Archives, a partnership between CATLR and the University Libraries, provided opportunities for faculty to embed experiential inquiry into courses. These courses enabled students to engage with diversity through Northeastern’s rich archives, which represent the diverse voices that have shaped the social and historical fabric of the Northeastern community.

Macro level: Initiatives at the micro and meso levels led to opportunities for CATLR to contribute to initiatives at the institutional level, such as a university-wide series of inclusivity and diversity workshops for faculty, staff, and administrators. The series has strengthened the center’s partnerships with the Office of Institutional Diversity and Inclusion and the ADVANCE Office of Faculty Development.

CATLR has partnered with the Office of the Vice Provost for Graduate Education, the Global Student Success Office, and other units to design a new, transformative orientation framework for graduate students and teaching assistants. During orientation, new graduate students create individual development plans and identify resources, programs, and other structures that support their goals and affirm their values. This approach validates the individual identities and experiences that each graduate student brings to Northeastern and establishes sources of support for the developmental transitions students will experience throughout their doctoral trajectories.

Conclusion

For educational developers, meaningful, sustainable engagement with diversity and inclusion requires an understanding of institutional cultures, a commitment to relationship building, and an ability to translate the scholarship that informs this work into professional development resources. The cases above make visible possible entry points and pathways for leaders at different levels to catalyze such engagement.

To consider potential ways of advancing a commitment to diversity on one’s own campus, one can begin by identifying and exploring the dimensions of macro-, meso-, and micro-level work that guide campus efforts. Drawing from a conceptual framework developed by Kezar and colleagues, one can guide the process of
exploration by applying the following prompts in relation to each dimension:
1. What does change look like?
2. What are the goals and measurable outcomes?
3. How will we know if we are successful? What benchmarks will we use, and how will we document our progress and success?
4. What gaps do we need to address (e.g., leadership capacity or expertise)? What challenges do we face (e.g., internal politics, buy-in, or time constraints)?
5. What actions will we need to implement to reach our goals and vision?
6. How will we operate and learn as an organization?

Through our respective efforts, we have learned that not all initial steps need to be profound; even small steps can lead to significant outcomes. Situating our strategic decisions in relation to micro, meso, and macro levels of change has allowed us to consider whether and in what ways we can effect change in our own institutional contexts. By balancing pragmatism with a focus on our principles and values, and by situating these elements in relation to our institutional cultures and identities, we can create the systemic change needed to transform our institutions into more inclusive and equitable spaces for students, faculty, and staff.

To respond to this article, email liberaled@aacu.org, with the authors’ names on the subject line.
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6. For more on teaching center involvement in institutional change initiatives, see Nancy Van Note Chism, “Getting to the Table: Planning and Developing Institutional Initiatives,” in Coming In from the Margins: Faculty Development’s Emerging Organizational Development Role in Institutional Change, ed. Connie Schroeder (Sterling, VA: Stylus, 2010), 47–59; for more on opportunity, see Constance E. Cook and Matthew Kaplan, eds., Advancing the Culture of Teaching on Campus: How a Teaching Center Can Make a Difference (Sterling, VA: Stylus Press, 2010).
8. CRLT’s materials on diversity and inclusion are available at http://www.crlt.umich.edu/multicultural-teaching.
10. Alison Cook-Sather, “Toward Culturally Responsive Classrooms: A Report and Recommendations Based on Initial Efforts Supported by the Teaching and Learning Initiative to Make Bryn Mawr and Haverford College Classrooms More Responsive to Diverse Students,” unpublished report available upon request.
Institutionalizing Inclusion in the In-Between

Perhaps to lose a sense of where you are implies the danger of losing a sense of who you are.
—RALPH ELLISON, Invisible Man

Over the past seven years or so, my institutional position has shifted as I have moved slowly but steadily away from the teaching center and into the provost’s office at Elon University. This transition has challenged my assumptions about the most effective ways of cultivating inclusive learning environments on campus. My new position has given me a different vantage point—and as standpoint theory suggests, who and where you are shapes what you see.

Changing vantage points

Before becoming assistant provost for teaching and learning at Elon, I had spent a decade at two different institutions, where I had approached the work of cultivating inclusive cultures from four relatively stable standpoints: I am a straight white male; I am a historian; I am a faculty developer working in a teaching center; and I am (and was) at a predominantly white university in the American South (first Vanderbilt University, then Elon). This has meant that my attention to diversity and inclusion has centered on questions of race and gender, focusing on the concerns and issues of faculty in their classrooms with occasional forays into the work of departments and programs. My various efforts shared certain elements: I was working with colleagues to build from the ground up, with the assumption that faculty are the primary actors and classrooms the main stages in the educational drama.

As I moved into the provost’s office through a series of steps (leading a university-wide initiative, becoming a member of the academic deans’ council, and so on), both my role and my perspective shifted. I came to realize, as a colleague and I recently wrote, that “most higher education institutions are structured in ways that make organizational sense but may not reflect the experience and needs of our students.” On a residential campus like mine, faculty are central players in student learning and students’ lives, but they are by no means the only (or even the primary) influencers. Undergraduates are surrounded by peers, staff, family members, employers, coaches, and many others who profoundly shape their educations. By focusing on students, I came to recognize that people beyond faculty and programs beyond the curriculum play vital roles in creating and nurturing an inclusive learning environment. My perspective had changed, leading me to see the task and the campus in fundamentally different ways even though the institutional context had remained the same.

The change in my role dramatically widened the scope of possibilities for my work and expanded the number of allies with whom I could collaborate. This isn’t to say that I hadn’t been engaged in meaningful work through the teaching center. As a faculty developer, I had partnered with instructors to support classroom and curricular initiatives, such as the teaching center’s Diversity Infusion Project. That program (now called Diversity and Inclusion Grants) still provides resources to teams of faculty seeking to develop and implement strategies that infuse the curriculum and pedagogies with best practices related to human diversity, broadly defined. In one early project, five faculty members collaborated to create and share diversity-related
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content units and experiential classroom activities that could be adopted in the many sections of introduction to psychology taught each year. From a faculty developer’s perspective, at an institution of Elon’s size, engaging five faculty from a single department in the creation of sustainable teaching resources for a multisection course is a meaningful project. In my new perch in the provost’s office, I still think we accomplished something significant.

However, institution-wide work can require engaging many people who are not within the typical realm of faculty development, including students, professional staff in student affairs and residence life, and others. Cochairing a committee on student peer mentoring, for instance, immersed me in scholarship and lived experiences that demonstrated the profound influence students have on one another’s sense of belonging on campus. Because of this work, I entered into ongoing discussions about new student orientation, the intellectual climate in residence halls, and staffing configurations in student affairs. I had to rethink my assumptions about the most effective ways of creating and nurturing inclusive learning environments on campus, as well as recalibrate my beliefs about who the central actors are in this shared work.

Seeing potential
My experience highlights and complicates what Kezar and Lester describe as “dual authority structures” in higher education. Faculty typically are leaders-in-place who may lack formal administrative authority but who can draw on their professional power and expertise, along with the traditions and structures of shared governance, to act as grassroots leaders. Administrators occupy seats of authority within the institutional hierarchy, although their actual capacity to act autonomously is often circumscribed. As my position shifted from one of these structures to the other, I came to see the distinct affordances of each—and to recognize the generative in-between place that faculty developers occupy at many institutions, including my own.

As Green and Little document, faculty developers typically exist in a liminal space between faculty and administration. This position can constrain them, but it can also make them pivotal actors on campus: fulcrums on which diversity and inclusion efforts rise or fall. They are neither fish nor fowl, but they
connect across and function within dual authority structures on campus. Ironically, as I left my formal role as a faculty developer, I came to see even more clearly the power of boundary-spanning roles. As bell hooks has explained, being in marginal or liminal spaces may offer “the possibility of radical perspectives from which to see and create, to imagine alternatives, new worlds.”

In my new (and still evolving) role, I have attempted to maintain this liminal orientation, keeping a foothold in what Walker calls the “as-if” places and opportunities within the institution—“spaces within which we behave the way we want to live” in the academy and in the world. This requires me to recognize and accept the limits of my own knowledge and the uncertainty of the outcomes I pursue. Given my positioning as a white male administrator, awareness of my own limitations seems a prudent place to start as I work with faculty, staff, and student partners to enhance inclusive excellence for all at Elon.

To respond to this article, email liberaled@aacu.org, with the author’s name on the subject line.
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Diversity Work in Contentious Times

The Role of the Chief Diversity Officer

Without community, there is no liberation … but community must not mean a shedding of our differences, nor the pathetic pretense that these differences do not exist.

—AUDRE LORDE, “The Master’s Tools Will Never Dismantle the Master’s House”

I am the chief diversity officer (CDO) at San José State University (SJSU), which is both a Hispanic-Serving Institution and an Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander–Serving Institution. Following the 2016 presidential election, my office began receiving calls from professors who were anxious about facilitating discussions in their classrooms. At SJSU, a significant number of students were upset by—and fearful about—incidents of hate and harassment nationwide, which had risen steeply in the election’s aftermath. Many immigrant students, particularly those who are undocumented or registered with the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program, were also afraid that they or their friends and family members would be deported.

SJSU’s instructors were not calling my office for personal or emotional support. Instead, they wanted CDO-vetted advice that they could give to students and their families. They also wanted to know how to support their students emotionally when class discussions veered into upsetting topics like racism, sexism, homophobia, anti-Semitism, or Islamophobia. Some asked for guidance on facilitation, feeling that their previous course policies prohibiting discussion of politics were inauthentic, disconnected, and frankly ludicrous when the whole nation seemed to be caught up in political news. Like many educators across the nation, SJSU faculty found themselves having to “play mediator and educator to students from a range of backgrounds.” These concerns only intensified after the presidential inauguration in January.

Leadership from the CDO

Especially in times like these, preparing faculty to support diversity, equity, and inclusion within their classrooms is a multidimensional undertaking, encompassing areas of work such as the curriculum, pedagogy, research, and faculty–student mentorship. Enacting institutional change in all these areas means negotiating complex systems of governance involving multiple evaluation bodies, supervisory lines, and budgets. And yet, within these systems, faculty are the primary connector between students and the institution. Faculty are responsible for curriculum delivery and evaluation; as scholars, they have relative autonomy to develop their own research, curricula, teaching methodology, and modes of engagement, especially if they are tenured or on the tenure track. Faculty also have academic freedom, which affords them some latitude in expressing themselves, interacting with others, and designing their teaching practices.

Thus, faculty are essential to building capacity for diversity, equity, and inclusion. But how can the CDO best ensure that faculty have the skills they need to create inclusive classrooms? Mandatory faculty training on diversity and inclusive pedagogy might seem to be the answer; but even with a supportive provost and deans, mandatory training is very difficult to implement. Critics of mandatory training cite infringement
on academic freedom, the need to maintain faculty governance over faculty life, and a commitment to the faculty’s relative autonomy in determining their research, teaching, and service activities. On some campuses (SJSU included), the faculty union contract prohibits mandatory training of any kind, with the exception of Title IX training prescribed at both the state and federal levels. Some faculty also contend that diversity training lies outside the scope of their regular duties, and that they should be paid accordingly to attend it. From my past experience as executive director of the National Conference on Race and Ethnicity in American Higher Education, I know that such objections are common across the United States.

The strategies I have developed to build capacity for diversity, equity, and inclusion at SJSU include (1) offering voluntary training focused on intergroup dialogue and other topics for students, faculty, staff, and administrators (e.g., diversity training for those who lead new student orientation); (2) solidifying the diversity office’s campus-wide reputation for research-based, ethically grounded work; (3) working with deans, chairs, and the provost to make the diversity office an accessible and useful resource for problem solving and consultation; (4) modeling transparency by clearly communicating processes and protocols, especially in response to incidents; and (5) holding members of the campus community accountable to policies, executive orders, laws, and standards of behavior, regardless of organizational location. The last two areas of work are particularly important in developing a sense across the campus community that the administration addresses diversity issues directly, promptly, and fairly, no matter the power dynamics of the individuals and groups involved, nor how embarrassing the situation for the institution.

Importantly, my own social identity informs this structural work. As a woman of color, I am able to translate my own experiences and struggles into tools for shaping the work of inclusion at both personal and professional levels. My mere presence contributes to structural diversity, which is important for institutional change. But my privilege is relative, balanced always with the possibility that I may be marginalized within the very system I am trying to change, even when that system is calling for greater diversity and equity.

Effective institutional structures

Because SJSU’s CDO position is new (starting in July 2016), I am building the university’s Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion from the ground up, with new staff and a new structure. I sit on the president’s cabinet and report directly to the president, and I oversee all Title IX investigations in addition to leading the work described above. With a budget and physical space in the president’s office, the new office has high visibility.

The office’s structure was designed jointly by a campus-community task force and the President’s Commission on Diversity. The president
charged both entities with designing a CDO position in the aftermath of a racist incident in the residence halls that roiled the campus and local community in 2013, creating fear and outrage and ultimately going viral. A campus climate survey conducted after the event found that the then-administration’s response to the incident broke trust, lowered morale, and contributed to a negative campus climate. As on other campuses nationwide, members of the SJSU community—including students from historically underrepresented groups, their allies, and campus leaders—demanded that the administration take responsibility for improving the campus climate for students of color, close the gaps in graduation rates, and make progress in relation to other markers of student success.

My place on the cabinet allows me to serve as consultant and advisor to the president and vice presidents; it also facilitates my ability to coordinate integrated activities, such as campus-wide diversity trainings that help members of different constituent groups develop a common vocabulary and frame of understanding. For example, the Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion recently trained eighty-five administrators, including some deans, on developing cognitive empathy and reducing bias. Components of this training were consistent with similar trainings conducted among faculty and staff. We also briefed these administrators on a range of cases and issues facing campuses across higher education, helping them establish what biases and microaggressions may look like in different settings.

**Strong voices in contentious times**

The work described above formed the scaffolding for our response to the 2016 election and its aftermath. After the election, the Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion held two series of regularly scheduled, voluntary two-hour support meetings—one for staff and, separately, one for faculty. Beginning two weeks after the election and ending in April 2017, these sessions focused primarily on how to facilitate student learning and support students in these contentious times.

By offering these sessions and using them as opportunities to address the requests and concerns of the faculty and staff who attended, the Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion established a reputation for being responsive and consultative when faced with urgent diversity issues. An analysis of the concerns raised in these sessions, layered over data about regional and system-wide trends, has informed the office’s current and future work to help staff and faculty provide inclusive support to their peers and students.

To reduce equity gaps for students of color and others from groups historically underrepresented in higher education, colleges and universities will need to involve the faculty and staff who interact most directly with students. And we will need the strong voices and institution-wide leadership of our Chief Diversity Officers. These contentious times require it.

To respond to this article, email liberaled@aacu.org, with the author’s name on the subject line.
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Intersectionality and Liberal Education

JOHNELLA E. BUTLER

Intersectionality, when applied broadly and critically, can be a pathway toward much-needed complexity in higher education inquiry and praxis.

In fact, in our age of media-produced attitudes, the ideological insistence of a culture drawing attention to itself as superior has given way to a culture whose canons and standards are invisible to the degree that they are “natural,” “objective,” and “real.” —EDWARD SAID, The World, the Text, and the Critic

I am speaking as a member of a certain democracy in a very complex country which insists on being very narrow-minded.

Simplicity is taken to be a great American virtue along with sincerity. —JAMES BALDWIN, I Am Not Your Negro

Intersectionality—an integrated approach to analyzing the complex, matrix-like interconnections among patterns of discrimination based on race, gender, and other social identities, with the goal of highlighting how resulting inequalities are experienced—has many implications for exploring the relationship between knowledge and experience and for understanding identity and its role in scholarship and teaching. Over-arching it, it has the potential to reveal the power dynamics within the melting pot, whose hegemonic place in the American imagination has continually thwarted our achievement of a complex, pluralistic, relational national identity. Building such a national identity is necessary if we, as a country, are to realize the generative diversity that arises from the conflictual and complementary complexities of democracy.

In this short article, I explore the significance of intersectionality to a liberal education curriculum in both general education and the major, at two- and four-year colleges and universities, and its potential for undoing what I call the violent conundrum of our national identity. To paraphrase Edward Said, quoted in the epigraph above, that violent conundrum has become “natural,” “objective,” and “real” in its insistence on a binary understanding of people, their identities, and their ideas as either superior or inferior.

By denying the contextual, interconnected, and relational dimensions of individual, group, and national identities, such an approach facilitates the dismissal of those identities as signifiers of essentialist identity politics, ultimately distorting the humanity of all. While not a panacea for binary thinking, intersectionality is a necessary framework for methodological and pedagogical engagement with complexity and conflict. It allows us to embrace diversity—in teaching, research, and scholarship; in student and faculty development, recruitment, and retention; and, ultimately, in our everyday political experiences as citizens.

To many, intersectionality is a troublesome term. In a recent Chronicle of Higher Education article, Ange-Marie Hancock, a scholar of the topic, is quoted as saying that the term “shapeshofts so much as to no longer be recognizable as anything other than a meme gone viral.” As sociologists Patricia Hill Collins and Sirma Bilge discuss in their definitive work, Intersectionality: Key Concepts, it has been criticized for being separatist and fragmentary; for placing more value on cultural recognition and narrow interests than on economic redistribution and the social good; and for fostering victimhood. In their detailed, explanatory, and accessible study, Hill Collins and Bilge respond to these critiques by analyzing how simplistic, individualistic, and essentialist interpretations of identity politics infect our political discourse and obstruct much of our understanding of one another. “Collectively,” they demonstrate, “these arguments against intersectionality’s claims to identity only work within narrow understandings of intersectionality that simultaneously emphasize intersectionality as a form of abstract inquiry and neglect intersectionality as a form of critical praxis as it actually happens.”

As the Baldwin epigraph above reminds us, we cannot solve the problems of our democracy with a narrow-minded simplicity—no matter how sincere. Intersectionality, when applied broadly and critically, can be a pathway toward much-needed complexity in higher education inquiry and praxis.
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Liberal Education
Origins and uses of intersectionality

While intersectionality can provide a framework for integrated analysis of the interconnected realities of many social identities, it has historically involved particular attention to the central roles of race and gender. In a 2015 contribution to the Washington Post titled “Why Intersectionality Can’t Wait,” Kimberlé Williams Crenshaw, the legal scholar whose 1989 article “put a name to the concept,” succinctly explains how a 1976 discrimination suit against General Motors prompted her, as a young law professor, to define the “profound invisibility of black women in relation to the law.” She explains:

Racial and gender discrimination overlapped not only in the workplace but in other arenas of life; equally significant, these burdens were almost completely absent from feminist and anti-racist advocacy. Intersectionality, then, was my attempt to make feminism, anti-racist activism, and anti-discrimination law do what I thought they should—highlight the multiple avenues through which racial and gender oppression were experienced so that the problems would be easier to discuss and understand.

Her delineation of the case demonstrates the complexity of how race and gender interact, and clarifies how considerations that rely on racism alone can obscure the function of gender discrimination.⁵

While Crenshaw’s work has proved foundational to our understanding of intersectionality, the concept’s origins can be traced back at least as far as Sojourner Truth’s 1851 “Ain’t I a Woman” speech. In fact, scholars throughout the years have proposed similar approaches to analyzing race and gender, although often circumscribed by the silos of their own disciplines or interdisciplinary fields. The 1977 Combahee River Collective Statement, for example, clearly signaled intersectionality:

The most general statement of our politics at the present time would be that we are actively committed to struggling against racial, sexual, heterosexual and class oppression, and see as our particular task the development of integrated analysis and practice based upon the fact that the major systems of oppression are interlocking. The synthesis of these oppressions creates the conditions of our lives.⁶

In the 1980s, feminist scholarship took what one might now call an intersectional approach, with a focus on expanding the “women” in women’s studies. For example, in their 1984 book Women’s Place in the Academy: Transforming the Liberal Arts Curriculum, Schuster and Van Dyne called readers to “pay meaningful attention to intersections of race, class, and cultural differences within gender” (bold in original);⁷ similar calls appeared in Culley and Portuges’s 1985 volume Gendered Subjects: The Dynamics of Feminist Teaching.³

If similar delineations of intersectionality predated Crenshaw’s foundational 1989 work, interest in the topic has only continued to grow in the decades since. In 1991, arguing for the potential of ethnic and women’s studies to transform the liberal arts curriculum, I recommended beginning any curricular change by teaching about the experiences of women of color, which reveal how race, class, ethnicity, and gender modulate one another: “The categories of race, class, ethnicity, and gender are unified; likewise their related ‘-isms’ and their correctives.”⁹

The fall 2011 volume of New Directions for Institutional Research, entitled “Using Mixed-Methods Approaches to Study Intersectionality in Higher Education,” provides examples of intersectional analysis applied to researching the faculty experience, college access and equity, racial “hyperprivilege,” student experiences, and mixed-race identity, among other topics.¹⁰

More recently, in their 2013 fact sheet “Intersectionality in Sociology,” Jones, Misra, and McCarley identify intersectional sociology as occurring most frequently in journals focused on feminist, ethnic, and racial issues and those discussing social problems.¹¹

Indeed, intersectionality has come to serve as a key point of connection across disciplines. In literary studies, Ketu H. Katrak posits that “intersectionality precedes interdisciplinarity, the former method leading and informing the latter.” She states that the theoretical category of intersectionality includes the analysis of a growing intersection of categories that are crucial in interpreting ethnic literary texts: the centrality of race and ethnicity as intersected and modulated by gender, sexuality, class, the state, and increasingly, by nationality, immigration laws, and diasporic concerns. I assert further that intersectionality, in terms of the deployment
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of the categories of race, gender, and class, along with nation and diaspora, informs the use of interdisciplinarity. In contemporary reading practices for literary texts, scholars rely primarily on intersecting categories of race, gender, class, and nation, among others. The intersecting categories then guide scholars in their use of other disciplines such as history or politics. As this small selection of examples illustrates, intersectionality has been deeply influential across a range of areas of scholarship. At the same time, I would argue, it still stands to be integrated more fully across the content and pedagogy of the undergraduate curriculum. What, then, can intersectionality contribute to liberal education, and what is its connection to the quest for equity and inclusive excellence?

**Intersectionality’s transformative potential**

In their recent volume, Hill Collins and Bilge define intersectionality as having become a way of understanding and analyzing the complexity of the world, in people, and in human experiences. The events and conditions of social and political life and the self can seldom be understood as shaped by one factor. They are generally shaped by many factors in diverse and mutually influencing ways. When it comes to social inequality, people’s lives and organization of power in a given society are better understood as being shaped not by a single axis of social division, be it race or gender or class, but by many axes that work together and influence each other. Intersectionality as an analytic tool gives people better access to the complexity of the world and of themselves.

Hill Collins and Bilge go on to identify six “core ideas” of the intersectional framework: (1) social inequality, (2) power, (3) relationality, (4) social context, (5) complexity, and (6) social justice. These core ideas are consistent with the implicit aspiration in the word *veritas*, which appears so often on the institutional seals of our colleges and universities to signal our shared search for truth. These ideas also resonate with the challenge often rightfully posed to higher
education: that our work should better the human condition, and that the liberal education we provide should grow our democracy by enhancing civic engagement among our graduates. Each of these core ideas is essential to the transformative work that intersectionality can bring to liberal education. But one idea in particular—relationality—holds special promise for the work of educating for democracy.

Why is relationality so important? In brief, it is important because holding concepts, identities, experiences, and knowledge in relation to one another requires a both/and thought process that enables one to identify and analyze complex connections. Relationality allows for the interconnected interrogation of difference, identity, and power relations and the conflicts they entail. Furthermore, it challenges the idea that categories of difference, identity, and power exist in binary opposition to each other, when in fact the relationships among these categories involve varying degrees of opposition that result in complicated power dynamics and injustices. Relationality allows us to comprehend the “matrix-like interactions” of race, class, gender, sexual identity, and other categories of identity, suggesting a nonhierarchical methodology that bursts open the oppressive order imposed by individual and institutional “-isms.”

If relationality—or, in the context of undergraduate education, encouraging relational thinking in our curricular and cocurricular pedagogies and in our scholarship—is so critical to combating oppression in society, what are the implications for our approach to liberal learning? In short, relationality requires a pedagogy that encourages students to acquire knowledge of social context and power dynamics so they are able to recognize social inequalities and equipped to pursue social justice for all, a necessary requirement for our democracy to continue and flourish. As I have written elsewhere, such a pedagogy “would refuse primacy to either race, class, gender, or ethnicity, demanding instead a recognition of their matrix-like interactions.” Indeed, the interactions among these categories are as critical as the categories themselves; for, “speaking generally, the sexism that the black woman experiences, whether instigated by white or black males, is reinforced and defined in its nature by the
 racism and ethnocentrism of the oppressors. Class, of course, creates additional variations.\textsuperscript{16}

There are challenges involved in implementing a pedagogy based on such a nonhierarchical methodology. Among these challenges is the possibility that such a methodology, in disrupting long-established approaches, “increases in whites the fear of displacement from the center, the locus of control,” even as it simultaneously “increases the fear of being relegated to the periphery” for people of color, “who are fighting for validation within the traditional norms.” In short, even after decades of theoretical development, implementing intersectional approaches continues to challenge the established order. To a degree, the words I wrote in 1989 remain true today: “All of us trained traditionally, even as we challenge, experience an uneasiness with interdisciplinary approaches as they defy the (false) boundaries of knowledge.”\textsuperscript{17}

The false boundaries of knowledge prevent us from recognizing—and even allow us to deny—how power functions. They allow us to ignore how racism forged the connection between rich and poor whites that Lillian Smith wrote about in the mid-twentieth-century South,\textsuperscript{18} and to overlook, when debating whether Harriet Tubman should replace Andrew Jackson on the twenty-dollar bill, that Jackson’s Trail of Tears essentially led to the expansion of slavery and the forced takeover of Native lands.\textsuperscript{19} They obscure these and other histories that informed the shouts of white nationalists in Charlottesville this summer: “We will not be replaced!” and “Jews will not replace us!” The boundary between class and social context obliterates the fact that the “working class” extends beyond white men and women, while simultaneously being modulated by race and gender.

While liberal education does not focus solely on issues of identity per se, the relationship between identity and power—sometimes called the politics of identity or identity politics—arguably shape what is taught and to whom; whose histories are told and not told; who is defined as object and not subject. This is true of literature and the arts, but it is also true of the social sciences and STEM disciplines. In our work to transform liberal education so that it meets our students’ changing intellectual and skill-based needs, we are implementing new programmatic structures that may well be transformative. However, if these structures lack relationality and complexity—two defining dimensions of intersectionality—their transformative potential will be severely limited.

A truly transformed liberal education would involve interdisciplinary modules implemented within disciplinary courses to help students understand the interconnectedness of and relationality among disciplines, knowledge, and experience. Such an education would involve comparative, intersectional, and interdisciplinary study in history, philosophy, religious studies, literature, and political science. It would challenge students to engage with the core ideas of intersectionality, including social inequality, power, relationality, social context, complexity, and social justice. These core ideas—including, especially, relationality and complexity—emerge from the human experience and are key to defining the liberal education of the twenty-first century, just as the relationship between identity and power—although circumscribed by binary thinking about different hierarchical categories of identity, such as slave and free, male and female—was integral to the foundational concepts of liberal arts and liberal education.

**The high stakes for our future as a nation**

As alluded to above, the United States faces a violent conundrum of national identity that often seems continuous and unsolvable. Ethnocentrism, racism, classism, sexism, homophobia, ableism, and religious intolerance, functioning at the systemic and individual levels, combine with a lack of a shared understanding of our past, resulting in a national failure to contend with our complex history. This conundrum intrudes upon dialogues across and about diversity at all levels; it hampers the inclusion of knowledge and of people needed to transform our disciplines, fields of study, and pedagogies. Moreover, the violent conundrum of national identity challenges, impedes, and even distorts efforts to embrace diversity through a commitment to equity and inclusive excellence. The ultimate result is an obliteration of shared aspirations toward the Common Good.

Historian Jill Lepore observed in a May interview that “all politics is really an argument about the relationship between the past and the future. And the more polarized our politics has become, the more polarized the past.”\textsuperscript{20} It is worth remembering that in the 1990s, projects aimed at introducing race, gender, and class analyses into the curriculum were met with vicious opposition not unlike what intersectionality
faces today. Critics now describe intersectionality, as many then described ethnic studies and women’s studies, as “a quasi religion, one that stifles free expression on college campuses and threatens democracy itself” or as “advancing the view that ‘identity politics trumps all.’”

To the contrary, intersectionality offers a critical framework for understanding the interactive dynamics of race, class, gender, and other categories of identity, thus providing the space to grapple with inequality and inequity and to tell the truth of our national history. It also reveals the possibility for and potential avenues toward social justice, as new scholarship unearths the complex, conflictual, connected stories that constitute our national narrative. Learning and accepting this complicated narrative in all its beauty and ugliness is the only way we can exorcise the horrors of the past and truly aspire to be the democratic republic we imagine ourselves to be.

Intersectionality as a concept and practice is rooted in the politics of identity—the multiplicity of identity, the social location of identity, and the power inequities maintained by defining identities as disconnected from their social, political, and economic locations. The politics of identity operates at the individual, group, regional, and national levels. Our challenge, as I see it, is to embrace a national history that is relational and pluralistic—that seeks the generative in our differences and strives to correct our power inequities. Embracing that history requires us to approach our scholarship, pedagogy, and institutional and policy research in an intersectional, relational way, allowing us to embrace and examine complexities with greater attention to their details and, ultimately, greater understanding. At the pedagogical level, such an approach will equip our students to help guide our nation away from the apparently unsolvable conundrum of national identity toward the complex wholeness that is necessary to us as individuals, to our communities, and to our nation.
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“Why Are All the Black Kids Still Sitting Together in the Cafeteria?”

We may be living in a color-silent society, where we have learned to avoid talking about racial difference.

When I told people that I was working on a twentieth-anniversary edition of my 1997 book, “Why Are All the Black Kids Sitting Together in the Cafeteria?” and Other Conversations about Race (released in fall 2017), they typically responded with two questions: “Is that still happening? Are things getting better?” A quick glance across the cafeteria in the average racially-mixed US high school or college indicates that the answer to the first question is usually “yes.” What, if anything, does that tell us about the answer to the second question, “Are things getting better”? What does “better” look like? That is a more complicated question.

What has changed, for better or worse, in the last twenty years? What is the implication for how we understand ourselves and each
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and Other Conversations about Race in the Twenty-First Century
other in reference to our racial identities? And, if we are dissatisfied with the way things are, what can we do to change it?

Almost two decades into the twenty-first century, we are still struggling with what W.E.B. DuBois identified in 1906 as the “problem of the color line,” even though the demographic composition of that color line has changed. The numbers are remarkable: in 1950, the total US population was nearly 90 percent White; in 2014, for the first time in US history, the minority of elementary and secondary school children were children of color—Black, Latino, Asian, or American Indian.

New faces, same places
Today Latinos are the largest population of color in the nation, at 17.6 percent of the total population. The Black population is at 13 percent. The Asian population is at 6 percent but growing faster than any other group, largely due to immigration. The percentage of multiracial babies has risen from 1 percent in 1970 to 10 percent in 2013. But despite the rapid shift in our national diversity, old patterns of segregation persist. Nationwide, nearly 75 percent of Black students and 80 percent of Latino students attend so-called “majority-minority” schools. Both Black and Latino students are much more likely than White students to attend a school where 60 percent or more of their classmates are living in poverty. Separate remains unequal as schools with concentrated poverty and racial segregation are still likely to have less-experienced teachers, high levels of teacher turnover, inadequate facilities, and fewer classroom resources.

Neighborhoods once again determine school assignment, and to the extent that neighborhoods are segregated, the schools remain so. Certainly income matters when you are looking for housing. But we can’t overlook the way housing patterns have been shaped historically by policies and practices such as racially restrictive real estate covenants, racial steering by real estate agents, redlining of neighborhoods, and other discriminatory practices by mortgage lenders. That history includes the use by many White homeowners’ associations of physical threats and violence to keep people of color out of their neighborhoods. The legacy of these policies and practices lives on as past housing options enhance or impede the accumulation of home equity and eventually the intergenerational transmission of wealth. And though such policies are now illegal at the federal, state, and local levels, evidence suggests they haven’t been eliminated in practice.

What difference does it make? For people of color, living in a hypersegregated community increases one’s exposure to the disadvantages associated with concentrated poverty and reduces access to the benefits associated with affluent communities. Racial segregation limits access to the social networks needed for successful employment and access to other important resources. Keeping groups separated means that community helpfulness is not shared across racial lines. Because of residential segregation, economic disadvantage and racial disadvantage are inextricably linked.

The now-centuries-long persistence of residential and school segregation goes a long way toward explaining why “the Black kids are still sitting together.” In those few places where students of color and White students enter academic environments together, their lived experiences are likely to have been quite different, and racial stereotyping is likely to be an inhibiting factor in their cross-group interactions.

Change you can believe in?
That said, isn’t anything better? In his 2016 commencement address at Howard University, President Barack Obama highlighted how opportunities for Black people have expanded since his own college graduation in 1983. “We’re no longer only entertainers, we’re producers, studio executives. No longer small business owners—we’re CEOs, we’re mayors, representatives, Presidents of the United States.” While President Obama was correct that positive, meaningful social change has happened in our lifetimes, in the twenty-year period from 1997 to 2017, at least three setbacks have occurred: the anti-affirmative-action backlash of the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries, the economic collapse of 2008 known as the Great Recession, and the phenomenon known as mass incarceration. In this article, I will focus on the first two.

The anti-affirmative-action backlash has had significant effects on Black, Latino, and American Indian access to the best-resourced public universities. California offers a telling example. In 1996, California voters approved
California Proposition 209, effectively ending all state-run affirmative action programs, with devastating impact on the enrollment of Black, Latino, and Native American students at the University of California–Los Angeles and the University of California–Berkeley. A similar result followed the passage of Michigan’s version of Proposition 209 in 2006. The California and Michigan flagship institutions have found that without taking race into consideration, it is very difficult to achieve representative levels of diversity, despite recent demographic change.

Recognition of that difficulty seemed to play a role in Abigail Fisher v. University of Texas at Austin, which challenged the university’s use of race as one factor among many in a holistic review of applicants. To the surprise of many observers, the Supreme Court ruled on the side of the university. Writing the majority opinion for the court, Justice Anthony Kennedy praised the university for having offered a reasoned, principled explanation of its policy, but also warned that the court’s decision “does not necessarily mean the university may rely on that same policy without refinement” in the future, reminding us all that affirmative action programs stand on unsteady ground.

The second setback—the economic collapse of 2008—shook the ground of many, but had a disproportionately disastrous effect for many Black and Latino families, with many families of color losing their homes and their jobs. Disparate unemployment rates continue, despite the national economic recovery, and “the racial wealth gap between Whites and people of color is the highest it has been in 25 years.”

Economic disparities translate into educational disparities. College access is much more difficult when families have little opportunity to accumulate savings and no real estate assets against which to borrow. According to the National Postsecondary Student Aid Study, the percentage of Black students whose families had nothing to contribute to their college educations (in financial aid terms, an “expected family contribution of zero”) went from 41.6 percent in 2008 to 60 percent in 2012. For many Black and Hispanic families, the last twenty years have been a downward slide. It is worth noting that some White families have been sliding, too. Since 2000, the poverty rate among working-class Whites has grown from 3 percent to 11 percent, fueling both economic anxiety and anger.

These statistics are depressing, and perhaps you are thinking, “surely something has changed for the better in the last twenty years!” Indeed, if there is one thing that might suggest a positive change in race relations in the twenty-first century, it would be the election of Barack Obama in 2008.

The election of President Obama
I spent Election Night 2008 with hundreds of students gathered at Spelman College. When the announcement of Senator Barack Obama’s victory came, the cheers and tears in the swell of the largely African American crowd at Spelman were mirrored in the multiracial, multiethnic, and multigenerational gatherings broadcast from Chicago, New York, and Washington, DC. It was a night to remember. According to a USA Today poll taken immediately after the election, 67 percent of Americans expressed pride in the racial progress the election represented, even if they did not vote for Barack
The young age of Dylann Roof, who’s charged with sitting alongside nine Black churchgoers for an hour before standing up and shooting them dead, is sure to inspire some head-scratching in the wake of his attack. He’s 21, which means he’s a millennial, which means he’s not supposed to be racist—so the thinking stubbornly (if disingenuously) persists, despite ample research showing that it’s just not true.

Demby cites the results of an MTV survey of young viewers regarding their racial attitudes. That 2014 survey of a nationally representative group of one thousand fourteen- to twenty-four-year-olds was an in-depth look at how millennials think about issues related to bias. Among the key findings was a widespread belief (91 percent) that everyone should be treated equally, with 48 percent believing it is wrong to draw attention to someone’s race, even in a positive way. Seventy-two percent reported believing that their generation is more egalitarian than previous generations, and 58 percent agreed that racism will become less and less of an issue as they take on leadership roles in our society. For 62 percent, electing a Black president was evidence that race is no longer a barrier to opportunity for people of color.

White respondents and respondents of color, however, reported significantly different life experiences. White respondents, for example, reported rarely feeling excluded at school or work because of race or ethnicity (10 percent), while 23 percent of respondents of color said they often felt excluded in those settings. Thirteen percent of White respondents said they had been treated differently by a teacher because of their race, compared to 33 percent of respondents of color. Despite the fact that White respondents reported fewer negative experiences with bias, and 41 percent agreed that “I have more advantages than people of other races,” almost half (48 percent) also agreed that “today, discrimination against White people has become as big a problem as discrimination against racial minority groups.” Only 27 percent of respondents of color shared that perception. Almost twice as high a percentage of White millennial respondents (41 percent) as respondents of color (21 percent) agreed that “the government pays too much attention to the problems of racial minority groups.”

Despite these highlighted differences in experiences and attitudes, almost all millennials
surveyed (94 percent) reported having seen examples of bias (defined by the survey as “treat-
ing someone differently—and often unfairly—
because they are a member of a particular
group”). Yet just 20 percent indicated that they were comfortable having a conversation about bias. Most (73 percent) think we should talk openly about bias, and that doing so would lead to prejudice reduction, but like many adults, they are hesitant to speak up. For 79 percent, their biggest concern about addressing bias is the risk of creating a conflict or making the situation worse.¹⁶

For me, one of the main conclusions from this survey is that neither my Baby Boomer generation nor their millennial generation is living in a post-racial color-blind society. Instead, we may be living in a color-silent society, where we have learned to avoid talking about racial difference. But even if we refrain from mentioning race, the evidence is clear: we still notice racial categories, and our behaviors are guided by what we notice. Those biases manifest themselves in ways that matter—who we offer help to in an emergency, who we decide to hire, who we give a warning instead of a ticket, or who we shoot at instead of deescalating during a police encounter.

Indeed, police shootings and their aftermath have offered the most glaring evidence that we are not living in a post-racial world. The police shooting of Michael Brown in Ferguson, Missouri, in the summer of 2014 was a tipping point. The activism that followed, not just in Ferguson but around the nation and on college campuses, linked through social media by #BlackLivesMatter, awakened a new generation to the power of protest. Whether it came from professional athletes wearing “I can’t breathe” T-shirts, medical students in “White Coats for Black Lives” staging die-ins, Bay Area public defenders organizing demonstrations, Stanford students blocking the San Mateo bridge, or college students mobilizing protests on their own campuses, the rallying cry of “Black Lives Matter” had the nation’s attention.¹⁷

The movement goes to college
If Ferguson was the epicenter of Black Lives Matter, the University of Missouri in Columbia (known as Mizzou) became the most visible symbol of campus-based student activism in the fall of 2015. Just as the young activists of
Ferguson felt betrayed by President Obama’s inability to stop police violence, Black students were angry that senior leaders were unable to prevent bias incidents on campus—or that the responses to those incidents often lacked a sense of urgency.

The speed with which events unfolded at Mizzou, culminating in the resignation of the two top campus leaders, was breathtaking. So was the wave of activism that swept across other campuses. Again, social media played a critical role. A new website, TheDemands.org, was created to compile links to student demands on a growing number of campuses, providing templates for student leaders as they drafted their own versions. By December 2015, student demands at eighty colleges and universities (including three in Canada) had been posted.

An analysis of the various campus demand statements led researchers to conclude that “these students are petitioning institutions to consider expansive shifts to institutional culture rather than merely stand-alone programs or add-on policies.”18 Presidents are responding. In a January 2016 anonymous online survey conducted by the American Council on Education’s Center for Policy Research and Strategy, of the 567 college presidents who responded, nearly half said that students on their campuses had organized around concerns about racial diversity, the vast majority (86 percent of those leading four-year campuses) had met with student organizers more than once, and the majority (55 percent) indicated that addressing racial climate on campus had become a higher priority for them than it was three years ago.19

But not everyone has been sympathetic to the cause of the student protesters. Pushback has come from all corners—from fellow students, from faculty, from administrators, from alumni, from trustees, from state legislators. People say the students are overreacting and need to get over it. Often, though not always, the critics are White. Failure to empathize with the outrage of Ferguson protesters or the sense of isolation or threat that students of color report may be due in large part to the racially insulated lives many White people lead, the result of persistent school and residential segregation.

According to a 2013 American Values Survey conducted by the Public Religion Research Institute (PRRI), 75 percent of Whites have entirely White social networks without any minority presence. This degree of social network racial homogeneity is significantly higher than among Black Americans (65 percent) or Hispanic Americans (46 percent). Robert P. Jones, the CEO of PRRI, writes that “the chief obstacle to having an intelligent, or even intelligible, conversation across the racial divide is that on average White Americans … talk mostly to other White people.” The result is that most Whites are not “socially positioned” to understand the experiences of people of color.20

**Not just a Black matter**

Perhaps because so much national media attention has focused on lethal encounters between Black people and police, the national conversation about race, to the extent that it has occurred, has focused on anti-Black racism. However, it is important to recognize that lethal police violence is not just a problem for Black communities. In fact, Native Americans “were more likely to be killed by police than any other group, including African Americans.”21

In the same way that the problem of police violence extends beyond African Americans to other marginalized populations of color, so too does the problem of isolation and marginalization on historically White campuses. Indeed, while 13 percent of student statements on TheDemands.org focus specifically on the concerns of Black students, over half have a more general focus on campus diversity, broadly defined.22

What cuts across the experiences of all marginalized groups on college campuses is the phenomenon known as microaggressions. Psychologist Derald Wing Sue defines the term as “the brief and commonplace daily verbal, behavioral, and environmental indignities, whether intentional or unintentional, that communicate hostile, derogatory, or negative racial, gender, sexual-orientation, and religious slights and insults to the target person or group.”23 Often involving the projection of stereotypes, microaggressions can occur at any moment of the day and are a constant potential source of stress.

After experiencing one of those moments walking with his family after church on a Sunday morning in October, Michael Luo, a Chinese-American journalist, posted about his experience on Twitter and wrote “An Open Letter to the Woman Who Told My Family to Go Back to China.” To his surprise, the New York Times...
published it on the front page. “Dear Madam,” it began, “Maybe I should have let it go…. But I was, honestly, stunned when you yelled at us from down the block, ‘Go back to China!’…. Maybe you don’t know this, but the insults you hurled at my family get to the heart of the Asian-American experience. It’s this persistent sense of otherness that a lot of us struggle with every day. That no matter what we do, how successful we are, what friends we make, we don’t belong. We’re foreign. We’re not American.”

Luo’s open letter captured the psychological and physiological toll that microaggressions take on those who experience them. Social science research has demonstrated that microaggressions cumulatively “assail the self-esteem of recipients, produce anger and frustration, deplete psychic energy, lower feelings of subjective well-being and worthiness, produce physical health problems, shorten life expectancy, and deny minority populations equal access and opportunity in education, employment and health care.” Unfortunately, these experiences became more frequent for some during the 2016 presidential campaign season.

The election of 2016
Donald Trump’s campaign gave new visibility to a movement that for many years had been in the shadows of American life. The “alt-right” is defined by the Southern Poverty Law Center as “a set of far-right ideologies, groups and individuals whose core belief is that ‘White identity’ is under attack by multicultural forces using ‘political correctness’ and ‘social justice’ to undermine White people and their community.” Much alt-right rhetoric is “explicitly racist, anti-immigrant, anti-Semitic and anti-feminist.”

Jonathan Greenblatt, the national director of the Anti-Defamation League, speaks for many when he says he is troubled by the “mainstreaming of these really offensive ideas.”

While not everyone who voted for Donald Trump had bigoted views, Donald Trump’s election victory nonetheless emboldened White nationalists. The Southern Poverty Law Center, which tracks hate-motivated incidents, released a post-election report documenting almost nine hundred reports of harassment and intimidation from across the nation, not including online harassment. In these documented accounts, many harassers invoked Trump’s name during assaults, making it clear that the outbreak of hate stemmed in large part from his electoral success. According to the report, most occurrences involved hateful graffiti and verbal harassment, although a small number included violent physical interactions. K–12 school and college settings were the most common venues for hate incidents. Only 23 of the 867 incidents reported were directed at the Trump campaign or his supporters.

At a time like this, we know that leadership matters, on college campuses and in our nation. When I listened to the polarizing rhetoric of radio and TV commentators during the long campaign season, I was reminded of *Left to Tell*, a book by Immaculée Ilibagiza, a survivor of the Rwandan genocide. She wrote about the hostile rhetoric that was on the radio airways before and during the genocide, demonizing the ethnic minority to which she belonged. That rhetoric was made especially powerful because it came from the country’s leaders.

I do not mean to suggest that what we are seeing in the United States today is on par with what happened in Rwanda. But what we say matters, and leadership matters. The expectations and values of leaders can change the nature of our conversation.

Human beings have an innate tendency to think in “us” and “them” categories, but we look to the leader to help us know who is “us” and who is “them.” The leader can draw the circle narrowly or widely. When the leader draws the circle in an exclusionary way, using hostile rhetoric, the sense of threat among followers is heightened. When the rhetoric is expansive and inclusionary, the threat is reduced. The leader has to ask, *How is the circle being drawn? Who is inside? Who is outside? What can I do to make the circle bigger?* As Martin Luther King, Jr., once said, we are caught in a “network of mutuality”30; our collective fate is intertwined. We will thrive or fail together.

And here’s what we must also consider: If a person is twenty years old in 2017, born in 1997, all the critical issues I have identified thus far are coming-of-age hallmarks of their generation. If you were born in 1997, you were eleven when the economy collapsed, perhaps bringing new economic anxiety into your family life. You were still eleven when Barack Obama was elected. You heard that his election was proof of a post-racial society; yet your neighborhoods and schools were likely still segregated. In 2012, when you were fifteen, a young Black teenager named
Dialogue as action

Creating campus dialogue groups is an action that could be taken on any campus. I found a hopeful example of this strategy at the University of Michigan. In October 2016, I visited with David Schoem and some students from the Michigan Community Scholars Program, a residential program, intentionally multi-racial in its composition, students take a seminar and participate in various structured dialogues. The students, both White and of color, who chose the Community Scholars program spoke eloquently about what they had gained, and also about how different their experience was from that of their classmates who are not part of the program. They are deeply engaged in learning how to talk about difficult topics with rather than past one another.

In the 2016 fall semester, White supremacist posters with explicitly anti-Black content appeared around the university’s campus, creating a hostile environment for Black students who felt under attack. Among the students I met was a young African American woman in her first year who said, “It’s hard to focus [on your schoolwork] when there’s so much hateful stuff.… It’s hard to know who to trust.… it takes energy to reach out to Whites without knowing if they are ‘safe.’” MCSP [Michigan Community Scholars Program] helps with that.” A White woman in her cohort was quick to second that observation, even though as a White student she was not the target of hateful rhetoric. She said, “MCSP is the only place where I’ve constantly felt supported, listened to, and understood.”

When we get it right, it makes a difference. Research shows that when schools (and communities) are truly integrated, with real opportunities for students of different racial backgrounds to take the same classes, participate in clubs and sports together, and collaborate on projects, they make more friends across racial lines and express more positive views than other students do. As adults, they are more likely to live and work in diverse settings, more likely to be civically engaged, and more likely to vote.29

In my view, that is what “better” looks like. Is it better? Not yet. It could be. It’s up to us to make sure it is.

To respond to this article, email liberade@aacu.org, with the author’s name on the subject line.
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By focusing on the issues rather than on political parties or candidates, CD16 delegates explored their beliefs and practiced communicating those beliefs respectfully to their peers.
Create a New Model for Civic Engagement
With a focus on the issues rather than on the candidates or political parties, CD16 organizers launched a campaign to recruit student participants, ultimately involving 147 delegates from the fifty states and Washington, DC. The delegates came from big public universities, small private colleges, and community colleges; they were predominately women (63 percent), and nearly half (45 percent) identified as members of underrepresented racial or ethnic groups. The cohort comprised students majoring in a range of disciplines, including dance, chemistry, engineering, and literature.

Several organizational partners whose civic missions aligned closely with the goals of CD16 assisted Dominican in recruiting delegates and communicating about the initiative. These partners included the Association of American Colleges and Universities, the American Democracy Project, the Bonner Foundation, Bringing Theory to Practice, Campus Compact, The Democracy Commitment, Imagining America, the Institute for Democracy and Higher Education at Tufts University, Ignite, NASPA, Project Pericles, and the Washington Center. CD16 organizers worked closely with these groups to ensure that the initiative would complement rather than detract from their efforts. The partnering organizations were instrumental in recruiting student applicants, expanding the delegates’ networks, providing guidance as the program developed, and measuring the program’s impact. The CD16 leadership team also partnered with the Social Media Analytics and Command Center at Illinois State University to analyze students’ social media activity throughout the initiative.

**Promoting issues-based civil discourse**

CD16 focused on the need to promote civil discourse at a time when civility in politics is waning. This meant focusing on political, economic, social, and global issues rather than on political parties. To ensure that delegates represented a diverse array of opinions and positions, applicants completed the Pew Political Typology Quiz and submitted the results as part of their applications. The quiz requires respondents to state their positions related to a range of social, political, and economic issues; it then associates an individual’s views with one of seven typologies representing a continuum of conservative to liberal standpoints that transcend the simplified labels of Republican, Democrat, and Independent. Collectively, the delegates’ responses revealed how their viewpoints differed markedly from those of the general public. For example, CD16 delegates agreed more than the public that:

- “stricter environmental laws and regulations are worth the cost” (by 32 percentage points);
- “society is just as well off if people have priorities other than marriage and children” (by 34 percentage points);
- “it is NOT necessary to believe in God in order to be moral and have good values” (by 33 percentage points);
- “racial discrimination is the main reason why many Black people can’t get ahead these days” (by 50 percentage points);
- “immigrants today strengthen our country because of their hard work and talents” (by 35 percentage points).

After identifying a group of delegates with a range of views about these and other issues, CD16 organizers focused on preparing these delegates to engage in respectful discourse. An initial two-day convening on Dominican’s campus in June 2016 reinforced, despite CD16’s focus on the power of social media and virtual communication, that face-to-face interactions are invaluable. Together, delegates acquired tools for engaging in civil discourse, both online and in person. In one exercise, filmmaker Julie Winokur screened her documentary *Bring It to the Table,* which chronicles her journey across the United States to meet with people holding a variety of political positions. As she traveled, Winokur invited people to sit at a table she carried with her, talk about their positions on a range of topics, and reflect on the roots of their political beliefs. After the screening, delegates participated in “Table Talks” modeled on those depicted in the film. This structured listening exercise helped delegates explore how their personal biases and assumptions could prevent them from hearing one another.

The delegates also learned about digital citizenship in a discussion guided by Sybril Brown, professor of journalism at Belmont University. Brown emphasized that although social media is a tool for civic engagement, it can pose challenges to civility by displacing face-to-face interactions with online posts. Brown encouraged the delegates to leverage social media to begin the kinds of conversations that are needed to effect change, but also asked them to...
consider their roles in creating virtual forums that promote engagement rather than exclusion.

Finally, the delegates participated in two open forums: one with Alexander Heffner, host of PBS’s *The Open Mind*,9 and another with Alex Padilla, California’s Secretary of State. These events prompted delegates to consider the importance of informed citizenship, the need for facts to substantiate arguments and guide voting behavior, and the role that their generation can play in reintroducing civility to political discourse and facilitating respectful debate. The discussions allowed delegates to practice their listening skills and articulate ideas they had not necessarily had a chance to express in other venues.

Following the initial convening, the delegates spent the summer engaging their peers, classmates, and friends on the issues that mattered to them through social media. Their efforts were guided by a toolkit developed by the Dominican CD16 team.10 The toolkit instructed delegates to use #collegedebate16 as an identifying tag when sharing their insights and ideas through various social media platforms. The delegates’ tweets, chats, and Instagram posts exemplified their ability to discuss rather than yell, listen rather than ignore, and emphasize rather than condemn.

**Taking student voice to a national stage**

For two days in September 2016, the delegates reconvened on the Dominican campus to identify the group’s top five core issues and craft one question per issue that they would like to ask the presidential and vice-presidential candidates. The delegates submitted these questions by formal memo to the Commission on Presidential Debates; the commission then forwarded the memo to the moderators of the debates, who ultimately decided whether to ask any of the recommended questions.

While Dominican organizers provided support, space, and discussion facilitation, the process of narrowing the topic areas and developing questions was in the hands of the delegates. Students’ prior training was crucial in helping them arrive at consensus. Using a caucus-style format, delegates first chose five topic areas that were relevant to them. They then shared meaningful personal stories that helped depoliticize and humanize volatile topics like immigration and health care. Some delegates spoke of being immigrants or members of immigrant families, complicating the narrative about “building a wall”; similarly, one delegate shared insights into the role that subsidies play for his family’s farm, prompting other delegates to consider the economic impacts of government policy on agriculture.

After two hours of discussion, the delegates determined that their core issues were (1) income inequality and the economy, (2) foreign policy, (3) social justice and civil rights, (4) immigration, and (5) education. The next day, they developed questions for each topic area and—again, through a process of respectful dialogue and argumentation—arrived at three questions for each topic. During a town hall event that evening, delegates voted to select these questions for the presidential and vice-presidential candidates:11

- **Income inequality and the economy**
  - How would you restructure governmental assistance programs for the unemployed or impoverished to obtain self-sufficiency? (Topic: Income inequality and the economy)
  - What will you do to reduce the recidivism and mass incarceration rates in communities where poverty and violence are prevalent? (Topic: Social justice and civil rights)
  - How do you plan on supporting Syrian civilians without creating further conflict with other political actors? (Topic: Foreign policy)

- **Foreign policy**
  - What specific circumstances would prompt the United States to use military resources in a foreign country? How would you utilize the country’s military resources? (Topic: Foreign policy)
  - How would you use military resources to fight terrorism without creating further conflict with other political actors? (Topic: Foreign policy)

- **Social justice and civil rights**
  - How do you plan on reducing the recidivism and mass incarceration rates in communities where poverty and violence are prevalent? (Topic: Social justice and civil rights)
As facilitators, we observed firsthand the value of both in-person and virtual engagement. We saw a student who described himself as a “staunch Republican” and believed in the need for a strong military discussing the environment with another who identified as an Emma Goldman-inspired anarchist awaiting the “real revolution.” We observed the same kind of spirited engagement online as students encouraged their peers to take positions and explain their points of view. CD16 provided a framework for acknowledging how students make connections across multiple media. Just as important, the initiative showcased how those same media can be tools for enacting civility as well as expressing opinion.

The 2016 election was one of the most divisive and contentious elections in recent memory. In the analyses that followed, many commentators pointed toward social media as contributing to the negative nature of the election. A recent study, however, showed that the increase in political polarization is largest among those demographic groups least likely to use the internet or social media (i.e., older Americans). By using social media constructively, the CD16 delegates underscored the role generational differences may play in how people communicate civic ideas and create civil dialogue online.

Commenting on the idea that voters cast their ballots for candidates or parties, CD16 delegate Dara Prentiss (Spelman College) stated, “You need to go vote for yourself first. This is what you believe in.” By focusing on the issues rather than on political parties or candidates, CD16 delegates explored their beliefs and practiced communicating those beliefs respectfully to their peers. The initiative allowed students to engage with difference—an important high-impact educational practice—in ways many had never done before, by entering into conversations with peers of varying political standpoints through a variety of media. As facilitators, we saw humor and humanity in their interactions, both virtual and in-person. The initiative gave us great hope for higher education’s work to build the civic skills and capacities of a new generation of college students. And it reminded us to recognize and appreciate how this generation of millennial students will craft their civic identities and engage in civil discourse in new and innovative ways.

To respond to this article, email liberaled@aacu.org, with the authors’ names on the subject line.
NOTES
3. The other partners (Hofstra University; Longwood University; Washington University in St. Louis; and the University of Nevada, Las Vegas) hosted the presidential and vice-presidential debates on their campuses in fall 2016.
6. To take the Pew Political Typology Quiz, visit http://www.people-press.org/quiz/political-typology/.
7. See http://bringit2thetable.org/.
10. Please contact Hanna Rodriguez-Farrar (hrf@dominican.edu) if you are interested in the toolkit.
11. The town hall can be viewed in its entirety at http://collegedebate16.org/.
12. A tie vote in the foreign policy category resulted in the selection of two questions.
Cocurricular Arts Programming

Engagement with the arts is a fundamental element of a liberal education, especially in the first year of college. Liberal education seeks to form critical, creative citizens who can participate actively in “the various conversations that constitute a culture.” Engagement with the arts contributes to these ends by building “capacities for imaginative and emotional understanding.” Such capacities allow students to relate to one another empathically as well as on the basis of factual knowledge. When students focus their hearts and minds on novels, plays, paintings, or other works of art, they discover perspectives that may be very different from their own. This kaleidoscopic view of the world is crucial to navigating the intellectually, culturally, and socially diverse campus community. More deeply, the moments of enlightenment provided by the arts may reveal to students the previously hidden architecture of their minds. This epistemological self-awareness is the foundation of deep liberal learning and facilitates the dismantling of unexamined notions. Students often need to undertake this work before they can build more sophisticated and informed ideas.

The intellectual growth sparked by the arts serves many of the essential learning outcomes of liberal education identified by the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U), especially knowledge of human cultures, critical and creative thinking, civic knowledge and engagement, and intercultural knowledge and competence. While much of this learning takes place in the classroom, complementary cocurricular programming can enrich a student’s education, particularly during the first year. As generalists with a broad view of liberal education and an extensive campus network, academic advisors are well-positioned to coordinate and, in some cases, lead cocurricular arts programming. The arts programming sponsored by the First Year of Studies, the college for all first-year students at the University of Notre Dame, is a successful example of this model.

Benefits of cocurricular arts integration
Cocurricular arts programming can provide all first-year students, regardless of major, the opportunity to engage widely with the arts during the most formative time of their college careers without the constraints or divisions of the curriculum. Undoubtedly, many students will encounter literature or other works of art through required or elective courses, where they will learn how to analyze these works in specific contexts and through disciplinary lenses. These experiences, while invaluable, are insufficient. As Jeremy Haefner and Deborah Ford argue, “relying solely on the formal academic curriculum to achieve the outcomes of a liberal education shortchanges the total academic experience available to students.” To support “truly transformational liberal education,” institutions must also recognize and foster the learning that takes place outside the classroom.

Indeed, AAC&U has identified intentional and coherent connections between the curriculum and cocurriculum as a principle of integrative liberal learning.

Cocurricular arts programming serves the goals of integrative liberal learning in distinctive
and an Integrative First-Year Experience
ways. As defined by AAC&U, integrative liberal learning “develops the whole student for personal growth, economic productivity, and responsible citizenship.” This holistic view of liberal education recognizes the value of transgressing traditional disciplinary boundaries and divisions between curricular, cocurricular, and extracurricular activities. As reflections of human experience, the arts are inherently interdisciplinary. A novel, for instance, is an aesthetic, sociological, and historical document that can be read in a variety of ways for a variety of purposes. While a discipline-based course might prioritize a reading informed by that discipline’s approach, cocurricular arts programming is not bound by such specific learning goals and can encourage free exploration of the different aspects of a work of art. In addition, cocurricular arts programming gives students a space to connect what they are learning in their courses to an intellectual experience outside of the classroom. These types of connections are the foundation of integrative liberal learning.

Recent advocacy for integrative liberal learning has begun to reshape the conception of the role of academic advisors. Marc Lowenstein argues that an advisor’s primary responsibility should be to facilitate integrative liberal learning through integrative advising. For Lowenstein, integrative advising is “an academic endeavor” and “a locus of learning” that “helps students make meaning out of their education as a whole.” Rich Robbins similarly contends that advisors are well-positioned to teach students “the value of an integrative liberal learning education,” in part by emphasizing learning outcomes over curricular requirements. Although Lowenstein and Robbins focus on the advisor’s traditional role as a student’s primary guide through the curriculum, the theory of integrative advising suggests that advisors should be involved with cocurricular academic programming as well. By organizing, participating in, or leading academic programming, advisors position themselves as intellectually curious academics. In the process, they model for students the mind-set of successful liberal learners, demonstrate that deep intellectual engagement is not the purview solely of specialists, and reaffirm that the purpose of a college education is holistic learning. Moreover, by encouraging student engagement with arts programming in particular, advisors can provide students with opportunities to reflect on the purpose and meaning of their lives, thus fulfilling a goal of integrative advising.

The University of Notre Dame is developing new approaches that blend the benefits of cocurricular arts engagement with those of integrative advising. This work has occurred in the context of an undergraduate core curriculum that requires all students to take one fine arts or one literature course (or, for students in the College of Arts and Letters, one of each). The Notre Dame curriculum ensures that all students engage academically with the arts for at least one semester, regardless of their majors. Nevertheless, many students approach the requirement as another item on the checklist, to be completed at some point in their undergraduate careers, while others find their interest in exploring the arts limited by restrictive curricula (for example, in the College of Engineering, where the curriculum follows an established sequence with little room for electives). Notre Dame’s First Year of Studies is using voluntary cocurricular programming to address some of these curricular limitations and facilitate students’ engagement with the arts as part of an integrative liberal education.

**Cenacle and Parnassus**

Arts programming in the First Year of Studies is part of the university’s NDignite initiative, a diverse slate of cocurricular events that enables first-year students to “contribute something of their own to our intellectual and cultural communities” through meaningful engagement with faculty and campus resources. Academic advisors in the First Year of Studies collaborate with a wide variety of campus partners to design interdisciplinary cocurricular experiences that encourage students to broaden their perspectives and view their education holistically. These events facilitate intellectual yet informal conversation among students and faculty, fostering an understanding of academic inquiry as a shared and social activity that extends beyond the classroom. The First Year of Studies sponsors two primary arts programs, the Cenacle and Parnassus. The Cenacle, a literary salon hosted by different faculty members throughout the year, aims to show students that reading and conversation are life-changing arts. Parnassus invites students to disconnect from ubiquitous screen media and immerse themselves in live
Theater performances and the visual arts. Over the last three years, the university has expanded these programs to give students more opportunities to encounter and respond to compelling creative works.

The Cenacle assumed its present form in the spring semester of 2015, following several years of experimentation with format, organization, timing, and location. Cenacle participants meet three times per semester on campus for dinner and discussion of a book, usually a novel, but sometimes poetry or literary nonfiction. The discussions are led by academic advisors from the First Year of Studies or by faculty members. Each session is independent, and students can attend as many or as few sessions as they wish. There is no limit to the number of students who can participate, but free copies of the book are given to the first eighteen students who register for a session. Recent selections have included *Persuasion* by Jane Austen, *In Cold Blood* by Truman Capote, *Play It As It Lays* by Joan Didion, and *Citizen: An American Lyric* by Claudia Rankine. On average, around twelve students attend each session, a number large enough to sustain conversation but small enough to give all students the chance to speak.

While Notre Dame does not have a common reading program for incoming first-year students, the Cenacle shares some of the goals of these programs—notably, to “encourage reading among students” and to model “the intellectual engagement with different ideas that is expected in college.” The first Cenacle of the year, held during the first week of classes, is in spirit very much a part of the orientation experience. This first session introduces students to the pleasures and challenges of intellectual conversation in a convivial atmosphere and helps students begin to find a home at the university during an often-stressful period of transition.

The Cenacle has given first-year students the opportunity to engage intellectually with diverse perspectives, build community, and integrate their learning. For the 2016–17 academic year, 100 percent of respondents to a survey assessing the program said that the Cenacle facilitated meaningful and thoughtful discourse among students and faculty, and 92 percent said that the Cenacle was a very valuable or somewhat valuable part of their first-year experience. One student wrote, “I really appreciate these events because [participating in them] allows me to broaden my scope of

Notre Dame in connecting to different faculty members, as well as enhance my knowledge of the world through literature and discussion.” There is also evidence that the program promotes integrative liberal learning. In the discussion of *The Fire Next Time*, students connected James Baldwin’s classic essay on the civil rights movement to their conversations about diversity in a required first-year experience course and their experiences of race on campus. Similarly, a student described how his sociology seminar informed his understanding of Ursula K. Le Guin’s novel *The Lathe of Heaven*. Reflecting on a discussion of *Frankenstein*, a participant wrote, “As a student who currently wishes to go into scientific research, the work is particularly relevant, and even for those [who do] not, it is highly relevant to today’s culture and scientific advancements.” Organizers encouraged participants to make these connections in a variety of ways; for example, the survey sent to students after the event prompted students to reflect on links between the book discussed and their academic or personal lives.

The university launched Parnassus in the 2014–15 academic year to encourage students to attend the many high-quality theatrical productions staged on campus. The First Year of Studies provides free admission to the first twenty-five students who request tickets for each of several plays and musicals performed throughout the year. First Year advisors sometimes collaborate with campus partners to create supplemental events that promote critical and creative thinking, such as preshow lectures by faculty members and postshow talk-backs with actors. In the first year of the program, students attended productions of Shakespeare’s *Much Ado about Nothing* and *Macbeth*, both performed by a professional theater troupe, *Actors from the London Stage* (AFTLS). The following year, the program included performances by AFTLS as well as performances by Notre Dame’s Department of Film, Television and Theatre, namely *Wildflower*, *The Little Shop of Horrors*, and *Pride and Prejudice*. Expanding on the original program’s successes, a Parnassus event was added in 2015 to Welcome Weekend, Notre Dame’s first-year orientation. Each year, the First Year of Studies provides fifty free tickets to a professional production by the Shakespeare at Notre Dame program. This early and

Parnassus has created community among students and provided opportunities for them to broaden their perspectives and integrate their learning through participation in the arts.
prominent invitation to engage with the arts signals to students the centrality of the arts to a liberal education and introduces attendees to an important site of learning on campus, the performing arts center.

Parnassus has created community among students and provided opportunities for them to broaden their perspectives and integrate their learning through participation in the arts. In surveys assessing the program, respondents suggested that these events encouraged them to participate in cultural experiences that they would not otherwise have sought. One student wrote, “I am glad that the Ignite Initiative is offering opportunities to experience some of the lesser known programs at Notre Dame…. While I greatly enjoy plays, I’m not sure I would have attended both Little Shop of Horrors and Wildflower without the encouragement from FYS.” Parnassus also facilitates exposure to the performing arts by removing the financial burden of theater attendance, a benefit that some students noted in their feedback.

Student responses point as well to the intellectual engagement that Parnassus fosters outside of the classroom. For some students, the absorbing experience of seeing a live performance generates new ideas and greater imaginative possibilities for texts they have previously studied. Considering the style of the Actors from the London Stage, one student wrote that “the performance certainly has gotten me thinking…. I had never seen a minimalist performance like this before, and I found it enlightening to watch it and then think about what the form contributed.” Another student remarked, “The actors did an amazing job bringing the play to life, something I typically have trouble visualizing with Shakespeare.” The performances have led not only to personal reflection but also to conversation with peers, as students have reported gathering afterward to continue their conversations about Jane Austen and Shakespeare.

Although Cenacle and Parnassus are successful independently, integrating literary, theatrical, and visual arts programming provides students with opportunities for richer and more sustained intellectual engagement. In partnership with the academic curator of Notre Dame’s Snite Museum of Art, the First Year of Studies hosted two Cenacle events at the museum in the 2016–17 academic year. The museum provided an ideal location to discuss Emily St. John Mandel’s novel Station Eleven, which examines how we determine artistic value and why we preserve cultural artifacts. At another Cenacle event at the Snite, students discussed Mary Shelley’s novel Frankenstein (1818) alongside Marcos Raya’s painting Opportunistic Diagnosis (2004), considering how these two texts, created in different media and separated by two centuries, explore the ethics of scientific experimentation. To complement this event, Parnassus subsequently offered students the opportunity to attend the Department of Film, Television, and Theatre’s stage production of Frankenstein. Together, these Cenacle and Parnassus events invited students to encounter the same text in different forms and thereby see the novel through new lenses. Given the positive response from students, the First Year of Studies intends to continue and expand its integrated arts programming.
Successes and challenges

The arts programming sponsored by the First Year of Studies has strengthened integrative liberal learning among first-year students. But its success has depended on Notre Dame’s ability to address certain constraints. Advisors who are creating cocurricular academic programming need institutional support and time away from more traditional advising responsibilities. In addition, they need to be recognized as educators, and the cocurricular academic programming they design needs to be understood as an effective method for achieving integrative advising goals. Advisors also need the support of partners in academic departments and arts units, such as theaters and museums. Department chairs or directors of undergraduate study can provide invaluable assistance in recruiting faculty members, who may be reluctant to commit to additional responsibilities. Financial support is also critical, but there are many ways to reduce expenses: meals need not be provided during book discussions, for example, and essays or short stories can often be distributed to students electronically at no cost.

The primary limitation of voluntary arts programming is its scope. Events for small groups of students allow for active participation and community building, but their modest size means that they cannot reach most students. Significantly increasing the number of events would require an untenable investment of time and resources. Moreover, expanding programming would likely result in diminishing returns, as many students are unable to find time for voluntary cocurricular programs or are not interested in the arts. Nonetheless, through integrative advising, advisors can help even these students understand the place of the arts in liberal education and thus lay the groundwork for future curricular, cocurricular, and extracurricular engagement with the arts.

The successful arts programming organized by academic advisors in the First Year of Studies at the University of Notre Dame demonstrates the value of cocurricular engagement with the arts for first-year students. In keeping with the mission of liberal education and the goals of integrative advising, these programs help students join the university’s intellectual community, broaden their perspectives, and integrate their learning experiences. The response from students has been overwhelmingly positive. In the words of one happy theatergoer, “Please keep doing this, it was awesome!” The administrators, faculty, and staff who shape the first-year experience have a responsibility to provide students with these life-changing encounters with the arts.

To respond to this article, email liberaled@aacu.org, with the authors’ names on the subject line.
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Shaping the Public Narrative

PATRICK SULLIVAN

An urgent crisis is before us. A huge gap has appeared between how the public perceives higher education and what academics and researchers at colleges and universities know to be true. It is imperative that scholars and educators take the lead in closing this dangerous—and highly politicized—gap.

The politicization of education
Evidence of the public relations gap is everywhere. Massive cuts to higher education budgets in states like Arizona, Illinois, and Louisiana, among others, can be regarded as attacks on the academy itself. Recent legislation in Wisconsin and proposed legislation in Missouri and Iowa seek to end tenure at public colleges and universities. Interventionist bills in Connecticut and Florida suggest that legislators now feel emboldened to bypass the collaborative problem-solving process and impose educational reform by legislative fiat; sometimes the resulting legislation draws on disciplinary expertise, and sometimes it does not. Politicians and others may find support for their actions in a stream of recent books and op-eds suggesting that the educational system is in a state of free fall. Perhaps the most well-known of these is Richard Arum and Josipa Roksa’s Academically Adrift: Limited Learning on College Campuses, which concludes that undergraduates don’t learn much in college.

At the same time, public discourse in the United States has eroded to such a degree that to call it anti-intellectual is to misrepresent it. We have entered the “post-truth” era—a world without facts. Specialized news programming on cable television, radical transformation of public communication propelled by the Internet and social media, attacks on journalism as a profession and as an essential pillar of democracy, unrestricted infusions of cash into political campaigns nationwide, news feeds driven by computer algorithms that create curated echo chambers for individual users, and insular microcommunities whose members communicate only among themselves—these have led to a world liberated from scientific consensus and from the cognitive habits of mind that privilege logic, evidence, and research-based analysis.

It’s no wonder that 2016’s word of the year, selected by Oxford dictionaries, was post-truth: “relating to or denoting circumstances in which objective facts are less influential in shaping public opinion than appeals to emotion and personal belief.”

As Neil Postman warned in Amusing Ourselves to Death, his book about the decline of public discourse in the United States caused by television and entertainment culture, “people will come to love their oppression, to adore the technologies that undo their capacities to think.” If current trends continue, the time of his prediction may soon be upon us.

The power of narrative
Powerful regressive forces are at work, threatening much of what is best about our educational system. These policies draw their legitimacy from a narrative—a particular understanding of learning, education, and economic development—that those hostile to higher education are actively theorizing and systematically disseminating across a wide variety of platforms. To borrow a formulation...
about Teaching and Learning
from literary critic Edward Said, writing about a different form of cultural imperialism, “the power to narrate, or to block other narratives from forming and emerging, is very important to culture and imperialism, and constitutes one of the main connections between them.”

Edward Said, Marshall Ganz, Rebecca Solnit, and others have documented the many ways in which narrative helps create the social consensus that translates ideas into law, legislation, and public policy. Constitutional law scholar David Cole notes in Engines of Liberty: The Power of Citizen Activists to Make Constitutional Law that “the campaigns for marriage equality, gun rights, and human rights in the war on terror were as much about molding public sentiment as shaping law, as much about a working outside the courts as pressing a case within them.”

Academics must actively resist the current failure-based narrative about higher education and work to help shape a more informed, research-based public narrative about education in the United States. We have a great deal of public-facing work before us—a theme reinforced at the Association of American Colleges and Universities’ 2017 annual meeting, which focused on “Building Public Trust in the Promise of Liberal Education and Inclusive Excellence.” Specialized academic groups, like the Science Coalition and the Modern Language Association, have also noted this ominous development and have made public calls to their membership to address it. We cannot simply stand by, watch the higher education narrative be shaped by others, and then submit quietly to the consequences.

**Rewards and recognition**
The need for higher education to participate in crafting the public narrative means that academics can no longer afford to write and publish only for ourselves, in journals that only we read. We must actively translate disciplinary knowledge for a broad public audience. This public work must become a central part of what it means to be a researcher, scholar, and educator.

Reaching the general public will require creative thinking, new genres and communication pathways, and the efforts of our best minds. This expanded work might include open letters to students and parents, two-hundred-word summaries like those published by the New York Times to provide multiple angles on complex stories, memos to decision-making groups on and off campus, print vehicles not yet invented, and any variety of uses of new media.

For academics to effectively engage in this work, promotion and tenure committees must encourage, recognize, and reward it. At present, such work simply “doesn’t count” in promotion and tenure decisions. This must change. We must begin normalizing the idea of public outreach as an essential part of what we do as scholars, researchers, and educators who are in the best position to advocate for public policy related to teaching and learning. Our understanding of scholarship must include not only original research, but also accessible versions of that research for nonspecialized audiences, such as parents, legislators, and students. Research should not be considered complete without this outreach and translation. It is time for promotion and tenure committees to liberate academia’s powerful voices and support the faculty role in providing leadership for social change in America.

As academics, we have a moral and professional responsibility to help shape the public narrative about learning and education in the United States. Our colleges and universities must acknowledge that activities related to this responsibility are vital to our professional identities and must encourage their integration into all aspects of our work. We are experts in higher education, and our voices must be part of the national conversation about its future.
To respond to this article, email liberaled@aacu.org, with the author’s name on the subject line.
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SAVE THE DATES

February 15–17, 2018—Philadelphia
General Education and Assessment: Foundations for Democracy

Keynote
Reimagining General Education: Design Thinking and Intrinsic Motivation Perspectives
Richard K. Miller
Olin College of Engineering

March 22–24, 2018—San Diego
Diversity, Equity, and Inclusive Democracy: The Inconvenient Truths

Keynote
We Gon’ Be Alright: Diversity, Equity, and Resegregation in Higher Education and Beyond
Jeff Chang
Stanford University

To register for the spring Network for Academic Renewal conferences, visit www.aacu.org/conferences.

2018 AAC&U FALL NETWORK FOR ACADEMIC RENEWAL CONFERENCES

October 11–13, 2018—Seattle • Global Engagement and Social Responsibility
November 8–10, 2018—Atlanta • Transforming STEM Higher Education