MORE REASONS FOR HOPE: Diversity Matters in Higher Education
# Table of Contents

**The Evolution of Campus Diversity Work**
Caryn McTighe Musil ................................................................. 1

**Diversity at the Crossroads**
Edgar F. Beckham (1933–2006) .................................................. 9

**Institutional Mission and Ethos**
University of Washington, Seattle, WA ....................................... 19
San Jose State University, San Jose, CA ....................................... 20
Miami-Dade College, Miami, FL ................................................. 21
Emory University, Atlanta, GA .................................................. 22
Buffalo State College, Buffalo, NY ............................................. 23

**Access and Achievement**
Maricopa Community Colleges, Tempe, AZ .................................. 25
Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA .................................. 26
University of California-Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA ............... 27
Whittier College, Whittier, CA .................................................. 28
University of Maryland, Baltimore County, Baltimore, MD .......... 29
Bonner Scholars Program, Princeton, NJ ..................................... 30

**Curricular Designs**
Wheaton College, Norton, MA .................................................. 31
University of Charleston, Charleston, WV .................................. 32
Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR ....................................... 33
The College of St. Catherine, St. Paul, MN .................................. 34
Drury University, Springfield, MO ............................................. 35

**Alliances Between Academic and Student Affairs**
Hope College, Holland, MI ..................................................... 37
University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA .............................. 38
Consortium on High Achievement and Success, Hartford, CT ....... 39
Middlesex Community College, Bedford, MA ............................. 41
Bloomfield College, Bloomfield, NJ .......................................... 42

**Intercultural Relations, Dialogue, and Campus Life**
Duke University, Durham, NC .................................................. 43
University of Missouri-Columbia, Columbia, MO ....................... 44
Occidental College, Los Angeles, CA ........................................ 45
University of Maryland, College Park, MD ................................ 46
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI ..................................... 47

**Engagement with Local and Global Communities**
Saint Mary’s College, Notre Dame, IN ....................................... 49
St. Lawrence University, Canton, NY ......................................... 50
Worcester Polytechnic Institute, Worcester, MA ........................... 51
Dickinson College, Carlisle, PA ................................................ 52
Ohio State University, Columbus, OH ....................................... 53
To Edgar F. Beckham  
(1933–2006)

Consumeate educator, sage, raconteur, and leader

Edgar F. Beckham was senior fellow at AAC&U,  
a former program officer at the Ford Foundation,  
and emeritus dean of the college at Wesleyan University.
“Our nation’s campuses have become a highly visible stage in which the most fundamental questions about difference, equality, and community are being enacted.”

THE DRAMA OF DIVERSITY AND DEMOCRACY
The Evolution of Campus Diversity Work

Caryn McTighe Musil

This volume, the newest in the Making Excellence Inclusive series, is designed not only to take stock of higher education’s progress over the last ten years in deploying diversity to achieve institutional and educational excellence, but also to honor those who have made such progress possible. Few would rank higher in the pantheon than Edgar F. Beckham (1933–2006), to whom the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) lovingly dedicates this publication.

Edgar was the consummate listener, which allowed him to be the consummate storyteller. He paid attention to what campuses were doing and how they defined diversity in its different contexts and meanings. As program officer at the Ford Foundation, he supported diversity practitioners as they invented new ways of thinking, teaching, leading, and acting. He understood he was part of a larger historic movement to bring democracy’s promise of equal opportunity to fruition and to unleash the full riches of formerly excluded or marginalized people, perspectives, and knowledge in order to benefit an otherwise diminished academy.

For those of you who missed the opportunity to meet Edgar Beckham, and for all his many colleagues who mourn his loss, we provide a glimpse of the sweep of his historical knowledge, institutional sophistication, and human wisdom by including in this volume one of his most prescient speeches. Delivered at AAC&U’s 2002 Diversity and Learning conference, the speech examines some of the early campus diversity initiatives centered on race in the 1950s and 1960s, as well as the ever more expansive and complex understanding of diversity that challenges and enriches us today.

Bookends on Campus Diversity Practices

More Reasons for Hope: Diversity Matters in Higher Education (2008) revisits the important points made in an earlier volume, Reasons for Hope: Promising Practices in the Campus Diversity Initiative (1998). Edgar’s insightful voice can also be found in his forward to the 1998 monograph. Both volumes were funded through the generosity of the Ford Foundation, whose leadership in equity, social justice, democracy, and advancing knowledge distinguishes it among foundations within the United States and across the globe. Edgar Beckham served at the Ford Foundation from 1990–1998 where he launched, shaped, and reshaped a new initiative on campus race relations. Within a short period of time, a small and well-defined project evolved into the Campus Diversity Initiative (CDI), a national network that eventually included more than 400 U.S. colleges and universities. By the end of the 1990s, CDI had partnered...
with educators in India and South Africa in comparative investigations of the role that higher education plays in diverse democracies.

The research for this volume, *More Reasons for Hope*, drew from multiple sources to capture a snapshot of what is happening on college campuses today. AAC&U issued a national call for submissions of exemplary programs addressing various dimensions of diversity that are represented in the volume’s six categories. We also drew examples from AAC&U’s comprehensive Web site, DiversityWeb (www.diversityweb.org), which was established in 1996, and from AAC&U’s periodical, *Diversity & Democracy* (formerly called *Diversity Digest* from 1996 to 2007). In 2007, AAC&U also conducted a series of focus groups with senior diversity practitioners and scholars. These sources were supplemented by exemplary programs identified from the association’s sponsored campus-based initiatives, meetings, conferences, and institutes.

**Historical Contexts for the Two Publications**

The initial 1998 volume, *Reasons for Hope*, mapped a period of staggering creativity on campuses during the 1990s which was in turn the culmination of earlier decades of diversity work. Diversity, as defined in *The Drama of Diversity & Democracy* (1995), refers to the variety created in any society (and within any individual) by the presence of different points of view and ways of making meaning that generally flow from the influence of different cultural and religious heritages; from the differences in how we socialize men and women; and from the differences that emerge from class, age, and developed ability.

The end of legal and de facto racial segregation in higher education in the early 1960s became the catalyst for changes that transformed admissions policies, campus climates, and institutional policies, as well as curriculum, pedagogy, and scholarship for the next two decades. By the 1990s, more comprehensive diversity studies evolved from efforts that had first begun with a focus on race in the 1960s. Its template then influenced successive reform efforts, beginning with gender in the 1970s. During the 1980s diversity had come to include analysis of ethnicity, religion, class, disability, gender identity, and the nascent exploration of global issues and cross-cultural identities. Institutional policies and practices in most cases had to run to catch up with the intellectual changes.

Although higher education had been reinvigorated by these new reform movements, it often veered wildly between two oppositional conceptions of excellence and diversity. In the older definition, excellence is defined as exclusive, restricted only to the finest, geared to winnowing out “weaker” students. In the newer definition, excellence is defined as inclusive, and involves expanding the talent pool and committing institutional resources to cultivate all students’ potential. During the early 1990s, the choice was frequently presented as selecting either excellence or diversity. Yet, towards the end of the decade, the majority of colleges and universities began to understand that diversity was not distinct from educational excellence, but integral to achieving it.

*Diversity refers to the variety created in any society (and within any individual) by the presence of different points of view and ways of making meaning that generally flow from the influence of different cultural and religious heritages; from the differences in how we socialize men and women; and from the differences that emerge from class, age, and developed ability.*
More Reasons for Hope seeks to paint a picture of innovations that are rooted in the foundational work featured originally in Reasons for Hope. However, recent progress has coexisted with setbacks, fueled by the fierce backlash against innovations that led to more inclusive colleges and universities. While those who resisted earlier diversity efforts lost the scholarly debate in the 1990s, they began to propose and win various battles against diversity efforts in both state and federal courts, state referendums, and public policy discussions. Their assaults focus primarily on affirmative action, especially policies that increase racial diversity on campuses. The Hopwood Case in Texas, Proposition 209 in California, Initiative 200 in Washington, and the challenge to the University of Michigan’s affirmative action policies case argued before the Supreme Court in 2003 were but a few of the more dramatic collisions of two visions of educational quality. These efforts have had a chilling effect in some settings. The desire to live in a climate of perceived race neutrality and the longing for a color-blind society where race doesn’t matter can actually prevent the necessary investigation of how race, in fact, continues to operate as a powerful, if sometimes subtle, force in society. Nonetheless, the critiques of diversity also stirred a more careful assessment about how to achieve demographic diversity which higher education now understands as critical to its intellectual and institutional viability and vitality.

Institutional Approaches to Diversity

Despite some successes in the efforts to challenge affirmative action, higher education leaders understand more than ever that diversity is essential if institutions are to achieve their educational and civic missions. New imperatives to explore the global contexts of education have also made diversity work all the more urgent and compelling. In truth, new admissions restrictions challenge only selective institutions that have competitive admissions policies. The majority of colleges and universities educate nearly all the students who come through their doors, including the 40 percent of students who begin their studies in community colleges or pursue their degrees at public and private institutions with mandates to serve specific local populations. The impact of these trends runs the risk of intensifying an already stratified educational hierarchy.

The section that follows on Access and Achievement reveals how inventively highly selective colleges have accommodated new restrictions, while continuing to create new pathways and expanded infrastructures to guarantee access and success for new students. With access still highly stratified by race, ethnicity, and income, it is widely agreed that we are still not doing enough. But commitment to reach out to the underserved students continues to build within the academy.

Today, emphasis has shifted to an examination of how poorly higher education is doing in graduating new students. With 53 percent of entering college students in need of remedial classes, higher education increasingly takes responsibility for helping all students to achieve at their highest levels. Instead of just measuring success by retention and graduation rates, AAC&U and other leaders insist that all students
should also graduate with a full range of capabilities that will properly serve them and others well in the communities in which they live and work.

Despite some external setbacks, diversity work has evolved and carries a more far-reaching institutional impact. For instance, it is now more common to have diversity initiatives appear in strategic plans and extend beyond matters of compositional or demographic diversity. Some institutions are on their third and fourth generation of campuswide diversity plans. Many are raising the bar even higher as they deploy diversity as a resource across all domains of the institution.

The most advanced diversity efforts now define diversity as both an end, in and of itself, and also a means for the institution to reach its own highest aspirations and meet its multiple obligations to students and society. This is reflected in the evolving positions for chief diversity officer. These new hires often are made at the vice president and vice provost level, report directly to the president, and function as part of the leadership team that shapes all institutional policies and initiatives. To create greater coherence and coordination for the many campus diversity initiatives, campuswide diversity councils are visible parts of some administrative infrastructures. Overall, diversity is more commonly seen as the responsibility of the whole community rather than the purview of a single office or person.

In order to capture the evolution of diversity as it moves from being seen as an isolated, self-contained initiative to an institution-wide catalyst for educational excellence, AAC&U framed its twenty-first-century diversity work as Making Excellence Inclusive. The phrase recognizes the importance of integrating diversity and educational quality efforts, of locating these undertakings within the core purposes and functioning of institutions, and of anchoring the enterprise in student and academic achievement. Making Diversity Work on Campus: A Research-Based Perspective (2005) underscores how important it is that such diversity efforts be informed by the available research and theory which have been developed in the past decade or more.

**Emerging Themes**

Since the publication of More Reasons for Hope in 1998, new themes have begun to emerge as campuses weave together complex tapestries of current campus diversity work. Below are a few of the most prominent innovations.

**Research and assessment:** A major change since the last decade is the availability of new research about the impact of diversity on different dimensions of college learning, including intellectual and moral development, and civic understandings and commitments. Such research underscores the value of having a single mode of seeing the world disrupted. This can be prompted by experiences in local or global communities with people whose background differs dramatically from most campus profiles or courses structured so that different perspectives are routinely explored as part of classroom interactions. With more intentionally cultivated diverse environments, the resulting disequilibrium accelerates cognitive and moral development. There is also a new investment in institutional research and a new emphasis on tracking how students are
faring across groups and within different departments and programs. Assessment is now providing new information about what works, for whom, and under what conditions, whether in campus life, the classroom, governance structures, or institutional policies.

**Diversity within professions:** Diversity courses, in their earlier and more recent manifestations, remain firmly rooted within general education. Even so, many institutions have fortunately slipped out of the straight jacket of the single diversity course into broader arrays of general education courses that do not necessarily have diversity in their titles. But the newest direction for diversity work has emerged in preprofessional majors like nursing, allied health professions, and public health. All these majors have a deep consciousness of how diversity affects their fields — in areas such as health care treatment, research, public policies, and health care solutions. Diversity as a goal for learning also surfaced as well in other preprofessional fields such as engineering, where associations such as the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET) insist on diversity education as an essential component of the engineering major. Business leaders were among diversity’s most staunch allies in the amicus briefs submitted to the Supreme Court in the Michigan case, and that is reflected in the way business majors are now prepared to work effectively in diverse teams; meet the needs of diverse clients and markets; and become engaged in their diverse communities where firms do business, both locally and globally.

**Global engagement and learning:** The need for a global framework in the curriculum has emerged as one of the more pressing concerns of higher education. The newly recognized global context for all work and for many societal challenges has prompted many institutions to include mission statements that call for educating students for the global economy and/or global citizenship. What had previously been restricted to study abroad, language acquisition, or area studies is now bursting out of those more limited arenas to influence general education programs and professional and liberal arts and sciences disciplines. In *Shared Futures: Global Learning and Liberal Education*, Kevin Hovland cites an AAC&U Mellon-funded study that revealed there are far more rhetorical aspirations articulated than coherent curricular opportunities created. Nonetheless, there is growing investment in faculty and curricular development to begin addressing this embarrassing gap. Unfortunately, the persistent fear is that attending to global learning will: (1) consume a disproportionate amount of institutional resources to the detriment of U.S. diversity work; (2) deflect attention from unaddressed inequities at home; (3) lead to hiring international faculty instead of also hiring faculty of color from the U.S.; and (4) erase social justice perspectives as diversity, as it were, “goes global.”

While Edgar Beckham’s speech acknowledges that these fears must be addressed, he also cautions that to see U.S. and global diversity as purely oppositional is one of the most dangerous barriers to continuing progress. There is some evidence that more institutions are beginning to see interconnections and complementary insights across their U.S. diversity programs and their global learning efforts. Some in our focus groups noticed that global scholarship and courses were increasingly attending to social and political issues of inequality, poverty, gender discrimination, health disparities,
and sustainability, thus providing many points of comparison with the work of U.S. diversity. The global study of human migration has, for example, also provided common ground through the study of new immigrant populations within U.S. borders. Postcolonial international scholars also focus on power, subjugation, and struggles for freedom that interact with U.S. diversity scholars. Such crosscutting investigations are likely to be fertile ground for reconceptualizing both fields of study.

Civic engagement and involvement in local and global communities: A twin whirlwind of activity matching global learning is found in what is commonly called the civic engagement movement. The move to create strong academic programs that match the cocurricular and student-led community service activities and the development of new infrastructures for civic work, are distinguishing hallmarks of the most recent decade. There are multiple streams of leadership and activity feeding this acceleration: those interested in democracy building, those committed to serving people in need, those seeking to understand and solve systemic sources of inequalities, and those who see in this work continuity with their own familial and community stories. There is a natural correspondence between civic work and diversity work, but the two typically operate as if they were in parallel universes. Such a situation weakens the potential of each movement.

Good news however, is found in the growing efforts to connect these two fields. Diversity practitioners believe their work is civic work. Leaders in the diversity movement seek to hold our U.S. democracy accountable for its espoused values and align principles and practices. Similarly, civic engagement leaders believe their work addresses the inequities that mar local and global communities and that they can help students apply what they are learning to help solve these persistent dilemmas. AAC&U’s publication *Diversity & Democracy* features institutions that have successfully integrated the two paradigms with extraordinary results in terms of student learning, faculty development, and community enrichment. We expect to see more integration across these educational reform efforts in the coming decade.

Multiplicity and intersectionality: If diversity in the 1990s was challenging for some people to understand, diversity in the first decade of the twenty-first century can be staggeringly complex. It causes headaches for bureaucrats who rely on neat, clean categories and it tests the power of institutions to create workable policies related to diversity and group differences. But then, human beings in their historic and contemporary contexts are at the core of all diversity investigations, and have always carried many complex, fluid identities. As a national diversity practitioner said when she moved from a national office to a campus to be its chief diversity officer, “This is really hard work to implement on the ground.” (AAC&U Focus Group 2007)

All people are diverse in their lived experiences, and, as such, carry within themselves multiple identities across many dimensions, share multiple legacies from many different sources, and inherit and choose to be part of multiple kinds of communities. New scholarship is exploring this complexity with increasing sophistication and translating it into curricular structures that are more comparative.
and integrative as they explore intersections across race, class, gender, religion, sexual identity, ethnicity and other differences. As Edgar Beckham argues in the following essay, “When diversity education pays adequate attention to both difference and unifying context, difference and commonality reinforce each other.”

**Remaining Challenge for the Coming Decade**

Presently, there is an overriding challenge for higher education. How do we create educational pathways that prepare students from different contexts to be the new citizen leaders and creative entrepreneurial employees so necessary to meet the economic, social, and political needs of the new global century?

As AAC&U has documented in its 2007 LEAP report, *College Learning for the New Global Century*, there is broad consensus about what capacities students must have to accomplish this agenda. Graduates will need a broad knowledge of and curiosity about the history, cultural traditions, and productivity of humanity both here and abroad. They will need the cognitive complexity to address difficult problems in ethical and socially sophisticated ways. And they will need to be complex thinkers who recognize inequality when it exists and the dangers it poses to building democracies and effective communities. Importantly, students will need to recognize the limits of their current knowledge and understand how, where, and from whom to gather the information they require. Finally, they will need the intercultural competencies and commitments to, as Maxine Greene states, strive to achieve “an awareness of a world lived in common with others.” Diversity education can be a means to achieve these goals, and in the next decade, higher education needs to deploy it wisely in order to succeed. *More Reasons for Hope* chronicles the work of campuses that are figuring out how to undertake that ambitious agenda of making excellence inclusive.

**References**


“Education is the great engine of personal development. It is through education that the daughter of a peasant can become a doctor, that the son of a mineworker can become the head of the mine, that a child of farm workers can become the president of a great nation. It is what we make out of what we have, not what we are given, that separates one person from another.”

NELSON MANDELA
Diversity at the Crossroads: 
Mapping Our Work in the Years Ahead

Edgar F. Beckham (1933–2006)

(First presented as a plenary on October 27, 2002, at AAC&U’s conference, Diversity and Learning: Education for a World Lived in Common)

My first conscious encounter with diversity as a concept occurred in the mid-sixties, shortly after Wesleyan University, my alma mater and then current employer, made the fateful decision to enroll a substantial number of students of color, mainly African Americans. A number of black students (including me) had matriculated into Wesleyan in the past, but their enrollment had not resulted from an affirmative decision to make enrollment at Wesleyan sensitive to race. That fact changed in 1965 when Wesleyan, for the first time, enrolled a cohort of African American students whose admission had been influenced in an affirmative way by race. Now let me be clear. My admission, I am certain, was influenced by my race, but it was not an affirmative admission. It was to some extent negative and to some extent exemplary. That is, I was admitted despite my race, AND because I was expected to set an example. This is not speculation on my part. I can infer it from one of the questions I was asked in my interview, and I was told it explicitly by my high school principal, a Wesleyan alumnus who had hovered over my application from start to finish.

Things were different in 1965. Affirmative admission carried with it a set of expectations. These students were expected to constitute a distinctly black presence at Wesleyan, to assert a black identity, to establish a black perspective, to provide a point of contrast with the Wesleyan that had existed before they got there. Implicitly, they were expected to change Wesleyan, and they did so, profoundly and for the better.

To its credit, Wesleyan attempted quite early in the process to move the discourse on its affirmative admission policy from the realm of social justice to that of education. That’s when the term “diversity” was introduced. Black students were being admitted because they enriched Wesleyan’s diversity, and diversity — as was well known — was good for education. In an address to a group of Wesleyan alumni, the dean of admissions put it succinctly: “Wesleyan needs black students,” he said, “in order to educate white students.”
As you might imagine, his comment was not popular among black students. In fact, they were offended by it. What a perversion of the social justice impulse it was, they thought, to bring black students to Wesleyan for the benefit of privileged white students.

For my part, I was annoyed by the substitution of the term “diversity” for the goal of admitting black students. The term seemed to diffuse the urgency of the desired social justice outcome. It was a euphemism, I thought, designed to duck the real issue. But it worked as a tactic, and as black, Hispanic, and then Asian and Asian-American enrollment grew, and opposition to it fell mute, I resigned myself to “diversity” as an artful term of necessity.

Mediating Deficits of the Term “Diversity”
That is one of the enduring legacies that continue to burden the term “diversity,” at least in higher education circles. The legacy has three elements. First, there is the suspicion that diversity is used to avoid a tough confrontation with racism, our own if we’re white; yours if we’re not. Many people want that confrontation, some because they want to vent their righteous anger; some because they hope for a catharsis that will clear the soul as well as the air, and create a platform from which we can launch initiatives aimed at healing, reconciliation, and a mutuality that would adorn a world lived in common.

The second deficit that “diversity” still carries is the suspicion that the term serves as a prism that deflects our focus completely onto those newly admitted into our midst. Diversity viewed through this prism is not all of us; it’s those of us who are not like the real us. Our students of color give us our diversity; we do not. This is the more severe distortion, for it makes of diversity a term that divides, reifies separation, and builds barriers between people who belong together.

The third deficit has its source in the specific social history of the United States. We know that the American past created the present problem, which gives the problem a decidedly American cast. We are inclined to urge, therefore, that we address diversity as a domestic challenge: one that belongs in our American house, a challenge that ought to define American identity. And we have grown skeptical of those who would locate the diversity challenge in a world of global concerns. Global citizenship, we fear, is a vehicle for skipping blithely over the unfinished business of finding and realizing America.

Some observers have suggested that the term “diversity” is so burdened that it should be abandoned in favor of pluralism, multiculturalism, global citizenship, or perhaps a neologism not yet invented. I disagree, and I would argue — along with an old teacher of mine — that abandoning a good word like diversity impoverishes the language and diminishes our capacity to communicate. I advocate a different course. Let us take control of diversity and its definition; let us make it mean what we mean, let us wipe out its deficits and replace them with constructions of meaning that serve as assets to understanding, not merely passive assets, but performing ones that build our capacity to make a world we can live in common.

Let us take control of diversity and its definition; let us make it mean what we mean, let us wipe out its deficits and replace them with constructions of meaning that serve as assets to understanding, not merely passive assets, but performing ones that make a world we can live in common.
This is a relatively new task for me. When I left Wesleyan in 1990 and joined the Ford Foundation to guide its newly established Campus Diversity Initiative, I had virtually no conceptual understanding of diversity. I knew diversity only experientially through my experience at Wesleyan. And so, when I was first asked by a very professorial colleague at the foundation what I meant by diversity, I fumbled for an answer in such sophomoric fashion that my distress lasted for days. I determined, largely on the basis of that experience, that I should look for ways to engage diversity without first defining it. As I was writing a paper on the campus diversity initiative that was to be vetted by the foundation’s board of trustees, I hit upon the avoidance formula I would use. I asserted in the paper that rather than define diversity prematurely, the foundation should listen attentively to the conversations that occur when diversity is invoked. It would then be in a position to say what diversity means to those who talk about it, which would most likely provide a more felicitous basis for stating what diversity should mean to the foundation.

The formula worked, perhaps because it made sense in at least two respects. First, it called upon the foundation to draw its understandings of diversity from the field rather than impose its preformed notions on the field. Second, it gave the foundation an opportunity to examine the experience of institutions that had been grappling with diversity issues for years.

**Tensions Between Educational and Social Justice Aims**

As the foundation followed this suggested course of listening, what became apparent was that the conversations about diversity were themselves thematically diverse. Diversity was a matter of demographics for one group, of social justice for another, of American democracy for a third, and of education for a fourth. Each of these themes could be divided into subthemes. The themes and sub-themes could be combined in a variety of configurations. For example, there were often rich discussions of how to manage diversity in an educational environment that was undergoing rapid demographic change.

While the combining power of these themes often led to discussions that were blended productively, the differences among them often led to tension and conflict. Take education and social justice, for example. They look and sound rather compatible, until, that is, one identifies the intended beneficiaries. Some advocates of social justice argue that efforts in behalf of diversity should be targeted to benefit those who have been oppressed, deprived, and disadvantaged by the discriminatory practices of the past. The historically privileged may indeed benefit, but mainly by acknowledging their guilty responsibility for the original injustice. The notion that diversity education should benefit every learner is offensive to some who think of social justice as a correction of past wrongs. That was a primary source of the anger of black students at Wesleyan over the suggestion that they were there to educate white students. That is, they were offended by the suggestion that they were there to do what they were indeed doing.
This tension between the educational and social justice aims of action in support of diversity continues to this day, and in my view, it is one of the most serious impediments to progress on diversity. The tension is most pernicious when it leads an advocate of one aspiration to discount the value of the other. Take, for example, the observation, made to me just a few days ago, that instruction on diversity should be aimed at the disadvantaged, not the privileged. Creating that kind of a division is perverse not merely because it transposes advantage and disadvantage in an almost vengeful way, but rather more importantly because it construes education as a zero-sum enterprise incapable of contributing to the growth and development of diverse students in differentiated ways.

Diversity as Difference and Inclusive Context

Perhaps this is as good a time as any to pause and make a couple of observations about what we ought to mean by diversity — that is, the meanings we as diversity practitioners in higher education should advocate. First and foremost, we should insist that while diversity denotes difference, it connotes inclusive context, and the context is potentially unifying. Ironically, the dictionary doesn't help us much with this analysis.

Usage helps us more. If I suggest that Americans are different, I may mean that they differ from Indians or South Africans. But if I say that Americans are diverse, it is clear that I mean two things: they differ from each other, and they are all Americans. I think we need to work harder to emphasize these two dimensions of diversity simultaneously: to insist on both the denotation and connotation of the term, to reject the notion that it focuses simply on difference.

The educational implications of this observation are quite far-reaching. If we neglect diversity as inclusive context, we are very likely to neglect the educational needs of some of our students. We may justify our neglect by invoking the need to redress past wrongs, to focus on the needs of the historically oppressed, but that, in my judgment, simply introduces a new form of oppression. Exchanging one target for another is not a proper aim of diversity education.

But even more importantly, or perhaps more ominously, the neglect of context can blind us to the productive complexity of the teaching–learning process. Let’s suppose we are teaching African American history and are seeking thereby to enrich the self-understanding of our African American students. That is indeed a worthy goal, but it is not the only goal, even if all our students are African American. Our students, regardless of the racial/ethnic mix, will position themselves differently in relation to the subject matter. Their positionality will affect what and how they learn, and what they do with that learning subsequently. If we neglect positionality, ignore where people “are at” and where they “are coming from,” we drastically diminish the potential power of education.

When I was seventeen, some high school buddies took me to the Jewish Community Center, where I joined a class in which my friends were being instructed in the enactment of a ritual Passover meal. I listened, I watched, and I learned. But my learning was very
different from theirs, because, as a non-Jew, my perspective and my prospects were different. I was viewing the ritual as a respectful Christian, having little need to know what they were learning and no need to do what they were being trained for. Years later, it occurred to me that while they had received Jewish training, I may have been getting a Jewish education, that is, learning to remember the past in behalf of the future. Just think for a moment what kind of education it might have been had the instructor rejected me, signaled through word, gesture, or attitude, that his instruction was exclusive, meant for the Jewish guys, but not for me.

Inclusive education is good because it’s just, but also because it teaches more and teaches it better. Exclusive education, on the other hand, is abusive and corrupt. When diversity education pays adequate attention to both difference and unifying context, difference and commonality reinforce each other.

About four years ago, the Ford Foundation sponsored the second in a series of three seminars on diversity in higher education that involved representatives from India, South Africa, and the United States — at that time the largest, the youngest, and the oldest democracies in the world. All were grappling with the ominous challenge of diversity. The seminar was held in South Africa, and at one of its most memorable sessions we heard an address by Albie Sachs, a justice of South Africa’s highest court. Justice Sachs talked about his life, about growing up in a family of radical social activists, a Jewish family that taught him early in life that he was different and the same. He described his work in opposition to apartheid, and the assassination-attempt bombing that crippled his body and strengthened his resolve to help build a new South Africa in which everyone could be different and the same. He returned again and again to that phrase until it was imprinted on the minds of his listeners that we are all different and the same.

Justice Sachs’ pronouncement that we are different and the same has deepened my conviction concerning the value of diversity and the meaning we should attach to it.

In our diversity, we are different and the same. In South Africa, apartheid arranged society so that difference was in an unequal war with sameness — and difference won. And its victory was so lopsided that even the basic understanding of diversity as a concept suffered a grievous defeat. The notion of a unifying South African context was submerged. The triumphant understanding glorified what it called cultural difference by imposing a rigid hierarchy of access to rights and resources. To this day some South Africans are suspicious of the term diversity because of the perverse way in which it was used to support oppressive separation.

In other words, the pursuit of social justice does not, by itself, protect us from this kind of distortion of the meaning of diversity. On the contrary, if we view social justice exclusively as redress of past wrongs and not as an inclusive condition in which we all seek to live a world in common, we run the risk of defeating ourselves and creating new injustice. We must remember two things — that diversity is inclusive of difference, and that inclusive education pursues justice.
Tensions Between Domestic and Global Diversity

I mentioned earlier that I considered this tension between the educational and social justice aims of diversity to be another serious impediment to progress. The other is the tension between what I will call domestic and global diversity. Now part of this tension is ordinary and probably permanent. It’s the simple and straightforward competition for resources. It’s important, it needs to be dealt with, but it will most likely not be overcome. What we need to do is acknowledge the competition and manage it productively.

But the competition for resources is not the issue I wish to address. I am much more concerned about our failure to appreciate the complementarities of domestic and global concerns, and about our tendency again to discount the value of one in our effort to promote the other.

As I have suggested, some advocates of attention to the American context fear that global considerations will be at best a distraction, most likely a drain, and at worst a vehicle for avoidance of urgent American concerns. On the other side, advocates of global engagement suspect that the focus on American concerns is yet another example of American incapacity to see beyond its navel. The argument is often made that Americans think their way is the only way, and that their efforts to craft approaches to American diversity really seek to manufacture yet another American export. This tendency was evident in the tri-national discussions at the three seminars I mentioned earlier. Throughout the meetings there was an undercurrent of suspicion that what the Americans were really after was hegemony of their vocabulary, their formulation of the problem, their approach to solutions.

The Americans tried to defend themselves, but we often sounded like white people saying they are not really racists. In other words, we were defending ourselves personally against a structural accusation. Now I won’t go so far as to suggest that personal racism is irrelevant, but I will say that I would be prepared to tolerate lots of it if I could rid our American institutions and structures of the racism embedded in them. And I am also prepared to acknowledge that whether or not I personally want my American values and understandings to prevail throughout the world is trivial in comparison to the overwhelming influence of the United States in the world, and its structural tendency to impose its values, tastes, products, and predilections unthinkingly and insensitively on a world without the power to oppose them.

But there is confusion here, and, I think, an intellectual error. An international business consultant once asked me to explain the difference between a multinational corporation and a global one. Knowing that I would politely ask him for the answer, he paused only briefly and provided it. A multinational, he explained, is viewed as multinational only in the country of its origin; everywhere else it is viewed as national. A global corporation, on the other hand, has learned that it must understand the character of its original national culture in order to enter into respectful and productive relationships with global partners.
Now isn’t that one of the most important lessons we’ve learned from our work on diversity — that it is not merely a matter of getting to know the other, but rather most likely begins with knowing ourselves? What has been the most insistent American question since September 11, 2001? What does it mean to be an American? I would argue that that is the first iteration of an ultimately global question, and that if we insist on polarization between the domestic and global dimensions of diversity, we will miss the developmental process that the international business consultant was referring to. We will miss the need to know ourselves, indeed, to proceed from self in the direction of wider worlds in which we can be different and the same, worlds we can live in common with others.

I know this will sound pretentious, but I think it was in collaboration with my mother that I improved upon Descartes’ famous dictum: I think, therefore I am. I know he was wrong, because I was, long before I ever thought I was. But here’s the right answer: my mother thinks, therefore I am. I would ask you to pay close attention to my choice of words. I am not suggesting that I owe my existence to my mother’s being, or to her nurturance, but rather to her thought, to her deliberate — or as we like to say in educational circles — intentional structuring of worlds that I could enter safely and learn to be different and the same, or to put it another way, to enter into respectful and productive partnerships across lines of difference.

One of my favorite stories about my mother has to do with the world of black heroes she created for me. It was inhabited by Phyllis Wheatley, Sojourner Truth, Harriet Tubman, and Mary McLeod Bethune. There were some men, too, like Crispus Attucks, Toussaint L’Ouverture, and Frederick Douglass, who supplied my middle name. My mother, whose favorite course in high school had been elocution, communicated to me who was in this world of heroes not by the content of her speech, but by its rhetorical register: the pitch of her voice was slightly raised, the vowel sounds were longer, the intonation of sentences tilted upward, she seemed to sing her words. One day — I must have been five or six years old — she shifted into the special register and began to talk about a familiar name. I was confused, but the power of her patterns of speech was so overwhelming that I asked her without hesitation if President Roosevelt’s wife was a Negro. She chuckled good-naturedly and said, “No, she’s not.” My mind spun, and reached the congenial conclusion that the communication system was still intact, indeed, the world of heroes was intact and needed only a slight adjustment to admit a white woman like Eleanor Roosevelt. By the way, neither her husband made it, nor did any other white man I can remember.

My mother transported me into other worlds too. For instance, there were the frequent field trips to other Congregational churches in the Greater Hartford area. Since ours was the only black Congregational church in that part of Connecticut, our trips took us to white churches that seemed strange and discomfiting at first, but which I learned to negotiate by following her admonition that we not all sit together. I think hers was a calculated strategy, an orchestration of ventures into safe spaces that would allow me to explore and discover myself, to be different and the same.
We need to explore more worlds. We need to discover our own humanity in distant places, learn to be different and the same. We need to engage global concerns from the vantage of ourselves and learn to live a world in common. To do so, we need to understand more deeply and richly who we are, in all our multiple dimensions, which include in a most consequential way, our national identity — for many of us, as Americans.

Identity, Social History, and the Teaching of Diversity
Let me dwell on the word “consequential” for a moment. You may recall that in the Hopwood case in which the University of Texas’ use of race as a criterion for admission to its law school was successfully challenged, at least one judge commented that race and gender should be no more relevant than height or weight. I thought the comment made sense if one considered height, weight, race, and gender as incidental biological characteristics without correlation with educational qualifications. But the picture changes when one asks about social consequences that have unfolded through history.

All four of these characteristics have been consequential socially, but certainly race and gender have had the most far-reaching, compelling, destructive, and costly consequences in American history.

I think there are two educational points that need to be made here. The first is that the consequences of diversity have history — history that needs to be taught; and second, that the more powerful the consequences have been, the more powerful their histories can be as educational resources.

That brings me to my final point. The teaching of diversity is the most effective resource we have for overcoming the deficits of diversity and realizing its power. The teaching of diversity can model the very attitudes, skills, and capacities we want to convey to our students. Through the teaching of diversity, they can learn to value diversity as difference in a unifying context, learn to be productively different and the same, move confidently and respectfully among the domains of their experience, and ultimately live a world in common with others.

We have already discovered and created strategies and methodologies for pursuing diversity education in the classroom. They include, among others, the use of personal narrative to encourage students to invest themselves in their own learning, the establishment of dialogue groups that serve as safe venues for exploration and encounter, and the invocation of spiritual values to encourage students to see beyond the limits of the assumptions they receive from their home traditions. We need to redouble our efforts to make these strategies and methodologies more visible and more useful. And we can do so by increasing our emphasis on diversity as an educational resource.

The primary question put to institutions regarding diversity still remains, “How much diversity do you have?” A secondary question is, “How well are your ‘diversity’ students achieving and how comfortable do they feel in your institution?” I want us to modify the second question and create a third. We must, of course, get rid of the notion that our diversity students are a subset of our students and replace it with the
conviction that our diversity students are all our students. Then we must add the third question, “What are you doing educationally with the diversity you’ve got? How are you using it intentionally as an educational resource? And how are these uses benefitting all your students?”

I would like to conclude my remarks, characteristically, in the form of a story. In May of 1999, I was visiting in Germany at the home of close friends. One day, I had a conversation with their daughter Tina, who was studying at the Academy of Fine Arts in Stuttgart. During the course of our conversation, which had focused in part on Tina’s struggle to keep her German identity intact in the face of glib condemnations by other Europeans who assumed she must be a Nazi, I asked her if she felt responsible for the Holocaust. She said, “Yes.” I asked, “Why?” “On behalf of my parents and grandparents,” she answered. That’s when I took issue with her, suggesting that I agreed with her acknowledgement of responsibility, but disagreed with her reason, not only because I knew that neither of her parents were born when Hitler came to power, nor because I was personally familiar with the sentiments of her grandparents, but rather because I firmly reject the notion of intergenerational transfer of guilt. Her responsibility, I suggested, was to connect her German identity to German social history and to craft honest history at the crossroads where her identity and social history intersect. In other words, she was not the “perp,” she was the historian.

…I would like to ask you to pursue [this line of inquiry], to encourage students in whatever venues you and they share, to think about their identities and simultaneously about the social histories with which their identities intersect. Their identities are of course multiple, and will include race, ethnicity, and gender, and also class, religion, and national identity. I once asked a group of Indian students to explore this in a workshop, and they faltered until several high-caste professors admonished them to consider the intersection of their caste-identities with the social history of India. Then they got it.

I wish I were teaching again and could try this for myself. I think it could be developed into a powerful pedagogy that answers the question, “What are you doing educationally with diversity?” and would also realize some of the power of diversity as an educational resource.

Like everyone else associated with AAC&U, I consider myself an advocate of liberal education and, for me, the function of liberal education is to liberate. To liberate us all from both oppression and privilege, from unexamined assumptions, from passivity in the living of our lives, from ignorance of ourselves and others; to free us for the pursuit of a world lived in common. Our diversity is our pathway to liberation.
“An idea that is developed and put into action is more important than an idea that exists only as an idea.”

SIDDHARTHA GAUTAMA (BUDDHA)
Institutional Mission and Ethos

Embedding diversity within the guiding mission and ethos of a college or university is one revealing indicator of the institution’s level of commitment to diversity. The most common references to diversity in early mission statements were limited specifically to diverse students or what has come to be called compositional diversity. In the past decade or more, as the intellectual, educational, and civic implications of diversity’s broad sweep became clearer, so did the language used in mission statements, college catalogues, and campus self-promotional materials. Matching the expansion of the language were the attempts to embody those espoused ideals in a set of everyday practices — practices that translate into a campus ethos. Research shows that institutions that value diversity in their educational mission have a positive impact on promoting understanding across different campus identity groups and facilitating academic and personal success for students, staff, and faculty.

It is common now for diversity to be incorporated in multiple places within strategic plans, and several large public flagship institutions are already on their third generation of overarching campus plans to create more inclusive institutions. Because of the plethora of diversity initiatives, another recent trend is to create new high level cabinet positions such as the chief diversity officer to coordinate and provide high profile leadership. Diversity councils, new research centers, civic engagement centers, and centers for excellence are other institutional structures through which diversity is being addressed more pervasively. All of this progress, however, is against a backdrop of the erosion of legal and legislative protections as colleges and universities try to move towards becoming more inclusive institutions. At such moments, the courage and commitment of top academic leaders from presidents to provosts, and from deans to chairs and directors can reaffirm a campus ethos that embraces diversity as a means of achieving excellence, ensuring opportunity, and preparing responsible local and global citizens.

University of Washington, Seattle, WA

In the 1990s, as the lead institution in a Seattle-based educational partnership funded by the Ford Foundation’s Campus Diversity Initiative, the University of Washington became a major site for understanding how to transform higher education to reach a more comprehensive level of institutional diversity. With the guidance of the Ford Foundation’s program officer Edgar Beckham, this initiative helped the university conceptualize diversity as an educational resource and implement promising educational innovations. The University of Washington was propelled once again toward greater innovations in 1998 when legislation was passed that eliminated the use of race, gender, and national origin in admission, public education services, and employment in state institutions. While focused first and foremost on increasing the diversity of the student body through
enhanced outreach, recruitment, and retention, this new effort also resulted in a series of widespread organizational change initiatives.

To bring greater coherence and coordination to its many campus diversity initiatives, a University Diversity Council was formed in 2001 to guide the change process. The council consists of representatives from all administrative units, colleges, and schools, serving as the primary mechanism for communication, dissemination of best practices, and assessment. Under the leadership of the vice president for minority affairs and vice provost for diversity, the university embarked on a comprehensive institutional diversity appraisal. All 150 academic and administrative units were charged to identify specific ways diversity is integrated into their academic mission with a focus on eight areas: student access and opportunities, student development and retention, engagement with the external community, staff and administrative diversity, faculty diversity, curriculum, research, and climate.

This assessment of diversity practices resulted in a recommitment by university leadership and the development of new strategies to ensure the University of Washington remains an inclusive campus. Results of the assessment were compiled in a diversity appraisal report, which provided highlights of best practices, ongoing challenges, and recommendations. The report mobilized the university at the highest levels. President Mark Emmert reiterated his commitment by stating, “We must continue to build a multicultural academic community because it is an inherent ingredient in an excellent education.” Additionally, the board of deans formed a diversity committee, making diversity central to the academic mission of the university.

Most schools and colleges at the University of Washington have created diversity task forces or appointed diversity officers. The administration created two new positions: a diversity specialist to oversee staff diversity and an associate vice provost for faculty advancement. There is also a leadership, community, and values initiative intended to improve the university climate, a new Diversity Research Institute, and the highly regarded fifteen-year-old Center for Curriculum Transformation. As an indicator of further progress, diversity has become central to the institutional planning process, with goals and metrics established in the university’s new five-year plan.

San Jose State University, San Jose, CA
San Jose State University (SJSU) is committed to creating a diverse community guided by core values of inclusion, civility, and respect for each individual. One of SJSU’s six shared values is its commitment to a campus climate that values diversity. SJSU’s shared value regarding diversity states: “We value and respect diversity, inclusion, civility, and individual uniqueness and recognize the strength these factors bring to our community and learning environment. All of our interactions should reflect trust, caring, and mutual respect.” In order to create an environment supportive of this value, SJSU infuses diversity concepts in
a wide range of areas including: curricula, student support services, access and retention, and assessment.

SJSU’s curricular design is intended to engage students with U.S. and global diversity at multiple levels, in various disciplines, and over the course of their studies at the institution. There has been a diversity content objective across the general education curriculum in all courses since 1998. According to the 2005 guidelines for the general education curriculum, courses may incorporate issues of diversity in one of two ways: (1) the experiences of diverse peoples may be topical issues of discussion and analysis; or (2) diversity may be considered through the contributions of diverse individuals and populations to the material under study.

To make sure that SJSU’s commitment to diversity extends beyond the classroom, the institution provides students a wide range of programs and activities to ensure success. For instance, the educational opportunity program (EOP) that serves 1,100 new students each year is a long-established SJSU effort. It provides support in college preparation and admission, navigating first-year experiences, and ensuring overall academic success for students who historically have faced educational and financial challenges. EOP is administered through student affairs but conducted collaboratively with academic affairs.

Two other key initiatives focus on access and assessment. To ensure that SJSU provides access to underrepresented students, the institution has underwritten extensive grant-funded initiatives to create sustainable partnerships with a wide range of local schools and school districts, with the goal to encourage students from backgrounds underrepresented in college campuses to become college ready. In addition, student affairs has in place an assessment program that evaluates how SJSU programs and services have enhanced student appreciation for diversity. The assessment program also evaluates how students, in some contexts, are increasing proficiencies in interpersonal communication or transcultural appreciation and comfort.

**MIAMI-DADE COLLEGE, MIAMI, FL**

Miami-Dade College (MDC) has the largest undergraduate enrollment of any college in the nation, with the largest Hispanic and the third largest African American student enrollment. MDC students come from more than 170 countries and speak over ninety different languages. More than half of MDC students are the first in their families to attend college. The mission of MDC is to provide accessible, affordable, high-quality education by keeping the learner’s needs at the center of decision-making and working in partnership with its dynamic, multicultural community. The 2004–2010 strategic plan, which was developed by faculty, staff, administration, and students, centers on five themes related to the college’s mission and vision: access to the college, student achievement and success, serving the community, resource development and utilization, and employees and the college. The value of diversity is interwoven in all five themes, but most distinctly in the themes of access to the college, student achievement and success, and employees and the college.
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MDC’s eight campuses and two major outreach centers aim to reach students in underserved areas of Miami-Dade county. MDC offers associate and baccalaureate degree options in over 200 major areas of study as well as vocational, technical, and basic skills programs. MDC has more than sixty academic transfer agreements with colleges and universities across the country, and graduates transfer to some of the nation’s most prestigious institutions. Access to college courses is enhanced by MDC’s flexible schedule options, convenient locations, and “virtual college,” which enable nontraditional students who have family obligations or physical disabilities to take fully accredited courses.

MDC works to ensure success in each discipline by identifying the barriers faced by their diverse and nontraditional students and implementing strategies to overcome them. MDC is committed to serve underprepared students, as only 25 percent of incoming students test as “college-ready,” with the majority needing college preparatory coursework in reading, writing, algebra, English language skills, or some combination of these proficiencies. Creating collaboration between faculty and students is critical to ensuring students’ success and a variety of programs, such as service learning, learning communities, and student success courses, aim to do just that. The faculty at MDC has identified ten learning outcomes that are covered in all programs and the college is engaged in authentic assessment and curricular mapping to ensure that all students attain these critical outcomes.

MDC has one of the most diverse faculties and aims to continue that tradition by employing a workforce that represents the Miami-Dade community. As of fall 2007, 73 percent of MDC’s full-time employees are ethnic minorities and 56 percent are female.

With these innovations, MDC has taken on the challenge of educating the most diverse group of students in the nation. A clear and inclusive institutional mission and strategic plan aim to elevate awareness and educational achievement, enabling students, faculty, administrators, and the rest of the MDC to become a community of engaged intentional learners.

**Emory University, Atlanta, GA**

In spring 2005, Emory University devised the Transforming Community Project (TCP), a five-year effort to engage faculty, staff, students, and alumni in conversations about the meaning of race and racism on campus and in the United States. TCP is part of the university’s overall strategic plan, Where Courageous Inquiry Leads. Specifically, TCP is a component of Creating Community, Engaging Society — one of several cross-cutting initiatives in Emory’s strategic plan that foster university-wide collaboration between all nine academic schools and several administrative units in order to improve campus climate and foster community relationships. Housed in the president’s office, TCP is strongly positioned to effectively coordinate curricular and out-of-classroom learning opportunities for students, faculty, and staff.
To recover from a series of hate incidents that occurred in 2004, the project's first initiative was a series of community dialogues beginning in fall 2005. Dialogue participants use this opportunity to envision concrete ways the Emory community can create a new future around race. The first Community Dialogues have grown from 60 to 800 participants in the 2008 school year. Topics are rooted in Emory's involvement in African American enslavement, segregation, integration, and the world that blacks and whites created together in the South. Newer themes, such as intersections of race with class and moving beyond the black/white dichotomy are incorporated into the dialogue. Groups are encouraged to move from these intimate conversations to constructive public action.

TCP fulfills the institutional-wide mission in other ways such as establishing Gathering the Tools, a working group of students and faculty interested in documenting Emory’s racial heritage using oral and archival research. A series of pedagogical seminars began in 2006 to assist faculty in creating and innovating courses to be inclusive of diversity and to encourage student research that reflects another theme of the strategic plan, “Confronting Race and Difference.” TCP also provides grants and sponsors events to academic schools in order to further Emory’s mission.

As campus members collect and organize Emory’s racial and social history, TCP will share these texts to inform and enhance campus diversity in various ways. Reports on the project are given to the provost and president’s office to inform the themes of the strategic plan. Results and practices from TCP can be found in *Academe* and *Change* articles and a book will be published in 2010. The Ford Foundation has selected and awarded Emory a $100,000 grant to continue its Difficult Dialogues Initiative through 2012. The grant will underwrite faculty participation in community dialogues, and sponsor two faculty pedagogical seminars on Emory’s racial history.

**BUFFALO STATE COLLEGE, BUFFALO, NY**

Buffalo State College, the largest of the thirteen comprehensive arts and sciences colleges in the State University of New York system, is developing a strategic plan that is inclusive of diversity for 2009–2013. As stated in its mission statement, the goal of Buffalo State College is “to empower a diverse population of students to succeed as citizens of a challenging world.” One campus strategic initiative is to Strengthen Excellence in Diversity through the inclusion of issues related to multiculturalism, race, women, and persons with disabilities in curricular and cocurricular offerings. The college has adopted a comprehensive set of strategies to enact its newly articulated institutional commitment to diversity.

For example, Buffalo State faculty and staff regularly engage in discussions on the inclusion of diversity issues not only in academic programs and classes, but also in cocurricular experiences and service programs including health services, counseling, advisement, assessment, athletics, alumni relations, internships, and community service.
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Ongoing meetings and focus groups assure that implementation of the campus strategic initiatives related to diversity are infused both within and beyond the classroom.

Within the Intellectual Foundations general education program, students are given a choice of over forty-five courses from all academic disciplines in order to complete a diversity requirement. Based in the disciplines and designed to prepare students to live and work in a multicultural society, these course goals seek to increase students’ knowledge related to one or more diverse groups; develop their intercultural understanding, sensitivity, and commitment to social justice; and examine the sources and consequences of personal perceptions, preconceptions, and values. In addition, students engage in service learning and volunteer programs where they apply knowledge gained in the diversity courses to actual situations in the community.

To ensure that diversity initiatives extend beyond the classroom, all programs in student life are required to have a multicultural diversity plan that is reviewed and approved annually. The plans include diversity goals related to leadership training and professional development, personnel decisions, programs, policies, and the physical environment to ensure accessibility to students with disabilities.

To facilitate widespread institutional progress, Buffalo State invested resources to support a minigrant program. The grants have supported curricular and cocurricular programs on a variety of topics, including religions, disabilities, women’s issues, sexual orientation, and various cultural and global issues in literature, science, history, art, and music to infuse diversity in students’ learning. Three institutional awards have also been established to recognize members of the campus community who have provided leadership in implementing the strategic plan for excellence in diversity. Understanding that diversity is more than a matter of demographics, these awardees promote the new notion of diversity as an essential and integral component of a Buffalo State education.
Access remains a front-burner issue for higher education and will remain so in the face of future projections of an increasing equity gap between college graduates and those who either never entered college or leave before earning the degree they seek. Reports indicate that more students of color — those least-well-served by the United States’ unjustly unequal school systems — are enrolling at a faster rate in postsecondary institutions than whites. This trend poses a challenge to how colleges can retain first-time and historically underrepresented students once they enter college and how we can increase the likelihood of their academic success. Achievement also continues to be a concern, as the Educational Testing Service notes that 40 percent of students in four-year institutions and 63 percent of students in community colleges take at least one remedial math or reading course.

Colleges and universities have turned their attention in two directions. The first focuses on how to provide the academic and personal support for college students who are not fully college ready. There is evidence of improvement in this area especially as higher education abandons the deficit model approach and adopts an asset and potential model approach. The second focuses on how to collaborate with the P-16 sector to raise the achievement bar, share resources, and devise strategies that will ensure that all students receive rigorous, horizon expanding educations before college that will guarantee their success in college.

Maricopa Community Colleges, Tempe, AZ

In 1988, the Maricopa Community Colleges launched Achieving a College Education (ACE), which is a partnership between community colleges and local high schools designed to reduce the dropout rate among at-risk high school students and transition them to community college and university studies. Some barriers that at-risk students may face include dropping out of high school, coming from families with little history of high school or college graduation, being a member of a social or cultural group underrepresented in higher education, living in single parent homes, and dealing with economic hardships that require them to work to financially support the family. Other conditions can include homelessness or living in foster care. In 2001, a federal grant from the Office of Housing and Urban Development allowed the program to expand to all ten Maricopa Community Colleges. Currently, ACE continues their efforts through funding from: tuition and operations, private funds collected by the Maricopa Community College Foundation Capital Campaign, and grants from the National Nuclear Securities Administration provided to Maricopa’s three Hispanic Serving Institutions. Since 1996, ACE has served more than 7,143 students.

Achieving a College Education is a 2+2+2 model program. With this approach, the program eases the transition and alleviates anxiety for participants at important junctures along the college journey. Additionally, parents and students are informed about what to do next at every step through a series of letters and ACE activities.
The first “2” corresponds to the student’s junior and senior years in high school, during which they begin to take community college-level courses. The second “2” corresponds to the students’ two years at the community college, while the final “2” corresponds to the students’ two years at a university, culminating with the attainment of a baccalaureate degree. Once admitted as a high school student, ACE students must stay in high school and take college courses during the summers and one college-level course during the fall and spring semesters. In return, they receive scholarships for their college courses, earning up to twenty-four college credits by the time they graduate from high school.

The Achieving a College Education program has demonstrated concrete success since the program’s inception in 1987. Over 83 percent of ACE students have graduated from high school, with rates at certain years as high as 96 percent. ACE students earn an average high school grade point average (GPA) of 3.05 and 83 percent of ACE graduates go on to enroll in college. Subsequently, ACE graduates outperform the general Maricopa Community Colleges student population with an average college GPA of 3.1 as compared to the overall Maricopa student population GPA of 2.81.

CARNegie MELLon UNIVERSITY, PITTSBURGH, PA

The Summer Academy for Mathematics and Science (SAMS) is a precollege program for high school students sponsored by Carnegie Mellon University. The Summer Academy differs from most precollege programs in that it does not focus either on at-risk students, or outstanding achievers. Instead, SAMS is devoted to rising juniors and rising seniors who may not have realized their full academic potential. Our program focuses on skill building and addresses the stumbling blocks that compromise the admission of good students from marginalized populations to selective institutions and their ultimate success in math- and science-based disciplines.

SAMS is a six-week, residential program whose purpose is to expand the pool of African American, Latinos/as, Native American, and underachieving students to attend selective colleges and universities in order to pursue majors in engineering, science, or other math-based studies. Eligible juniors and seniors are recruited nationwide. Our goal is to make good students excellent by immersing them in a community of peer scholars and exposing them to cutting-edge instruction and projects. SAMS strives to inspire students to be the best they can be by creating an academically challenging and personally rewarding environment.

There are separate academic and personal development tracks for juniors and seniors. Rising juniors focus on preparing for standardized college admission examinations, honing math and science skills, and applying concepts to hands-on projects. Rising seniors learn about the college application process and earn academic credit by taking college-level courses. Seniors also explore technical majors through their participation in math, science, and engineering projects. The demanding academic environment and
the peer support for excellence in the classroom build the self-confidence required to boost high school performance and compete successfully in college. Other program objectives include providing students with a preview of the social and academic aspects of college life, exposing them to role models, and introducing them to careers in engineering and science.

As a result of SAMS, participating high school students have increased their SAT scores by as much as 150 points. For instance, the average score for the 2006 cohort increased 121 points. As evidence that the Summer Academy achieved another of its goals, a survey of 112 SAMS alumni showed that students who participated in the SAMS program had enrolled in many of the nation’s elite universities, including MIT, Yale, Stanford, Cornell, the University of Pennsylvania, Tufts, Princeton, and Harvard.

University of California-Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA

The University of California-Los Angeles (UCLA) Academic Advancement Program (AAP) is a multiracial, multiethnic academic program that advocates access, equity, opportunity, and excellence. AAP has a threefold mission: to ensure the success and graduation of its more than 6,000 undergraduates; to increase the numbers of students entering graduate and professional schools; and to develop the academic, political, scientific, economic, and community leadership necessary to transform our society in the twenty-first century.

A significant number of AAP students come from low-income families (71 percent), are the first in their family to go to college (80 percent), are immigrants or the children of immigrants (75 percent), and are from historically underrepresented communities — African American, Latino, and Native American — (66 percent).

Throughout the academic year, AAP provides comprehensive, integrated services that promote academic, personal, and programmatic excellence, creating communities of shared learning and engaged learners. AAP also runs a rigorous academic six-week residential program for about 400 entering freshmen and transfer students, in which they take three summer courses to complete ten to thirteen units toward UCLA degree requirements. During the summer residential program and academic school year, upper-division AAP students are trained in dialogical pedagogical strategies to serve as tutors and peer counselors. AAP’s program is distinguished by its collaborative learning workshops, academic and personal counseling, tutoring programs, research opportunities, innovative science programs, and scholarships offered throughout the year. Students gain a sense of belonging at the university by building on the great wealth of resources they discover and by having the value of life experiences they bring to the university affirmed.

AAP also hosts six mentoring programs specifically designed to provide resources and support to prepare students for graduate and professional schools. Students also meet with faculty for roundtable discussions and intern
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for local, state, and national organizations. AAP also arranges for many of its students to engage in academic research under the direction of faculty and to publish their work in the university’s academic and literary journals. In addition, AAP encourages strong civic values by encouraging students to give back to the community.

The UCLA Academic Advancement Program has also established a Transfer Student Center. The center provides a framework for transfer students to become part of the academic community, to take ownership of their undergraduate experience, and to excel. The establishment of the Transfer Student Center has resulted in a dramatic increase in four-year graduation rates, with an overall increase from 61 percent fifteen years ago to 83 percent today. For African American students, graduation rates rose from 45 percent to 83 percent, while rates for Latinos/as rose from 66 percent to 83 percent.

Today at UCLA, African Americans and Latinos/as are graduating at the highest rate ever: the six-year graduation rate for African American and Latino students who entered as freshmen is 80 percent. Many AAP graduates continue their education by going into PhD programs or professional degree programs. They become doctors, lawyers, educators, urban planners, and political leaders; and a large number of AAP graduates focus their work on serving the poor and the underserved.

**WHITTIER COLLEGE, WHITTIER, CA**

In keeping with the values of its Quaker heritage, Whittier College faculty and staff have welcomed and aided students of color to achieve academic success for over a century. This legacy has led to the college becoming the fourth most structurally diverse liberal arts college in the nation and to be designated as an official Hispanic Serving Institution. However, Whittier College is determined to do more than achieve demographic diversity for its students, faculty, and staff. It is committed as well to tapping diversity as an educational asset that can enhance learning and ensure the academic success of all its graduates. To achieve that goal, Whittier College is investing in three key strategies: expanding its living/learning communities, turning first-year gatekeeper courses into gateway courses, and strengthening curricular offerings about U.S. and global diversity.

All first-year students are assigned to a living/learning community, located in one of two dedicated residence halls. These communities, which include commuter students, are formed by creating clusters tied to student enrollment in a themed writing seminar and a linked course. The clusters are socially enhanced by shared living space and coordinated activities. These intimate communities are a critical component in building a strong peer support network in the first year, which in turn contributes to students’ overall satisfaction and retention.
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The cultural perspectives element of the Liberal Education Program consists of four courses from six different areas: Africa, Latin America, Asia, United States, Europe, and crosscultural explorations. These can be taken across disciplines, ranging from introductory to upper-level courses. Many of the courses focused on the United States and Europe pay attention to subcultures, diasporas, and contemporary global diversity issues. Through these studies, students gain knowledge about and skills in cross-cultural comparisons, intersecting differences, and common issues that cross borders, whether cultural, economic, or national.

Although the college’s faculty is more culturally diverse than most other institutions, new strategies have been implemented to recruit an even more diverse faculty. Beginning in 2004, many open positions were converted to Irvine Teaching Fellowships that aimed either to diversify the curriculum or hire more faculty of color. Over the three-year period, Whittier College hired seventeen Irvine Fellows. Over one-third of these fellows are now tenure-track professors; as such, over half of Whittier’s assistant professors are faculty of color. The college’s long-range goal is to increase the percentage of permanent faculty of color from its current 27 percent.

**University of Maryland, Baltimore County, Baltimore, MD**

The Meyerhoff Scholars Program was created at University of Maryland, Baltimore County (UMBC) to support high-achieving students from underrepresented populations with an interest in pursuing doctoral studies in the sciences or engineering and to promote the advancement of minorities in the sciences and related fields. The initiative is an achievement program that provides full scholarships for high-achieving science students. Scholars start in a six-week residential summer bridge program that includes credit and noncredit courses such as calculus, African American studies, and seminars on time management.

The Meyerhoff Scholars Program provides a dynamic number of support networks to ensure student success. For instance, scholars are encouraged to participate in study groups and to meet regularly with the program’s counselors for academic advising. Mentors are also an important aspect of the program and scholars receive mentoring from both professionals within and outside of the program. These mentors provide career counseling guidance and advice on ways scholars can continue their studies in graduate school. Personal tutoring is also provided to students who are experiencing academic difficulty. This multilayered support system creates a dynamic and supportive environment through positive peer and mentor networks. Scholars begin research on campus after their first year through internships with faculty research laboratories or other off-campus organizations in the United States and abroad.

The Meyerhoff Scholars Program has been successful in reaching out to high-achieving minority students. There have been over 400 graduates since 1993, and over 200 students are currently enrolled, with an exceptional
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Bonner Scholars Program, Princeton, NJ

The Bonner Foundation established the Bonner Scholars Program to increase access to higher education for students with financial need and to promote service as a means of improving the quality of life in communities. The foundation believes that college students engaged in service possess unique gifts and talents that bring energy, creativity, and hope to individuals and communities. Additionally, the program reinforces the engaged presence of colleges and universities in local and global communities. In launching and supporting the Bonner Scholars Program, the Bonner Foundation has entered into a partnership with participating institutions committed to envision new possibilities for partnerships between campuses and communities.

The multiyear, service-based scholarship program identifies and supports students with significant financial needs to attend college. While in school, Bonner scholars fulfill a service expectation and receive financial support to help cover the cost of their education. The program follows a four-year student development model that provides a set of expectations, challenges, supports, and outcomes. The developmental model is shaped by a set of cocurricular experiences known as the “Five E’s”: Expectation, Exploration, Experience, Example, and Excellence. This framework is represented in six focus areas that are described as Common Commitments: social justice, civic engagement, spiritual exploration, community building, diversity, and international perspectives. Ultimately, the Bonner Scholars Program seeks to create a campus culture of service and support for students who want to make a significant commitment to community service.

The Bonner Scholars Program was initiated at Berea College in Kentucky during the 1990–91 academic year but has now grown to include seventy-seven colleges and universities across the country. Since its inception, more than 3,000 students have graduated from the program. Participating institutions were selected to be included in the Bonner network based on their financial support for low-income students, their engagement in the community, and their desire to work with a consortium of colleges and universities that share a common commitment to promote a culture of service on their campus.

CONTACT:
Bonner Scholars Program, Princeton, NJ
Ariane Hoy
senior program officer
609.924.6663
Ahoy@bonner.org

 retention rate of over 95 percent and high mean grade point average above 3.5. The program’s success is built on the premise that the high-achieving minority students thrive in an environment of an aspiring, mutually supporting, tight-knit learning community buttressed by the encouragement and dedication of faculty and staff members.
Curricular Designs

Colleges and universities across the country continue to develop curricular designs that better prepare students to thrive in and contribute positively to a diverse and global society. Initially, progress in transforming the curriculum was often measured by whether students were required to take at least one designated diversity course. However, advanced campuses are now moving beyond the one-course diversity requirement to more overarching curricular designs that encompass diversity, multiculturalism, and pluralism in both general education and minor/major areas of study, including traditional liberal arts and sciences and preprofessional fields. These innovations provide students with multiple lenses through which they can understand and examine the connections between identity, social justice, and disciplinary forms of knowledge. With these curricular innovations, stronger emphasis is now being placed on concepts such as the intersection of identities, civic engagement, intercultural competencies, and global interdependence. Many colleges are also now turning their attention to how the unique historical and social contexts of U.S. diversity relates to parallel discourses about diversity and social cohesion within varying global contexts.

Wheaton College, Norton, MA

Wheaton College’s Infusion Project began in 2001, when faculty voted nearly unanimously to emphasize — across the entire curriculum — race/ethnicity and its intersections with gender, sexuality, class, religion, and technology in both U.S. and global contexts. The faculty dropped an old cultural diversity requirement and imposed a new one by engaging new scholarship and pedagogies to ensure Wheaton students address these issues in all courses, especially within their majors. With Wheaton’s mission of transforming lives to change the world and its dedication to inclusive excellence, Wheaton faculty recognizes that these commitments must be reflected in the academic core of the institution: the curriculum. This movement is part of a twenty-five year tradition of innovations in inclusion, as the college began to teach writing across the curriculum and developed a gender-balanced curriculum that integrated emerging scholarship by and about women.

For the project, every department has formulated an “infusion” plan specific to its own needs. Some departments focus on curricular content, while others, such as math and the natural sciences, emphasize pedagogical innovations that are more inclusive of women and students of color. Each department has taken on the challenge to identify tangible learning outcomes and measures to ensure the Infusion Project’s success. Consequently, faculty members have been granted summer stipends to transform their courses and scholarship. Funding is also given to attend conferences, support for faculty study groups on topics like race and the humanities, and invest in campus life.
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with the broader challenge of creating a multicultural community. Innovations and contributions to the Infusion Project are vetted by faculty committees.

The Connections Program was established in 2003 to complement the innovations made to the curriculum by the Infusion Project. The Connections Program highlights how academic subjects and approaches transcend traditional disciplines. Students are required to take at least one set of three connection courses or two courses from the creative arts, humanities, history, social science, natural science, math, or computer science. To create a connection course, faculty from various disciplines propose a course set to be approved by an educational policy committee. Students are also eligible to propose a connection course set to the committee. Using this unique approach, concepts such as diversity, global issues, and civic engagement can be infused throughout all disciplines.

Finally, a full-time faculty curriculum coordinator position was created and filled in the 2007–08 academic year. The faculty curriculum coordinator manages the entire curriculum, with particular focus on the Infusion Project and Connections Program. This new position replaces previously held part-time coordinator positions and faculty subcommittees, communicating to the Wheaton campus community an institutionalized commitment to inclusion and sustained innovation.

**University of Charleston, Charleston, WV**
The University of Charleston (UC) has successfully developed a curriculum that embeds diversity, social justice, civic engagement, global contexts, and other liberal education outcomes throughout the general education program and major fields of study. UC’s unique structure and process to establish explicit outcomes and measures, sustained support systems for faculty, and leadership strategies that are inclusive of all stakeholders allow these outcomes to transcend the entire curriculum.

In the 1990s, UC underwent a planning process to reassess its strategic plan, Decade of the 90s. Nineteen committees of faculty and staff from every department came together to create a set of learning outcomes that made UC students distinct from most students in the nation. This inclusive approach was implemented to address the desire to map student learning holistically and to create lines of communication where various stakeholders can address these issues together. Eventually, the committees found common themes that led to the establishment of UC’s six learning outcomes: communication, creativity, critical thinking, ethical practice, science, and citizenship.

The citizenship learning outcome calls for students to have a historical grounding and knowledge of key social issues through a United States and global context, as well as acquiring the skills and abilities needed to address these paradigms through civic engagement and service learning. First-year students study political and economic issues related to citizenship, service learning, and community involvement in the United States. Sophomores move toward a historical and literary grounding of citizenship issues and are introduced to global issues. Service learning is implemented
throughout general education and major fields of study. Also, partnerships are established with the office of student life to create holistic learning experiences through initiatives such as alternative spring break or study abroad.

Several functions ensure the outcome is sustained. Students develop portfolios of papers, media, art, and other texts selected to demonstrate they have acquired expected learning outcome concepts. Students also meet regularly with faculty roundtables for sustained evaluation of their portfolios.

Faculty from all disciplines and general education fields submit courses for approval by outcome roundtables. The six outcome roundtables meet every two weeks to review materials, update measures, and evaluate courses to meet the outcome requirements. Courses that are approved as part of the learning outcome must demonstrate an explicit intentionality to address the outcome and can substantiate the development through assessment. While every course is developmental, faculty must clearly show how students develop the desired outcome. Each committee follows a general rubric used for reviewing, along with supplemental rubrics applicable to different majors.

To maintain consensus among the outcomes, outcome roundtable leaders meet once every six weeks. Also, faculty development centers are established to help enhance assignments, readings, and pedagogies to reach the exit level standard. Finally, every major has an interdisciplinary capstone course where students from different fields of study are grouped based on learning outcomes. Through the capstone course, students’ disciplinary thinking is defined and stretched as they are introduced to different disciplinary routes to attaining specified learning goals for citizenship.

OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY, CORVALLIS, OR
Since 1994, all undergraduates at Oregon State University (OSU) have been required to take a Difference, Power, and Discrimination (DPD) course as part of the baccalaureate core. DPD courses examine disciplinary content from perspectives of power, privilege, and social inequality. The university currently offers close to forty DPD courses that are taught within traditional departments using disciplinary content and frameworks, but also meet the DPD requirement’s criteria. To ensure quality DPD courses, as well as impart a sense of shared experience and responsibility for all stakeholders, faculty must have the skills and content knowledge to addressing issues relating power, privilege, the contexts of identity-based populations, and multiculturalism.

Because most faculty have not been specifically taught to examine their disciplines from perspectives of power and privilege, the DPD Program offers a sixty-hour summer faculty seminar that helps instructors transform their courses to meet the DPD criteria. The seminar emphasizes key theories about social inequality and systems of oppression and provides effective pedagogical strategies for teaching about difference, power, and discrimination. It also provides opportunities for faculty members to critique their own
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pedagogies and recognize how concepts of power and privilege affect their specific disciplines. Scientists, mathematicians, engineers, economists, historians, psychologists, anthropologists, business professors, and linguists have developed innovative teaching strategies and changed foundational knowledge constructs within their disciplines. Student learning outcomes sought by DPD faculty development programs include enhancement of critical thinking skills; understanding of U.S. diversity and its relationship with larger global constructs; the intersection of social identities with power, privilege, and discrimination; and a multidisciplinary lens for understanding issues of power and difference.

To supplement and support classroom learning, the DPD Program also offers brownbag discussions, film series, and lectures. The program has also developed a teaching resource, Writing for Change, which is available on the Southern Poverty Law Center’s Teaching Tolerance Web site www.teachingtolerance.org, and has published an anthology about the program, Teaching for Change.

The College of St. Catherine, St. Paul, MN

The College of St. Catherine’s (CSC) mission is to educate women to lead and influence. This mission is the driving force for diversity and democracy work at the college. CSC educates Minnesota’s largest population of African American women enrolled in private college, and one of the largest populations of Asian women, particularly Hmong women. CSC acknowledges the importance of revising and updating its curriculum and cocurriculum to prepare students to be responsible citizens in a dynamic and diverse democracy.

To expand students’ knowledge, CSC has developed two crucial additions to the college’s curriculum, a Critical Studies in Race and Ethnicity major and a Civic Engagement minor that addresses democracy in action. Both studies programs were developed with the intent of helping students increase knowledge of social justice issues and develop skills to facilitate systemic change.

Critical Studies of Race and Ethnicity (CRST) provides a framework for understanding race and ethnicity in historical, contemporary, national, and global contexts. Minnesota’s growing racial and ethnic diversity and CSC’s own diverse student body make this major increasingly relevant. In addition, the Civic Engagement minor creates an opportunity for critical analysis of, reflection on, and engagement in ethical civic engagement that evokes hope and systemic change. The focus of this minor is ethical civic engagement directed towards action against systems of oppression, as presented in the minor’s foundational course, Challenging Oppressions, Civic Engagement and Change, as well as the entire CRST curriculum.

Acknowledging that new initiatives require a supportive environment, a variety of minigrants, seminars, and learning forums for faculty and staff have been offered to refine both the curricula and cocurricula. Thirty-one departments revised their
curricula and/or teaching methods related to diversity and democracy over the last four years to offer courses in the CRST program. Examples of foci include: the complexity of identity, experience and perspective embedded in our over simplified racial/ethnic classification; multiple differences and intersecting oppressions (i.e., the extent to which class, race/ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, age and ability interact to magnify privilege/disadvantage). Global issues are covered as well: the responses to racism of diverse racial/ethnic groups, both national and globally; the global dimensions of race/ethnicity, including comparative systems of racial/ethnic classifications, the role of colonialism and neocolonialism and the implications of immigration patterns and policy; and the role of community learning in contributing to change.

**Drury University, Springfield, MO**

At the center of Drury University education is a unique, globally focused general education curriculum, known as Global Perspective for the 21st Century (GP21). As an integrated curriculum that emphasizes global learning across the disciplines, GP21 helps students develop the knowledge and skills needed to create innovative solutions that address the challenges of today’s interdependent and changing global community. The program divides broadly into two themes: (1) global studies, with its focus on cultural heritage, global awareness, cultural diversity, foreign language, and the global future; and (2) scientific perspectives, with its focus on mathematical and scientific literacy, technology, and the social sciences. All Drury students are required to complete GP21. With this focus on global learning, Drury requires all students to complete the GP21 curriculum, and students earn a minor in global studies as a result of this integrated general education curriculum.

The four-year curriculum focuses on current cultural, political, environmental, scientific, and economic changes in order to prepare students to become global citizens. Because global issues are infused across the general education curriculum, all general education goals are also GP21 goals. The first requirement of this curriculum is the Alpha Seminar (first-year) program, a two-semester course for freshmen to develop their writing, critical thinking, and oral presentation skills by exploring the diversity of the American experience. In addition, the curriculum encourages students, through study abroad, foreign language study, and courses in world cultures and globalization, to understand the global context that shapes U.S. diversity. The third component of the curriculum requires students to take interdisciplinary classes, allowing students to draw connections between their major and general education.

Drury has created an innovative capstone experience for its general education curriculum, focusing on globalization and its many effects. In completing the GP21 curriculum, students gain an understanding of global issues both locally and beyond our borders, competency in a second language, communication skills, reasoning and problem-solving skills, and a greater awareness and understanding of other cultures.
“We are each other’s harvest;
we are each other’s business;
we are each other’s magnitude and bond.”

GWENDOLYN BROOKS
**Alliances Between Academic and Student Affairs**

Establishing bridges of communication and collaboration between student affairs and academic affairs is essential if we are to create a holistic educational experience for students that is greater than the sum of its parts. Drawing from their distinctive professional areas of expertise around shared values has resulted in creative new programs through which students can draw connections between their personal lives and the knowledge and skills gained in classrooms. More opportunities to exchange educational strategies across domains have enriched programming in both student and academic affairs. Integrated and coordinated efforts include living/learning communities, programs to ease transitions to and success in college, community-based learning centers, and innovative programs that enhance students’ intercultural capacities. A few campuses have even merged academic and student affairs units to create more coordinated curricular and cocurricular initiatives and develop new approaches to integrative student learning.

**Hope College, Holland, MI**

The Phelps Scholars Program crosses both student and academic affairs and relies on joint cooperation across domains for its success. Phelps Scholars are a diverse group of first-year students learning to lead and to serve in a multicultural society and interconnected world. Students study about race and culture in class, and then practice what they learn while living together in their residence hall. They attend bimonthly meetings on a wide range of topics and travel to Chicago, Detroit, and other destinations. There were seventy Phelps Scholars enrolled during the 2007–08 academic year, almost 10 percent of the college’s first-year cohort. The program has four principles for its students: (1) get off to a great start, (2) learn about the world and its people, (3) succeed in college and in life, and (4) have fun along the way.

In the fall term, students enroll in a first-year seminar (FYS) with the theme Creating Community Together. The class is team-taught by faculty members who also serve as the students’ academic advisors. They display their FYS research projects in a poster presentation to the campus as a whole. Resident life staff coordinate initiatives to promote the development of strong, positive relationships in the hall. Phelps Scholars focus on diversity provides an opportunity to live with people from many different backgrounds. Compared to other first-year Hope students, Phelps Scholars report an easier transition to college; a larger number of meaningful relationships with students, faculty, and staff; and greater involvement in cocurricular activities.

**CONTACT:**
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In the spring term, Phelps Scholars take Encounter with Cultures, a course in which they learn about racial/ethnic diversity in the United States and explore the experiences of two specific cultural groups. The bimonthly meetings are open to everyone on campus, and address a variety of topics, such as cross-cultural communication, the status of migrant farm workers, and comparisons of Western and non-Western cultures. Students apply what they learn in class by teaching ESL, tutoring middle school students, working at the Boys and Girls Club, or participating in similar service learning activities in the community.

First-Year Seminar faculty spend a great deal of time talking with students about their academic progress and career plans. The four-year graduation rate of Phelps Scholars exceeds the campus average, and graduation rates for students of color equal or surpass those for white students in the program. Phelps Scholars are routinely represented among student leaders, student researchers, Phi Beta Kappa members, and other groups of highly successful students.

Phelps Scholars deal with some difficult issues, including white privilege and the persistence of social inequality. However, they also experience the benefits of a diverse friendship network, and they have numerous social gatherings throughout the year. After the first year, they lead the rest of campus in learning about diversity, too, preparing themselves to lead and to serve in the places they go after graduation.

University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA

University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA

The Albert M. Greenfield Intercultural Center (GIC) was established in 1984 and welcomes all students interested in fostering intercultural understanding on campus. As a site of learning through cross-cultural activism, reflection, and dialogue, the GIC promotes cocurricular educational and cultural programs. The center has historically been home to student of color groups committed to fostering understanding and building community on Penn’s campus. Based on this foundation of being “home” to underrepresented groups, the center embarked on initiatives to draw a more diverse group of students into the dialogue around diversity.

In 1994, the Greenfield Intercultural Center at the University of Pennsylvania began Programs for Awareness in Cultural Education (PACE) with a graduate level course entitled Cultural Awareness. The course is offered by the Graduate School of Education, cross-listed with urban studies, and facilitated by the Greenfield Intercultural Center, which is located in the Division of University Life. This course creates a pedagogically democratic space for graduate and undergraduate students to explore the multicultural, multiethnic nature of American society. The course content focuses on the historical and contemporary issues related to difference in the United States, as well as, theories of oppression, discrimination and prejudice. Instructors work together with student affairs professionals on course content and pedagogy.
in order to model constructive engagement in the classroom and to create both an academically rigorous and personally enriching experience for students.

Taking advantage of the rich interest in performing arts on campus, a second course that uses storytelling and performance as the applied medium for exploring diversity issues is now offered and cross listed with the Graduate School of Education and theatre arts program.

In addition to teaching students how to design their own workshops, the applied portion of each course teaches students to constructively handle difficult moments in a discussion, especially when differing personal experiences and perspectives are brought to the table. After completing courses, students work with center staff to design and implement workshops and discussions on campus. PACE students are routinely sought after as facilitators, not only because of their knowledge of issues, but also their skill set in designing constructive and engaging forums on campus.

The Race Dialogue Project (RDP) is a student-led organization that evolved from these courses. RDP aims to explore difficult topics through interactive and thought provoking student programming. One project involved plastering campus with posters, utilizing widely recognizable social commentaries on stereotypes around race and gender. They provided meaningful discussion questions, and opportunities for feedback and dialogue in many different spaces around campus. RDP programs have reached out to a broad cross-section of Penn’s campus, encouraging awareness and creating a more honest environment for dialogue.

The Race Dialogue Project is one example of how the Greenfield Intercultural Center continues to work with students who complete the PACE courses, helping them apply their learning within various communities on campus. Students credit the PACE programs — courses, workshops and campuswide activities — with helping them to engage one another, and to think beyond their own assumptions and stereotypes, moving toward deeper levels of interpersonal interaction and greater intercultural understanding.

**CONSORTIUM ON HIGH ACHIEVEMENT AND SUCCESS, HARTFORD, CT**

The Consortium on High Achievement and Success (CHAS) consists of thirty-seven private liberal arts colleges and small universities that focus on high achievement, success, personal satisfaction, and leadership for students of color. An integral component of the consortium is the institutional representation by student and academic affairs professionals, which also includes vice presidents, deans, directors, faculty, and multicultural affairs professionals. This network fosters the creation of a wide set of initiatives that address overlapping aspects related to student success, from identity-specific to institution-wide issues. CHAS began as the outcome of a 2001 retention conference organized by Trinity College. Participants who attended the conference felt that retention statistics only told part of the story about issues
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facing many students of color, such as their challenge to attain high academic achievement and to gain a sense of belonging and ownership of their institutions. As a result of this feedback, CHAS was founded.

CHAS is comprised of a six-member steering board and several working groups of various interests and foci. The steering board collaborates year-round, and the institutional representatives meet twice a year, focusing on institutional commitment to CHAS principles and the promotion of collaborative efforts. The resulting meetings and conferences are hosted by member institutions throughout the year. CHAS initiatives are unified through a statement of principles and a set of goals for student outcomes. The statement of principles guides members to look through the lens of achievement, not remediation, to identify and remove institutional barriers to high academic achievement, to address students’ campus experiences holistically, develop strong campus networks, and understand how this work has implications for all students. CHAS considers enrollment in honors programs and graduation with honors, conducting research with faculty, persistence in STEM majors, and utilization of campus resources to be some measures of student success.

The working groups address institutional obstacles to achievement and document the impact of CHAS work on student achievement. They enable sustained discourse on assessment, gateway courses, pedagogies in the sciences and humanities, etc. Conference and meetings for faculty have addressed stereotype threat, mentoring and supplemental instruction, and raising awareness of the connection between campus and classroom climate. Meetings have also focused on supporting specific administrative professionals, including psychological counselors, career counselors, religious and spiritual advisors, athletics directors, and prehealth advisors, offering opportunities for cross-institutional learning and collaboration. To build and maintain institutional buy-in, CHAS has organized two Presidents Forums. Chief academic officials accompanied presidents to the first forum, and they were joined by chief student affairs officers at the second forum.

The ability to concisely address high achievement and success through a wide range of issues, functional areas, constituencies, curricula, and pedagogy may seem far reaching, but is facilitated by a strong coalition of student and academic affairs professionals bonded together under a shared mission and measure of success. A wide-ranging approach is necessary to effect institutional change. This capacity gives light that subtle and explicit factors can potentially impact a student’s educational journey, and it is important to address personal, contextual, and environmental concerns to foster student success.
Middlesex Community College (MCC) has made a college-wide commitment to promote diversity and global awareness through teaching, learning, scholarship, and leadership. This commitment began in 1993–94, when MCC was part of the AAC&U’s American Commitments Diversity Initiative, which led to greater incorporation of diversity into the classroom and new pedagogies used by student services staff. Four components of the resulting diversity initiatives include among them Middlesex’s One World Series, which has featured over 100 guest lecturers who address concerns challenging humanity. A second program, The Student Leadership Development Program, provides a range of activities for students to develop leadership skills and engage successfully as members of a diverse campus community. To complement that, the Service Learning Program integrates community service with classroom instruction in community-based learning experiences to meet the needs of local communities. Finally, International Fellowship Experiences, our fourth component, combine international travel, community service, and a three-credit course.

In 2003, a merger between student and academic affairs created a new framework that enabled the college to easily reinforce its commitment to diversity and global awareness for all students. Moreover, a revision of the core curriculum resulted in the creation of two espoused commitments — multicultural and global awareness and values, ethics, and social policy — that are embedded in core curriculum courses. In completing these requirements, students gain an understanding of social inequality and the varied perspectives that exist within, or across, cultural boundaries.

These programs are now enhanced through the shared infusion of desired academic and student development outcomes for which representatives from academic and student affairs jointly develop themes. For instance, the One World Series includes programming that complements curriculum goals as well as college-wide initiatives. Diversity-oriented programs have increased in depth and breadth, as well as in student and faculty participation. To validate the effectiveness of these initiatives, graduates are surveyed each year about the extent that their courses and experiences have helped shape attitudes, actions, thoughts, and ideas related to diversity. Students report an increase in their understanding of cultural differences and privilege, reflecting on the relationships between the rights of individuals, the rights of society, and social policy.

Finally, as part of a new comprehensive collegewide assessment process, MCC has defined institutional learning outcomes that include both global perspectives and social responsibility. In addition, MCC has established a cross-functional/disciplinary research committee to identify strategies for strengthening equity of outcomes for students. Initiatives such as these foster the essential partnerships between academic affairs and student affairs that promote student learning.
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Middlesex Community College
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BLOOMFIELD COLLEGE, BLOOMFIELD, NJ
As part of the 2002 Bildner New Jersey Campus Diversity Initiative (NJCDI), which sought to develop and strengthen its diversity practice across campus, Bloomfield College invested in professional development. Collaboration between the academic and student affairs departments was a distinguishing result of Bloomfield’s diversity initiative.

The investment in professional development includes sponsoring seminars and individual research, and the development of a campus project. The seminars offer groups of faculty and staff the opportunity to work intensively together for a semester on issues of diversity, globalization, local and global connections, student-centered pedagogies, and transformative education. Seminar participants apply their learning to revise courses, programs, and pedagogies. Cumulatively, more than half the entire faculty and key staff and administrators were involved. These collaborations created a greater sense of community amongst faculty and staff members.

Some of the accomplishments of this professional development resulted in the creation of new courses and interdisciplinary programs with a focus on global education, linking courses together for first-year students through various diversity themes, and revision of existing courses across disciplines. Student activities at Bloomfield College were also strengthened as a result of the initiative, such as the creation of Diversity All Year, which features two to four programs per week, organized by the faculty, staff, and students.

The initiative not only increased diversity and global perspectives in curricula and cocurricula at Bloomfield College, but it also helped bridge the academic and student affairs divide. Through the seminars, faculty and staff members were given opportunities to work together in a series of discussions and activities which ultimately helped to enhance student learning in the classroom and in campus life.
Intercultural Relations, Dialogue, and Campus Life

Intergroup dialogue programs, retreats, and intercultural events continue to be promising approaches to engage students in purposeful dialogues that address social taboos and sources of tension among marginalized and more privileged groups, each of which has historic tensions between and among themselves. Research shows that students’ cognitive, moral, and civic growth is accelerated when they are confronted with norms, views, and values that challenge them to reflect on their own views. In some of these intergroup experiences, students have candid exchanges with one another, sometimes laced with intense emotions. But, when organized constructively, these encounters can empower students to ally with one another to eradicate personal and structural systems that stratify and humiliate. As researchers have noted, interaction between different groups is not always developmentally positive. When these interactions are not constructively orchestrated, they can be negative and reinforce stereotypes rather than eradicate them.

The proliferation of these kinds of initiatives on college campuses can provide students with intercultural competencies that employers and citizens alike believe are necessary in the workplace as well as in local and global societies still dangerously divided. Strong academic achievement is also related to participation in dialogues. Research has also shown that participants who gain a strong level of competency in intergroup relations move on to higher-ranking and higher-paying positions in the workforce after graduation as compared to those who did not participate during college.

Duke University, Durham, NC

The Duke Center for Race Relations (CRR) is a student-managed intervention program dedicated to improving the quality of campus life at Duke University. Through a set of dynamic experiential learning processes, student participants develop and strengthen their own personal sense of identity, become more culturally competent, and learn how to manage and assess the path of their own personal growth. Founded by students in an Enterprising Leadership Public Policy course and situated in the Center for Multicultural Affairs, the CRR is comprised of the peer education training (PET) program. This program prepares students to facilitate four diversity units: Dialogues on Race Relations (peer-facilitated discussion groups), Common Ground (an experiential immersion retreat), House Courses (student-taught classes), and Students to Unite Duke (cross-cultural social interaction events).

CONTACT:
Duke University, Durham, NC
Julian B. Sanchez
director, Multicultural Center
919.684.6756
jsanchez@duke.edu
The student-led PET program prepares students to work in the center’s four major program areas. All PET programs consist of three thematic sessions: progressing from self-assessment and self-awareness, curriculum development and understanding, and practical peer-facilitation skills. The training program is grounded in a model that combines a human relations curriculum with a set of experiential learning exercises. PET program coordinators train fully in both areas.

The cornerstone of the CRR is the Common Ground retreat, an experiential-learning immersion workshop held during the fall break of each academic year. The goal of Common Ground is to create a more inclusive campus community by teaching participants how to actively and thoughtfully promote respect and understanding of others within their respective communities. Seventy-five Duke students take part in the free four-day leadership retreat, which addresses a full range of human relations topics through workshops led by students and professors.

Engaging disparate student communities in dynamic conversations on intergroup relations is the focus of the Dialogues on Race Relations (DORR) component of the CRR. Intergroup dialogues on sensitive and rarely discussed topics are organized and facilitated throughout the academic year for student organizations and between social groups with a history of difference. Creating sustained cross-cultural dialogues in each dorm and/or residential quad area is also a primary focus. DORR conducts as many as seventy dialogues annually for 1,400 participants.

The seven, student-taught, faculty-supervised house courses bring sustained dialogues on race and intercultural relations into the residence halls. Students interact with one another and with guest faculty in small classroom settings on topics drawn from selected readings and/or multimedia presentations. Qualified student instructors must have participated in the PET program and have either attended Common Ground or completed one of the CRR half-credit house courses.

Students to Unite Duke (STUD), the social programming unit of the CRR, is dedicated to making Duke an inclusive campus by providing a comfortable, fun, and welcoming social atmosphere for Duke students of all backgrounds. Former participants of the CRR’s intercultural dialogues come together with fellow students in fun and spirited ways though STUD’s carefully planned social events.
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**UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI-COLUMBIA, COLUMBIA, MO**
The University of Missouri-Columbia’s Interactive Theatre troupe was founded in 2003, when MU joined a three-year multicampus program sponsored by the Carnegie Academy for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning and the American Association for Higher Education. The troupe performs for faculty, teaching assistants, classes, and freshman interest groups (FIGs). Theater faculty direct sketches and teach students techniques in interactive theater, which encourages audience members
to become active performers, taking advantage of the opportunity to explore multicultural dimensions of teaching in a safe space and get feedback from colleagues.

A typical performance includes a ten-minute sketch in which a class or student study group encounters diversity issues they do not know how to handle. After performing the brief scene, actors remain in character and engage in dialogue with the audience. Following small-group discussion, the actors begin to re-enact the scene, but audience members come onstage to replace one of the characters and try out their own ideas to improve the situation.

Campus interest in the interactive theater program has been growing steadily, including an invitation to perform for the journalism school’s 450-student sophomore class on multiculturalism. An interdisciplinary team of researchers at MU is studying the effectiveness of interactive theater for enhancing faculty awareness of multicultural dimensions of teaching. Our initial qualitative study suggests that the theater experience is memorable and can stimulate multicultural awareness, sensitivity, and reflection.

Occidental College, Los Angeles, CA

The Intergroup Dialogue Program (IDP) at Occidental College offers an integrated framework of academic courses, dialogue programs, and research opportunities for the entire campus community to engage in diverse democracy. Occidental’s approach emphasizes content about identity-based groups, diversity dynamics, and social justice, as well as leadership skills needed to engage in constructive dialogue. Founded during the 2002–03 school year, IDP represents one of the few intergroup dialogue programs found in a small liberal arts college setting.

The IDP academic initiatives are institutionally grounded through support from the department of psychology, the office of the dean of the college, and the Core (general studies) Program. Three IDP courses offered through the department of psychology blend sociopsychological readings with dialogue techniques and reflective writing. While all courses focus on intergroup relationships, each one is unique in its approach. The first course emphasizes peer intergroup dialogue about a specific identity (gender, race/ethnicity); the second expands students’ knowledge and experiences by linking intergroup relations and communications frameworks with six social identities; and the third, a practicum, offers students structured opportunities to apply what they have learned by serving as a dialogue peer cofacilitator. This curricular approach supports the Occidental’s mission of equity and excellence.

The advancement of research about intergroup dialogue and experiences of specific communities is another unique aspect of IDP. Current projects include exploring the relationship between intragroup and intergroup identity development during dialogue programs, participation in a ten-institution multi-university study on the educational benefits of intergroup dialogues, learning outcomes of students who participate in
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dialogue, and reflections on the use of racial labels among African Americans spanning various generations.

Students who participated in the IDP program have applied intergroup dialogue in all areas of the community. For instance, former IDP participants coordinated a campuswide Exploration of Whiteness Week during the spring 2006 semester, Exploration of Blackness during the spring 2007 semester, applied facilitation training in area public schools, and founded the nonprofit organization Walls Come Down to empower black youth. Overall, IDP’s engagement in curricular and out-of-classroom settings has established the program in a fashion that not only provides rich content knowledge, but allows engagement and social justice to be applied in all areas of people’s lives.

**University of Maryland, College Park, MD**
The Office of Human Relations Programs (OHRP) established the Words of Engagement (WE) Intergroup Dialogue Program in response to University of Maryland undergraduate student focus group results, in which students expressed dissatisfaction with the campus curricular and cocurricular diversity efforts. While most students cited the university’s demographic diversity as a major factor in their decision to enroll, once on campus, many students felt they were in a balkanized campus and believed the institution’s multicultural education programs and courses did little to enable them to develop skill and comfort for cross-group interaction and relationship building.

The WE Intergroup Dialogue Program engages students from one, two, or more social identity groups — typically when there has been a history of conflict or tension between the groups — for sustained (two hours a week for eight consecutive weeks), cross-group dialogue. These social identity groups are broadly defined to include race; ethnicity; language; geographic origin and immigration status; religious, spiritual, faith-based, and secular affiliation; socioeconomic class background, and employment status; gender; gender identity and expression; sexual orientation and family configuration; age and generation; physical, developmental, and psychological (dis)ability; among others.

Guided by trained and experienced cofacilitators, each representing one of the social identity groups around which the dialogue is organized, students learn to explore the conflicts and confront the tensions that have kept their groups at a distance from one another in order to build meaningful and sustained bridges across those groups. The goal of WE Program is for student participants to learn how to move through the four stages of intergroup dialogue: relationship building, group norming, conflict negotiation, and collective action. These stages are to increase intra and cross-group awareness, knowledge, and understanding, resulting in collective engagement in lifelong action for social justice.
Since its inception in the spring 2000, over 2,500 undergraduate students have participated in the WE Program. In 2001, participants became eligible to earn academic credit through an innovative partnership with the college of education's department of education policy and leadership. Over 250 graduate students, staff, and faculty members have formally trained as program facilitators and the program has offered over 300 dialogues on fifty different topics. Results from formal assessments show student participants routinely report that their intergroup dialogue experience was the single most important, meaningful, and useful educational experience they have ever had, because it helped them to connect theories of social justice learned in the classroom to the real-world practice of social justice in a variety of professional contexts.

**University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI**

The Program on Intergroup Relations (IGR) at the University of Michigan offers a coordinated series of academic courses, cocurricular programs, and community activities to undergraduate students. The mission of IGR is Education for Social Justice, and its activities focus on issues of social diversity, social inequity, and social justice. IGR's academic courses enroll over 1,000 students per year, and its other activities reach more than 2,000 students, faculty, and staff each year. The academic college of literature, science, and the arts and the Division of Student Affairs jointly fund and finance IGR. Faculty and staff work with shared and equal authority to direct and teach the program.

The primary innovation of IGR is the development of its Intergroup Dialogue courses. In these courses, small groups of students spend a semester in experiential education and dialogue about race/ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, socioeconomic class, or other issues of social diversity. Trained undergraduate peers facilitate these dialogues with intensive support and supervision by faculty and staff.

In addition to the Dialogue courses, IGR offers first-year seminars on social justice and diversity, upper-level theory courses on intergroup relations, and a senior capstone course. Students preparing to become Intergroup Dialogue facilitators can take a training course, as well as a practicum course, while they are engaged in facilitation. Importantly, IGR collaborates with university housing to teach a course in community building and social justice, which is required of all residence hall student staff. Graduating seniors who have excelled in IGR courses and activities receive the Patricia Gurin Certificate of Merit in Intergroup Relations.

IGR also has an active cocurricular program that reaches over 2,000 students per year. Common Ground Workshops explore topics of identity, power, privilege, and oppression to students, staff, and faculty in one-time workshop format. IGR also sponsors Growing Allies, a weekend retreat to cultivate a community of inclusion by training individuals to be allies for social identity groups. Finally, IGR is piloting a program called SAIF (Social
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*University of Michigan*
Justice and the Arts Interactive Forum) Spaces. This program explores how the visual arts, spoken word, theater, dance, music, poetry and creative expression can support the exploration of social justice issues.

IGR actively consults with other universities to assist them in establishing dialogues and diversity programs. To that end, it has inaugurated a series of Intergroup Dialogue Institutes, in which faculty and staff members from other universities and colleges meet in Ann Arbor for an intensive three-day training session with follow-up consultations.
Engagement with Local and Global Communities

Institutions of higher education are proactively engaging with their local and global communities in ways that extend beyond just philanthropic opportunities for students to give back, and that now include opportunities for them to develop their capacities for responsible citizenship. These engagements not only serve to improve the quality of communities but they also teach students to think critically and apply their knowledge in real world settings. Although colleges once developed most of these programs as separate sets of voluntary activities, many now are weaving community-based learning into the curriculum. While there is still much to be done within civic engagement initiatives to better incorporate the knowledge, skills, and analysis of power and stratification that characterizes the scholarship and practice of diversity, those institutions that have linked their diversity and civic initiatives are discovering even more transformative results for students and communities alike. Colleges are recognizing that engagement in local and global communities is an effective way to prepare all students for leadership in a diverse society and productive work in the economy. Through effective partnerships between campuses and communities, and with the goal of civic education at the core, students have opportunities to experience what it means to make America’s democracy work for those not yet well served by it and to put into practice skills required of responsible citizens.

SAINT MARY’S COLLEGE, NOTRE DAME, IN

The Center for Women’s InterCultural Leadership (CWIL) at Saint Mary’s College was established to foster the intercultural knowledge and competence critical to educating the next generation of women leaders. CWIL has three program components: global education, research and scholarship, and leadership education.

A highlight from the leadership education component is the Catalyst Trip, a dynamic experiential learning opportunity to explore women as leaders of social change. The Catalyst Trip is a week-long trip that brings together Saint Mary’s students, faculty, and staff with community women business and nonprofit leaders to live and learn together for seven days. There is extraordinary intellectual and emotional engagement by the students with the women, whose diversity stretches across age, race, education, faith, language, nationality, and sexual orientation.

The Catalyst Trip participants look deeply at issues of race, power, and privilege. It is a holistic journey that blends dialogue, diversity workshops, and site visits to community organizations, underserved neighborhoods, and historic civil rights centers with art, ritual, and poetry to create a transformative intercultural experience. Saint Mary’s students are given concrete tools of analysis and action that they can use for the rest of their lives. The relevance of the trip for students is evident in both their academic and personal
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development as they connect the trip back into classrooms through conversations, reflections, papers, and presentations.

Considerable assessment and research has been conducted, indicating that the Catalyst Trip is having real, positive effects on students’ learning and on the community. In 2004, Sadler Consulting Services found that 100 percent of the twenty-one survey respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that they had “gained a better understanding of race and privilege” as a result of the trip. The evaluator concluded that “the Catalyst Trip Project is the most effective model for discussing issues of race, power, and privilege that this evaluator has seen…. Several women from the local community indicated that they now see the campus as a more open and inviting place as a result of the Catalyst Trip. More importantly, community members now see Saint Mary’s as an asset to the community.”

**ST. LAWRENCE UNIVERSITY, CANTON, NY**

The mission of the Center for Civic Engagement and Leadership is to increase and enhance opportunities for students to be agents of positive social change on and off campus. The center combines academic and cocurricular activities that bring students and community partners together to collaborate in community projects that address locally identified needs. The emphasis of the programming is to foster citizenship and leadership skills through community-based learning, volunteerism, and leadership training. Although faculty and staff oversee the operation of the center, it is the students who determine the nature of the programs and projects of engagement, and it is their skills and talents that determine the success of the center’s initiatives.

The center took on the challenge of bringing together students and community partners from the St. Regis Mohawk reservation to develop “learn-and-serve” programs that address needs identified by the Mohawk nation and create opportunities for multicultural, democratic education for St. Lawrence students. In conversations between center staff, Mohawk educators, and the program directors at the Akwesasne Boys and Girls Club, it was clear that there was a need on the reservation for tutoring in communication skills, math, and science. There was also a critical need for English as a second language (ESL) and for tutoring for students who attend Freedom School, an immersion program for Mohawk students.

The center instituted the “Akwesasne semester,” a quasi-off-campus learn-and-serve experience for which students take a full semester of courses on the reservation while participating in both internships at tribal agencies and serving as tutors and mentors at the Akwesasne Boys and Girls Club. This unique curriculum program brings together the campus and the community, both physically and socially.

While the students take courses on Mohawk culture and society, language, oral traditions, and history, they work together with the professional staff at the club in order to develop a wide range of programming including basic tutoring, arts and crafts, computer games, and music and dance. St. Lawrence students come away with not only a greater
understanding of life on a Native American reservation, but a clearer understanding of what it means to be a citizen in a multicultural democracy. Through their experience, they learn to see the connections between inequality and discrimination, pursuing social justice, and the skills of citizenship.

**Worcester Polytechnic Institute, Worcester, MA**

Worcester Polytechnic Institute’s (WPI) innovative, project-based program features three inquiry-based activities required of all undergraduates: the humanities and arts requirement comprises a seminar or practicum involving research or creative work that ties together the student’s previous work in a specific area of the humanities or arts; the Interactive Qualifying Project (IQP) asks students to address and report on an interdisciplinary problem relating technology to social structures and human needs; and the Major Qualifying Project (MQP) in which two- to four-student teams complete research or design projects in their major field.

As WPI’s students are traditionally focused on engineering and science, WPI has a unique approach to global studies through the implementation of the Global Perspective Program. WPI’s seven-week academic terms allows students to complete one or more of their three required projects in a full-time immersion at one of twenty-five WPI project centers located around the globe. The project centers provide an opportunity for students to work under the guidance of residential WPI faculty on real-world projects for local agencies and organizations, such as government agencies, not-for-profit organizations, NGOs, or corporations. Approximately 65 percent of WPI students complete at least one of their projects off-campus in a term-long immersion at a WPI project center, and approximately 50 percent of students complete projects overseas, where they live and work as professionals under WPI faculty guidance.

The goals of the Global Perspective Program are to instill the following in WPI students and faculty: an appreciation of difference and an ability to interact effectively with other peoples and cultures; the ability to apply their skills and knowledge across disciplinary, geographic, and political boundaries; and an understanding of themselves and what roles they might play, professionally and personally, in an increasingly interconnected world. The opportunity to complete the required projects off-campus helps students understand the social and cultural contexts of technical problems, since the students become immersed in local culture while providing solutions for their sponsors on issues of local importance. In order for students to develop the appropriate solutions, they must first develop an understanding of the local agency or organization and the community.

The Global Perspective Program helps WPI students apply what they have learned in their studies and develop an understanding of the complexities of global problems. WPI sends more than 400 students off campus each year, with participation from faculty across campus. In 2006–07, 430 students and forty faculty members participated in the program; 310 of these students spent their time abroad.
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More Reasons for Hope: Diversity Matters in Higher Education

**Dickinson College, Carlisle, PA**

Through a series of collaborations between small groups of faculty and administrators at Dickinson College, the Crossing Borders and Mosaic programs were designed as innovative models for diversity education. Both programs encourage diverse students to live, work, and study together in multiple contexts, both within the United States and abroad providing an opportunity to learn about the dynamic interactions between the local and the global contexts.

The Crossing Borders program envisions a series of crossings: personal, institutional, disciplinary, linguistic, regional, national, and international. This innovative year-long program allows students to study in Cameroon, West Africa; at Dickinson College; and at a Historically Black College or University (HBCU). Since its beginning, sixty-four students from Dickinson, Spelman, Xavier, and Dillard colleges have participated in the program. The program has four exchange cycles, with students coming together in years one and two to study together in Cameroon, West Africa, during the summer, returning to Dickinson in the fall, and finally going to either Spelman or Xavier in the spring. In cycles three and four, the same pattern was followed with Dickinson, Xavier, and Dillard students.

In all three locales, the program encourages students to focus on issues of identity and culture, and the dynamics of intergroup relations, both interculturally and intraculturally. Through readings, fieldwork, and projects, students reflect on how their own backgrounds and experiences, as well as the culture and context surrounding Cameroon influence these interactions. The main objective of the program is to educate students about the diverse and pluralistic nature of American society and how it is connected with global issues and movements of people and ideas.

The American and Global Mosaic programs are intensive semester-long programs designed around fieldwork and immersion in local and global communities. Under the American Mosaic program, students and faculty work with local communities in Steelton, Pennsylvania and Adams County, Pennsylvania to collect oral histories, organize archival data, and analyze census and socioeconomic data that reveal the origins and continuing development of these communities. As a result of the first successful Mosaic in Steelton, Dickinson committed funds for a field-based Mosaic Project to be taught once every two years.

In 2001, the Global Mosaic program was launched to examine transatlantic migration, ethnic and labor relations, and community development among various ethnic groups in the oil company towns surrounding Comodoro Rivadavia in Patagonia, Argentina. The success of the Global Mosaic program expanded the project to Mexico in 2003, Montserrat in 2005, and Venezuela in 2007.
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Ohio State University, Columbus, OH
Ohio State’s commitment to engagement with its communities is identified as a priority at the highest levels of the university. The Ohio State University Academic Plan states that the university will “significantly strengthen the scope and effectiveness of its commitment to P–12 public education, with a special focus on the education of underserved children and youth.” To that end, the Ohio State University P–12 Project was created in the 2000–2001 academic year. Ohio State’s public decision to strengthen its commitment to P–12 public education is an important statement about its intentions as a university.

The P–12 Project is a university-wide initiative, supported by central funding, and working with faculty, staff, and students across all Ohio State colleges. The university develops cross-institutional capacity to impact P–12 education, sends the message that P–12 education is a matter of importance to every unit within the university, and provides a support system unhampered by intra-college competition.

The P–12 Project has the following goals: to initiate, incubate, and support projects closely aligned with school improvement and increased student performance; to provide an organizing structure to relate Ohio state’s P–12 activities into a single point of contact for a consistent campuswide outreach program; to develop and sustain ongoing relationships with local schools and districts to improve the educational opportunities for students, educators, and families; and to link initiatives, people, and projects in order to increase impact and avoid redundancy.

The project’s activities include researching and facilitating potential partnerships, consulting with and convening partners, developing specific research, teaching, and service initiatives, and finding ways to sustain and house successful efforts. For example, the project implements and sustains partnerships with schools, agencies, and other Ohio state units, seeds and supports innovative research in P–12 education, and aligns college and high school content and pedagogy in the areas of English, science, and study skills.
About AAC&U

AAC&U is the leading national association concerned with the quality, vitality, and public standing of undergraduate liberal education. Its members are committed to extending the advantages of a liberal education to all students, regardless of academic specialization or intended career. Founded in 1915, AAC&U now comprises more than 1,150 accredited public and private colleges and universities of every type and size.

AAC&U functions as a catalyst and facilitator, forging links among presidents, administrators, and faculty members who are engaged in institutional and curricular planning. Its mission is to reinforce the collective commitment to liberal education at both the national and local levels and to help individual institutions keep the quality of student learning at the core of their work as they evolve to meet new economic and social challenges.

Information about AAC&U membership, programs, and publications can be found at [www.aacu.org](http://www.aacu.org).