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Charge from Coordinating Council:

Recognizing the need to create institutional transformation that locates diversity as central to educational excellence, enhances intercultural understanding and includes all students, the Miami University Coordinating Council charged the Faculty Development Action Team:

To develop an integrated inclusive pedagogy faculty development plan for implementation in the 2005-2006 academic year using a 4-stage structural model of research, planning, enactment, and evaluation.

This subgroup of Coordinating Council was responsible for not only making recommendations but for developing a comprehensive and integrated plan which will be enacted during 2005-2006. To this end, the Team has engaged in the first two stages of this process. During fall 2004, members benchmarked existing programs at other institutions, identified and assessed existing inclusive-pedagogy faculty development efforts at Miami University, identified opportunities for integration across the University, and reviewed university diversity documents to identify action items suggested in the past but not yet enacted. During spring 2005 members identified desired outcomes, established priorities, and developed a detailed short range (1-2 year) continuous improvement plan which will include assessment mechanisms.

The following continuous improvement plan provides a theoretical educational foundation, summarizes the work done by the Faculty Development Action Team, outlines the interventions planned for 2005-2006 and lists recommendations for actions beyond the next academic year. By definition a continuous improvement plan is a fluid one which incorporates on-going assessment to further refine and inform subsequent outcomes.

It is important to note this is a multi-faceted and longitudinal plan built on existing programming already occurring throughout the University. Further, it is dependent on the support of and collaboration among key university constituents and stakeholders. The Action Team extends special thanks to Paul Anderson, Mary Jane Berman, Milt Cox, Carolyn Haynes, John Jeep, Christine Noble, and Jerry Stonewater for their collective insights and support in this important effort.

Educational Context for Inclusion:

A comparison of the U.S. Censuses for 1990 and 2000 documents striking increases in the Hispanic or Latino/a, African-American, and Asian populations—57.5%, 21.5%, and 74.3% respectively. (U. S. Census 2000). Moreover, projections indicate that within the next twenty years, 47% of the population growth in the U.S. will be among Latino/a Americans, 22% will be among African Americans and 18% will be among other minority group members. In addition to the increase in ethnic minorities, the 2000 U.S. Census also reports that there are almost 600,000 same-sex households in the U.S. According to the Human Rights Campaign, this number is likely to be artificially low since many gay
people are afraid to identify themselves because of the threat of discrimination. As university populations become increasingly more diverse, students represent a growing number of cognitive and learning styles, cultural orientations, and communication modes. This increasing trend requires faculty to address not only course content but its accessibility to and impact on all students. As James Anderson (1999) states, “…it would be naïve to expect that the cultural values, behaviors and expectations of diverse groups of students are so diluted on campus that their presence doesn’t have an impact on classroom dynamics and learning outcomes.”

In the last forty years, higher education responded to these demographic shifts in a number of ways, including mentorship programs, targeted recruitment to get underrepresented students and faculty into the academic pipeline and initiatives to give voice to ‘invisible’ minorities. While such efforts advance the democratic goals of higher education, they do not achieve the sustained, active engagement with diversity both in and outside of the classroom that promotes deeper levels of critical thought and social development (Hurtado, 1999). The report Diversity Works: The Emerging Picture of How Students Benefit emphasizes, “Evidence in the literature suggests that comprehensive institutional change in teaching methods, curriculum, campus climate, and institutional definition provides educational benefits for both minority and majority students [emphasis added]. Comprehensive diversity initiatives, beyond their capacity to improve access and retention for underrepresented groups, are related to satisfaction, academic success, and the cognitive and social development of all students.”

In 2002, the American Association of Colleges and Universities released the report, Greater Expectations calling for “a dramatic reorganization of undergraduate education to ensure that all college aspirants receive not just access to college, but an education of lasting value.” The shift from the present to this ‘new academy’ involves the recognition of the diversity of all students and the necessity to learn about one’s own and others’ cultural complexity in both domestic and global realms. (AAC & U Greater Expectations Report, 2002) As Gloria Ladson Billings (2002) states, “…[critical] pedagogy operates in the realm of the relational and the societal. No longer are we referring merely to knowledge transactions that occur in the classroom but the larger societal meanings that are imparted between and among teachers, students, and their social worlds.”

Inclusiveness is built on a foundation of the interrelationships of diversity, social justice, and culture. Diversity encompasses primary and secondary dimensions of identity such as age, race, gender, ethnicity, sexuality, religion, and socio-economic status. Social justice deals with access and equity. As Maurianne Adams (1997) states, “Social justice involves social actors who have a sense of their own agency as well as a social responsibility toward others and the society as a whole.” Finally, culture is a learned system of meanings that socializes its members to understand what it means to be desirable—a requisite for being part of the in-group. Much care must be taken to maintain that the distinct aspects of each of these conversations remain intact (Bennett & Bennett, 2001). At the same time, by reframing the conversation in terms of cultural intersections, all students are invited into the conversation with an ultimate, desired outcome of creating a more culturally sensitive mindset and skill-set based on deeper levels of critical thought.
As the Carnegie Corporation report *Liberal Arts for a Global Society* states, “Future oriented liberal education must prepare students to function effectively in a multicultural society and a world where borders may sometimes blur. The capacity to understand and communicate with people of other cultures begins with the understanding of one’s own culture and its relationship [and responsibility] to others.” (Barker, 2000)

Outside the confines of academia, these issues carry significant weight for our Miami University graduates. In increasingly diverse domestic and global climates, employers are seeking new staff with interpersonal proficiency and a broad worldview. Although Miami students receive stellar marks for knowledge, some employers may be hesitant to recruit then because of concern about a lack of diversity awareness and intercultural competence. According to Miami’s Office of Career Services, approximately 60% of the companies that recruit at Miami University inquire about opportunities to screen students with these abilities for openings in their companies. (Yearwood, 2005)

For Procter and Gamble, Inc., recently acknowledged by *DiversityInc* magazine as one of the top 50 U.S. corporations for diversity and social responsibility, a blend of diverse perspectives in the workforce is central to their mission. As stated in their recruitment literature, “There are no limits to the possibilities. P&G is an inclusive community composed of people of all cultures and abilities, including those with unique physical needs. Our ability to develop new consumer insights, create winning business strategies and provide superior global execution depends upon the richness of thought and action that only you, with your individual skills and attributes, can bring to P&G” (Procter & Gamble, 2005). In the global context, just this week, P & G launched its first companywide International Festival. As CEO A.G. Lafley stated “…for P & G to be a truly global organization, [workers] must understand the vastly different ideas, challenges and emotions of all people.” (The Cincinnati Business Courier, April 6, 2005) Procter and Gamble sent a shock throughout Miami University in May, 2003 when they temporarily curtailed their hiring efforts here because of concerns about the recruitment pool.

**Student Perceptions of the Climate for Learning at Miami:**

Synthesized results in the *Summary Report to the Division of Student Affairs on The Climate for Diversity at Miami University* (2004) from key data sets [including the 2002 *Miami University Climate Survey*, the 2004 *Dashboard Indicator Survey*, the 2004 *Women’s Advocacy Group Report*, and the 2003/2004 *Multicultural Student Enrichment Resource Report*] provide insight into Miami students’ views about how they perceive, evaluate and judge their climate for learning. We frame these findings within the notion of inclusive excellence—the premise that when campus diversity is embedded in the climate for learning, it becomes a resource to achieve academic excellence for all students (Gurin, Hurtado, & Gurin, 2002) (AACU, 2005). In this context, the integrated college experience can simultaneously increase cognitive understanding, sense of self, personal maturity and interpersonal effectiveness (King & Magolda, 1999).
Many results from the Miami assessments are consistent with national findings. In general, for Latino/a and black students in comparison to white students and for women in relation to men the former groups find the campus climate much less welcoming (Ancis, Sedlacek & Mohr, 2000; Hurtado & Carter, 1997) (Tidball, Smith, Tidball & Wolf-Wendel, 1999). Highlights from the Miami assessments indicate: 1) There is a good deal of support for a number of activities designed to improve the campus climate at Miami. It is most noteworthy that the most popular options are those that bring people with different backgrounds together in academic and social settings; 2) In overwhelming numbers students study or socialize with someone with a similar background (67-81%) while they socialize with others from a different background to a moderate extent (38-49%); 3) Students tend to treat each other rudely at times (70%) and are the source of discriminatory behavior. Among students surveyed, 19% say they have been discriminated against because of their race, 32% because of gender and 2.5% because of sexual orientation; and 4) From the much larger sampling population of the 2002 campus-wide survey, women of color and gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgendered students reported a strong sense of disconnection, and lack of support at the institution.

From a cultural perspective, higher education is deeply rooted in American values and an individualistic cultural tradition that emphasizes personal accomplishments and rights over those of the group. Generally, based on cultural tendencies, women, Latino/a, Asian, Native American and to a lesser extent, African American students are socialized in collectivistic cultures wherein collaboration rather than competition serves as the major underlying identity value and energizing force (Ting-Toomey, 1999). As the Miami University climate data suggests, to those with collectivistic cultural orientations, higher education can be an unwelcoming and disorienting place (Petrone, 2004).

Faculty Development Implications:

Chapter 8 of the 2004 North Central Accreditation Self-Study Report acknowledges the progress Miami has made through a widespread commitment to diversity and inclusion initiatives. At the same time, it states that “the University should extend its efforts to create a more inclusive climate on all campuses that welcomes and supports all Miami students.” Clearly, an initiative for inclusive excellence presents the professoriate with three major challenges:

1) Finding ways to create classroom climates and courses that address the diverse intellectual and social developmental needs of their students;
2) Engaging a range of pedagogical strategies that locate learning in students’ experiences; and
3) Facilitating intentional and meaningful intellectual engagement among and between all students.

Seminars on pedagogical approaches and curricular innovation are plentiful in colleges and universities nationwide. Although they provide potential points of entry for understanding and change, successful, inclusive pedagogical and curricular innovations must require faculty to traverse the dialectic between the traditional and the transformed
Looking beyond course content and established, pedagogical approaches, faculty must recognize the significant bearing that daily dynamics have on student engagement in the teaching and learning process (Lowman, 1984). As a beginning point, faculty must become aware of their own unique disciplinary, personal, and cultural orientation to the teaching and learning process—one that may differ considerably from those of their students.

As the scholarship of teaching demonstrates, no single teaching strategy will consistently engage all learners. As a next step, faculty must connect teaching content to the cultural backgrounds of their students. There is growing evidence that sustained engagement among students requires a holistic approach—that is, an approach wherein the how, what, and why of teaching are unified and meaningful while accommodating the dynamic mix of race, ethnicity, class, gender, sexuality, region, religion and family that contributes to every student’s cultural identity (Ogbu, 1995.)

The mission of this continuous improvement plan is to instill our students and colleagues with the capacity to think critically, to conceptualize inclusively, to act ethically, to reflect thoughtfully, and to engage in purposeful risk-taking in all their educational, civic and global endeavors. Its enactment demands a deep and unwavering commitment to ongoing programming and assessment to support faculty in creating more inclusive courses. The plan weaves together a range of component parts designed to fit the diverse needs and interests of the faculty each of which is part of a holistic, comprehensive, and integrated campus-wide effort. What follows is a summary of the plans and recommendations. A more detailed master plan will be available June 1, 2005 in the Offices of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Vice President for Student Affairs and Dean of Students, the Assistant to the President for Diversity Initiatives and Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs for Diversity Initiatives and in the Centers for American and World Cultures and the Center for the Enhancement of Learning and Teaching.

**FACULTY DEVELOPMENT CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT PLAN FOR INCLUSIVE EXCELLENCE**

**Institutional Definition:**

The Miami University Statement Asserting Respect of Human Diversity and the STRIVE Vision provide an integrated foundation for developing a more comprehensive approach to inclusive excellence. The former, which evolved from intensive work of the University Climate Committee, was endorsed by University Senate, the President, and the Miami University Board of Trustees in spring 2004. The latter is a synthesis of results of two series of inclusive, university-wide focus groups conducted by the STRIVE Initiative for Academic Excellence through Inclusion launched in the fall 2003. Common themes in both documents include:

- Valuing differences and recognition of commonalities
- Intrapersonal and interpersonal intellectual engagement
• Attention to both individual growth and growth as a community of learners
• The centrality of diversity to intellectual and social development
• An inclusive learning environment based on mutual respect and intercultural understanding
• Attention to faculty, students and staff alike as diverse knowers

Miami University Statement Asserting Respect for Human Diversity

Miami University is a community dedicated to intellectual engagement. Our campuses consist of students, faculty, and staff from a variety of backgrounds and cultures. By living, working, studying, and teaching we bring our unique viewpoints and life experiences together for the benefit of all. This inclusive learning environment, based upon an atmosphere of mutual respect and positive engagement, invites all campus citizens to explore how they think about knowledge, about themselves, and about how they see themselves in relation to others. Our intellectual and social development and daily educational interactions, whether co-curricular or classroom related, are greatly enriched by our acceptance of one another as members of the Miami University community. Through valuing our own diversity and the diversity of others, we seek to learn from one another, foster a sense of shared experience, and commit to making the university the intellectual home of us all.

We recognize that we must uphold and abide by university policies and procedures protecting individual rights and guiding democratic engagement. Any actions disregarding these policies and procedures particularly those resulting in discrimination, harassment or bigoted acts will be challenged swiftly and collectively.

All who work, live, study and teach in the Miami community must be committed to these principles of mutual respect and positive engagement which are an integral part of Miami’s focus, goals, and mission.

Miami University Vision of Inclusion
(from University-wide STRIVE conversations)

Miami University will be nationally recognized for its academic excellence. It will cultivate in its students, faculty and staff a passion for discovery, exploration and learning that crosses perspectives, disciplines, campuses, and cultures. Known for its broadly inclusive community, Miami will value diversity as an educational resource for promoting an outstanding liberal arts undergraduate education and distinguished graduate programs. Good listening and honest intellectual dialogue will be fostered to create a trusting, challenging and seamless learning environment which will encourage purposeful risks, ethical reasoning, and continuous reflection and improvement. Our
graduates will infuse these values into their lives and into their civic and global engagements.

**Guiding Beliefs:**

The following beliefs shared by all Team members and supported by the literature guided the development of this continuous improvement plan:

- Miami University will attain excellence—achieving both the First in 2009 goals and continuous improvement beyond 2009—when diversity is central to its mission.

- Excellence is achievable through intellectual, interpersonal, and cultural engagement.

- Engaging diversity is central to the intellectual and social development of all people.

- Engaging others “where they are” is the starting point for creating inclusive dialogue.

- An inclusive teaching and learning environment recognizes the learning needs of all students and creates opportunities for their growth and success.

- Inclusive learning environments foster alliances among all members of the university and the broader communities.

- There are multiple ways to create more inclusive classrooms regardless of discipline.

- Inclusive learning environments require service, teaching, advising, and research to be complimentary endeavors.

**FACULTY DEVELOPMENT FOR INCLUSIVE EXCELLENCE**

**Interventions for the 2005-2006 Academic**

**&**

**Recommendations for Future Actions**

After reviewing numerous diversity reports, benchmarking other higher education institutions, reviewing Miami University assessment data and informally surveying students and faculty, the Team concluded that the following interventions best meet the short range-needs of Miami University faculty. Although the outline that follows may seem extensive, most recommendations bridge already existing programs into a more comprehensive and integrated effort. By doing this, it is the Team’s hope that the
programs will become incorporated into the ongoing fabric of the institution and not be dependent on the initiative of a particular individual or group.

**Intervention # 1: Extended New Faculty Orientation Program**

With the projected turnover in faculty, Miami will be hiring a critical mass of new faculty in the next five years who will be instrumental in shaping the teaching and learning environment and overall institutional culture. This integrated and extended new faculty orientation program will offer seminars/workshops throughout the year to help faculty recognize and address inclusive teaching challenges.

**Outcomes by July 1:**

1. Create a brochure that includes a calendar which will be sent to all new faculty outlining the “inclusion” faculty development options for academic year 2005-2006. (with an accompanying letter from the President’s Office welcoming the new faculty member). The information will also appear on the CELT website and in the new CELT Newsletter.
2. Identify assessment mechanisms for each event and the overall program.
3. Create of a Steering Committee to champion and assess the outcomes and plan for subsequent year coordinated by CELT and representative Associate Deans.

**Intervention # 2: Sustained Programming**

Targeted for faculty already actively engaged in inclusive-pedagogy, this programming fosters their efforts, assists in maximizing their success, and facilitates an informal, interdisciplinary dialogue among the participants. An important component of this programming is to develop “inclusion leadership” among the participants. As invaluable resources within the institution, in future years these faculty will be able to share a cadre of best practices and model diverse pedagogical strategies with those ranging from novice to resistor. Using a ‘peer-to-peer’ model for disseminating inclusive-pedagogy practices has far greater credibility than the ‘expert-from-outside’ model.

**Programs for Implementation for 2005--2006:**

- **BROWN BAG SERIES** – a four part series of 2 hour seminars using and interactive and dialogic format focusing on take-away tools—strategies faculty can implement right away to foster greater inclusion and engagement. Potential topic include Facilitating Difficult Conversations in the Classroom,” “Developing Inclusive Syllabus,” “Pedagogies that Work,” and “Contrasting Faculty Learning Styles with Student Learning Styles.” Sponsored by CELT and coordinated and publicized with the Student Affairs Brown Bag Series.

- **LET’S TALK**—Three diversity dialogues among faculty and students coordinated with the Division of Student Affairs. All topics for these conversations will be related to inclusion, engagement and high achievement. Possible topics include
“Who are Millenial Students?” “American Cultural Identity,” “Learning in the Miami Classroom” “What’s It Like for me at Miami.” Participants will be cross sections of faculty and students or targeted audiences of underrepresented groups identified on the basis of climate research. The Center for American and World Cultures will provide the venue and advertising for the dialogues. The Office of Assistant to the President for Diversity Initiatives and the Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs for Diversity Initiatives will identify and invite the faculty and student participants, coordinate the training for the faculty/student facilitation team, and provide funding for refreshments. There will be three sessions during 2005-2006 scheduled from 5:00-7:00 P.M. on dates in mid- to late September, early November and early February.

- **INCLUSION SCHOLARS COLLABORATIVE/CRITICAL FRIEND**

  This two phase initiative is modeled after the Assessment Scholars program sponsored by Liberal Education. The Center for the Enhancement of Learning and Teaching, the Center for American and World Cultures and the Center for Writing Excellence are jointly sponsoring and providing funding to support this effort.

  **2005-2006 PHASE I: Our Miami Inclusion Scholars Collaborative**

  As Inclusion Scholars faculty and student affairs professionals will collaborate to study inclusion research and inclusive best practices. The specific outcome for faculty will be to redesign a course making it a prototype for inclusive excellence. For student affairs professionals, the outcome will be to develop co-curricular programming which extends the teaching and learning process outside of the classroom. The call for participants will come jointly from the Provost’s Office, Assistant to the President for Diversity Initiatives and the Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs for Diversity Issues. Ron Scott, CELT Faculty Teaching Associate and Professor of Communication, will be the facilitator.

  **2006-2007 PHASE II: Critical Friends**

  The Critical Friends approach is a semi-formal mentoring framework launched several years ago by the Annenberg Institute and the National Coalition of Essential Schools. A Critical Friends Group (CFG) brings together a small group of educators for at least a year to encourage each other look seriously at their own classroom practice. After training in group process skills, participants focus on determining challenging, measurable learning outcomes and designing the pedagogical strategies to attain them. In a setting of mutual support and respect, peers receive critical feedback to assist them in refining their strategies. During the second phase of this program, Inclusion Scholars pairs—preferably one faculty member and one student affairs professional—will facilitate a group of three to five faculty in incorporating inclusive excellence into their courses and corresponding co-curricular activities. Lead facilitators will be selected from the previous year’s Inclusion Scholars Collaborative.
DIVISIONAL DIVERSITY RESOURCE TEAMS: Using a train-the-trainer model, diversity committees will participate in a workshop addressing a diversity issue identified from climate data and their own unit objectives. All members of the divisional diversity committee will be invited to participate in this training which they will be responsible for diffusing into their respective departments with a goal of fostering inclusion. Outcomes will be reported as best practices within the respective divisions and on the CELT website. Plans for workshops in the School of Engineering and Applied Science and the School of Fine Arts are underway and will be implemented in early fall 2005. Ron Scott and Marty Petrone will coordinate this effort.

Intervention #3: Strategic Training/Resources for Administration

Creating a culture of inclusion at any institution required the sustained and unwavering commitment of the administration. With the creation of two top level administrative positions for diversity initiatives and the positive assessment of the North Central Accreditation Team of Miami’s diversity efforts, it is clear that Miami has made that commitment. At the same time, as Brown University President, Ruth J. Simmons said at a recent gathering of the Leadership Alliance—a coalition of 29 higher-education institutions established in 1992 to bring more minority students into mathematics, science, engineering, and technology—“…we are not anywhere near where we should have been by this date." (Schmidt, 2005). The following recommendations are designed to more clearly situate the importance of diversity as central to both the educational mission and the viability of Miami University and would be implemented through the Offices of the Assistant to the President for Diversity Initiatives and the Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs for Diversity Initiatives.

Recommendations for 2005-2006 include:

1. Place the Statement for Respect for Human Diversity and the STRIVE Vision prominently on the University website and other communication outlets throughout campus.

2. Write and disseminate widely a White Paper on the centrality of diversity to academic and social development. It would be a comprehensive explanation including relevant Miami and national data about the centrality of diversity to critical thinking which:
   - Provides an overview of inclusion excellence and its impact on the intellectual and social development of students
   - Outlines a bulleted best practices resource guide for administrators who want to create a more inclusive climate in their units.

3. Develop and mandate mechanisms for creating and incorporating an accountability and reward system for inclusion/diversity teaching and learning efforts.
4. The development of detailed plans for an OUR MIAMI CAUCUS (referred to as Diversity Summit) which will focus on the climate for students.

5. The creation of a Student Advocacy Board to provide an ongoing resource to monitor and address student perspectives and issues. [This group is being established through the Division of Student Affairs.]

6. Charging the Coordinating Council along with the Assistant to the President for Diversity Initiatives/Associate Provost and the Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs for Diversity Initiatives with creating a broadly representative committee to undertake an institutional cultural audit and to develop an action plan to implement educational change based on the findings.

7. Develop a template to audit existing departments and programs for inclusion/intercultural sensitivity, and conduct audit.

8. Establish a mechanism for conducting Unit Level Inclusion Self-Assessments which would include a cultural audit component with an emphasis on policies and procedures—perhaps involving a group of Department Chairs to pilot it.


**Intervention 4: Creation of an “inclusion” link on the CELT website**
(linked to Hamilton, Luxembourg and Middletown campuses)

**Outcomes:**
- Complete off-line development of web resource by June 1, 2005
- Test and de-bug on-line version by July 1, 2005.
- Launch and publicize on or before August 1, 2005

**Future Recommendations:**

1. **FACULTY COLLOQUIUM SPEAKERS BUREAU & SERIES**—a compendium of faculty efforts to create inclusive course curricula complemented with a monthly 1½ hour showcase of faculty efforts to create inclusive course curricula.

2. **PRO-SEMINAR** on inclusive pedagogy or curriculum using either a 11:30-1:00 P.M. model on the same day of the week on five consecutive weeks, or a week-long intersession format. (Intercession would occur in May, 2006 and the series would occur during the fall semester 2006.)

3. **RESOURCE CONSORTIUM:** A compilation of the range of supplemental teaching resources available to assist faculty in locating/developing instructional materials and strategies which address a range of student learning styles
4. **Establish IMPACT AWARDS** for the department/programs/units that have made a meaningful impact on improving the campus climate

5. **Submit a PRESIDENT’S ENRICHMENT PROPOSAL** or seek external funding to establish a Center for Intercultural Understanding and Conflict Resolution.


*Summary Report to the Division of Student Affairs on The Climate for Diversity at Miami University*, 2004.


Yearwood, G. Assistant Director of Career Services, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio.