Diversity and Social Justice Pilot Project: Faculty Fellows Program and Teaching Guide

Sarah Taylor, PI
Rose Wong, Co-PI
Colleen Fong, Co-PI

Programmatic Excellence and Innovation in Learning White Paper

July 2014

California State University, East Bay

Diversity and Social Justice Pilot Project Background

Project Overview

    The Diversity and Social Justice (DSJ) Faculty Fellows Pilot Program and Teaching Guide [*Pilot Program*] were implemented to advance CSU East Bay's Institutional Learning Objective stating that "Graduates of CSUEB will be able to apply knowledge of diversity and multicultural competences to promote equity and social justice in their communities." The project continued our work from the *2012-2013 Programmatic Excellent and Innovation in Learning (PEIL) Diversity and Social Justice (DSJ) Planning Project [Planning Project],* which was also funded by PEIL through the Provost's Office.

    The goal of the *Pilot Program* was to support faculty in infusing more DSJ-oriented content and pedagogical approaches into their teaching. Our previous work on the *Planning Project* indicated that high faculty workload, anxiety, and inexperience pose barriers to increasing DSJ-oriented teaching at CSUEB, thus our *Pilot Program* sought to address these challenges. The *Pilot Program* included three components: 1) A Faculty Fellows Program, through which five faculty members in the College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences received support for infusing new DSJ-oriented content and/or pedagogical approaches into a class they were teaching in Winter Quarter 2014; 2) A Teaching Guide website featuring discipline-specific guidelines, tips, and examples of DSJ-oriented content and pedagogical approaches; and 3) A Learning Community to provide support throughout the year and serve as a catalyst for ongoing DSJ-oriented cross-discipline collaborations.

    Our full project team[1] included the following faculty, staff, and students:

---

[1] Professor Julie Beck was a Co-PI of the project in Fall 2014, but was unable to continue in that role. The Faculty Fellows she was mentoring, Professors Grant Kien and Nidhi Mahendra, were re-assigned to Dr. Dianne Rush Woods.

PROJECT TEAM

Faculty Mentors:
- Sarah Taylor (PI)
- Colleen Fong (Co-PI)
- Dianne Rush Woods

Faculty Fellows:
- Duke Austin
- Sukari Ivester
- Grant Kien
- Nidhi Mahendra
- Andrew Wong

Research Assistants
- Terezia Orosz
- Kate Shaheed

Teaching Guide Developers
- Rose Wong (Co-PI)
- Eileen Barrett
- Ken Chung
- Derek Jackson Kimball
- Shirley Yap

Student Assistants
- Meleana Akolo
- Brian Alexander
- Tammy Moon
- Lee Porscha Moore
- Maria Yescas

ADDITIONAL COLLABORATORS

Difficult Dialogues Consultant
Gale Young

Training Facilitators
Julie Beck
Elizabeth Cheuka
Mary D'Alleva
Kyzyl Fenno-Smith
Colleen Fong
Alison Richardson
Jonathan Stoll
Sarah Taylor
Jessica Weiss
Andrea Wilson
Dianne Rush Woods

Advisory Board Members
Diana Balgas
Luz Calvo
Marguerite Hinrichs
Michael Lee
Maxwell Davis
Ann Fajilan
Nina Haft
Pat Jennings
Jose Lopez
Annie Manning
Maria Nieto
Jonathan Stoll

PEIL Administration and Consultants: Mary Anne Brady, Stephanie Couch, Angelica Garcia, Jodi Servatius, & Beth Yeager

Highlights of our accomplishments this year include:

- Development and implementation of a faculty fellows pilot program that included active participation of five faculty members in the College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences as Faculty Fellows and training of five student assistants in DSJ-oriented teaching practices. The faculty in the target courses taught 184 students in Winter 2014.

- Development and distribution of a *DSJ Teaching Guide* website featuring videos, articles, and teaching examples; this guide is available to all CSUEB faculty as well as colleagues at other universities.

- Launching of an ongoing DSJ learning community that can serve as a catalyst for future DSJ efforts on campus. Continuing efforts of the learning community include plans to present our work at Back to the Bay in 2014 and during the Week of Inclusive Excellence in 2015. Several members also submitted a grant proposal to expand the Faculty Fellows program to STEM faculty. Though it was not selected for 2014-2015 PEIL funding, we plan to revise and re-submit this proposal in the next year to internal and/or external funders.

- Presentation of *Planning Project* findings at two academic peer-reviewed conferences, one regional and one national:
  - Beck, J., Fong, C., Taylor, S., & Wong, R. (2014, March). A small step toward implementing diversity and social justice education through a faculty mentoring program. Oral presentation delivered by J. Beck, C.

Fong, and R. Wong at the Pacific Sociological Association Annual

Meeting, Portland, OR.

○ Taylor, S., Wong, R., Fong, C. & Beck, J. (2014, February). Exploring

conceptualization of diversity and social justice in a diverse, public, urban

university. Oral presentation delivered by S. Taylor at the 26th Annual

Ethnographic and Qualitative Research Conference, Las Vegas, NV.

The next section of this paper sets this project into the context of past efforts to support

DSJ-oriented teaching and scholarship at CSUEB. The majority of the paper consists of reports

on activities and outcomes for each of the three main components of the project. The paper

concludes with a discussion of our overarching research questions and findings, project strengths

and limitations, and implications for supporting DSJ-oriented teaching at CSUEB in the future.

History of DSJ-Related Teaching and Scholarship at CSUEB

Early DSJ-related efforts date back to 1983-84 when the University founded the

Department of Ethnic Studies and established the Cross-Cultural Groups/Women (CGW) GE

requirement. That same year the Chancellor's Office awarded Professors Young, Jones, and

Clark a grant, "Toward a Cross-Cultural Curriculum" (TACC), which enabled CLASS faculty to

pair-up with Ethnic Studies faculty to create how-to resource manuals and sets of syllabi for

integrating multicultural perspectives into general education courses in a number of departments.

TACC also sponsored two conferences (1989 and 1991) and each produced a publication,

American Behavioral Scientist (1990) Volume 34:2 and *Toward the Multicultural University*

(1995), NY: Praeger, respectively.

In 1996-97, the Faculty Center for Excellence in Teaching was established in part to

provide faculty resources to better serve the increasingly diverse student body. Faculty Learning

Communities brought faculty together to work on how to more effectively engage their diverse students, integrate diversity and social justice into their courses, and present/publish their efforts in part through the creation of Writing Circles. A number of faculty worked collaboratively even after their FLCs ended to conduct research, present conference papers and publish on DSJ. By the late 1990s, the University Mission Statement included "diverse society" and Ethnic and Women's Studies courses were not the only ones fulfilling the CGW GE requirement (although most courses were still in CLASS). In particular, GLBT-focused courses had been created to fulfill the requirement. DSJ also became embedded in administrative projects including the WASC re-accreditation process which included a "Campus Climate Survey" (2006) and the strategic planning process (2008) which culminated in a "Diversity Action Plan" (2010).

In 2011-2012, the Faculty Learning Community for Diversity, Multicultural Learning, and Social Justice led by Faculty-in-Residence Dianne Rush Woods, with participants Ann Fajilan, Margaret Harris, Silvina Ituarte, Derek Jackson Kimball, Nidhi Mahendra, Marie Mallare, Monique Manopoulos, Julia McGurk, and Sarah Taylor, completed an All-Campus Diversity Survey. The survey received 1,142 responses from students, faculty, and staff. The responses to the open-ended survey questions about students' experiences of feeling respected and disrespected in class indicated a need for additional training in DSJ-oriented teaching among CSUEB faculty. However, given the limitations of an online survey, Professors Rush Woods and Taylor felt that richer and more detailed data would be necessary to gather before developing any new initiatives.

In Spring 2012, the University implemented a DSJ Institutional Learning Objective (one of six) and our team was awarded a PEIL Planning Grant to address this ILO. In the following year we were awarded a PEIL Implementation Grant, which is the subject of this White Paper.

Individuals involved in our PEIL project played crucial roles in the previously described DSJ efforts dating back to the 1980s.

<div align="center">**Project Activities and Outcomes**</div>

Faculty Fellows Program Overview and Participants

In September 2013, the leadership team (consisting of the PI and Co-PIs) selected five Faculty Fellows (FFs) based on a call issued to all CLASS faculty –tenure track and lecturer— to participate in a program to integrate DSJ content and/or pedagogical approaches into one of their Winter 2014 courses. A call was also issued to graduate students and advanced undergrads in DSJ-related CLASS departments and five Student Assistants (SAs) were selected and paired with the FFs. As part of the application process, the FFs and the SAs agreed to the conditions of participation and a Checklist of deliverables.

The Co-PIs designed this Program to appeal to the faculty member who already had a *commitment to (*and *ideas about implementing) DSJ* but, given the heavy teaching load, might only be able to do so if provided extra resources and time. Therefore the Program provided FFs with funding for an honorarium for a guest speaker, for course materials (books and films or DSJ conference or training registration), and a modest stipend. It also provided support in the form of Faculty Mentors and two common texts, one on teaching DSJ and the other on uprooting racism. These texts were also given to members of the entire PEIL team. Providing each FF with a well-trained SA, who would be able to work up to eight hours per week, was the Program's attempt to offset the extra time faculty would spend on major revisions of a course; Co-PIs did not think requesting release time for FFs was feasible given budgetary limitations.

DSJ Faculty Fellows. The FFs included Duke Austin and Sukari Ivester, both in their first year of tenure track positions in Sociology and Social Services, Grant Kien, an Associate

Professor of Communication, Nidhi Mahendra, an Associate Professor of Communicative

Sciences and Disorders, and Andrew Wong, an Associate Professor of Anthropology. As a

whole, the FFs ranged from brand new faculty to Professor Mahendra, who had previously

participated in a number of Faculty Learning Communities on DSJ.

DSJ-Trained Student Assistants. The five SAs selected by the Co-PIs participated in a

2.5-day training in Nov. 2013 in basic pedagogy, as well as DSJ topics such as finding relevant

curriculum resources, engaging in difficult dialogues, and helping struggling students access on-

and off-campus resources. The Co-PIs brought in a number of campus experts ranging from the

EOP director to the DSJ librarian, the University Diversity Officer, and the Accessibility

Services Project Impact Assistive Technology & Tutoring Coordinator.   Part of the training

session was held at the ASU Diversity Center where the director led the SAs in an exercise that

enabled them to recognize their individual privilege (or lack thereof) in relation to others in the

group.

The following week SAs were paired with their FFs:

- Communicative Sciences and Disorders Professor Nidhi Mahendra working with a master's student in her department, Tammy Moon, on *SPPA 4866: Introduction to Neurocognitive Disorders* (50 students enrolled)
- Anthropology Professor Andrew Wong working with 2013 CSUEB Creative Writing graduate, Brian Alexander, on *ANTHRO 3800: Language and Culture* (35 students enrolled)
- Sociology Professor Duke Austin with Anthropology undergraduate Meleana Akolo, working on *SOC 4800: Crossing Borders, Crossing Boundaries* (24 students enrolled)
- Sociology Professor Sukari Ivester working with Social Work master's student Lee Porscha Moore, on *SOC 3500: Social Psychology* (40 students enrolled)
- Communication Professor Grant Kien working with Public Administration master's student Maria Yescas, *on COMM 3005: Qualitative Communication Research Methods* (35 students enrolled)

Activities, Process, Outcomes, and Benefits

The specific research questions for the Faculty Fellows Program were:

1. How did the DSJ Faculty Fellows change their course content and/or approach to teaching?

2. How did the Student Assistants apply their DSJ-training in their work with students?

3. What new opportunities for learning related to DSJ were offered to the students in the selected courses, and what evidence is there that they took these opportunities?

We gathered a variety of data throughout the project to assist us in answering these research questions. As previously stated, both FFs and SAs were required to agree to a Checklist of deliverables in the application process. Some of these deliverables included providing old and revised versions of the Syllabus, submitting a Portfolio containing evidence of DSJ-related materials offered to students and of their comprehension of this material/pedagogy as well as a commitment to meeting with their Faculty Mentors at least two times per quarter. In addition to the deliverables provided by the FFs, we also kept notes from meetings between FFs and Mentors, and asked FFs and SAs to participate in brief individual interviews with Research Assistant Kate Shaheed to learn more about each participant's activities, process, and perceived outcomes. We received IRB approval for the evaluation component of our study and can provide additional information about research design and methods on request.

In response to the first research question, regarding how faculty made changes to their courses, we sought to honor each Faculty Fellow's academic freedom by encouraging them to make adjustments to their courses that felt most appropriate given their experience, knowledge, interests, and student needs. The focus of the mentoring was on providing peer support and feedback. Each mentor and FF agreed to meet at least once in Fall quarter and twice in Winter quarter. The meetings were arranged at mutually agreeable times and locations. Each mentor provided individualized support, and some activities differed based on the mentor and FF's

interests. Specific examples of mentoring support included classroom visits, video-recorded classroom activities and discussion, and review of syllabi.

Faculty Fellows exhibited a strong commitment to maximize student engagement while addressing students' differences in learning styles, life experiences, and identities. Here are some of the changes FF made to that end:

- assessed students' learning styles prior to the first day of class
- co-authored the syllabus with students
- used texting technology to provide anonymous feedback in class
- provided students a choice to select a service learning option or blog
- randomly selected work groups
- employed a closed and open-ended questionnaire about personal experiences and opinions
- required dramatic presentations (acting) of sociology experiments

One significant example of how a FF went to great lengths to engage as many of his students as possible can be drawn from the work Professor Duke Austin did in his SOC 4800 class, "Crossing Borders, Crossing Boundaries."   Professor Austin had his students host sixty-five Oakland International High School (OIHS) students on the Hayward campus for a day. OIHS is an Oakland public high school for recent immigrants not fluent in English and CSUEB students learned through interacting with them how difficult it is to be placed in a high school environment in an English-speaking country shortly before being expected to graduate as well as the conditions that led to students' emigration.

To address research questions two and three, regarding the contributions made by student assistants, the team process, as well as the learning opportunities provided, we have included a few examples in the narrative below, as well as in Table 1 at the end of this section.

Professor Austin originally planned to bring students from San Francisco International High School but he graciously switched to Oakland after his FM told him a similar public school existed in Oakland and thought it might be a better choice for establishing an ongoing

Community Engagement /service learning partnership. In the process he learned Oakland had already established a partnership with SFSU so for Spring 2014 he planned to partner with San Francisco which did not have any partnership with a local college.

Faculty Fellows often encouraged their SAs to provide a guest lecture or design and execute a classroom exercise. SA Brian Alexander took charge of an exercise he titled "'Cool' versus 'Koo'" on code-switching behavior in FF Andrew Wong 's anthropology course, "Language and Culture." Mr. Alexander described the purpose of the exercise: "To observe and create awareness of cultural and linguistic differences without debasing or devaluing the cultural identity of others" and involved students writing down various examples of how/what language they speak at home compared to in the classroom, in an informal setting with peers and so forth after which Mr. Alexander led a discussion/debriefing with the students, examining "What cultural boundaries do language and communication present in how people code switch from formal to in formal settings? What does it mean culturally when one does not code switch or is unaware when they do?"

Student Assistant Maria Yescas provided a PowerPoint presentation to FF Grant Kien's "Qualitative Communication Research Methods" students about becoming aware of how one's beliefs are shaped by how he/she was socialized, including media influences. Ms. Yescas challenged each student to identify *one* thing that they could commit to changing. She modeled a research method by using Poll Everywhere and found that "equality" was the term most students in the class associated with the phrase, "diversity and social justice," implying that the one thing students might change in their lives was to become active advocates for equality.

The benefits of DSJ participation among the FFs and the students in their courses are revealed in some of qualitative self-evaluations we required of FFs and evaluative measures FF

voluntarily included in their individual courses. Written comments from Professor Nidhi

Mahendra indicate that even someone like her with a "career-long passion for multicultural

issues and diversity inclusion in the curriculum" had never considered infusing DSJ issues into

her "Intro to Neurocognitive Disorders" course until this PEIL opportunity. She was

"flummoxed that in all these years of teaching" this course, she had not thought about including

materials on racial disparities in neurologic disorders and created an entire section on

racial/ethnic disparities in stroke care using as the foundational reading, a 2011 article published

in *Stroke*, a journal of the American Heart Association.   After reading her students' Discussion

Board posts, Professor Mahendra commented on her students' DSJ learning outcomes: "Overall

the discussion board was a huge success showing strong evidence of student learning from

instruction about disparities (through readings and in-class discussions) and a clear sense of

ownership, as future providers, about their role in ameliorating disparities through curricular

projects aimed at consumer education, outreach, resource development, and ongoing in-depth

instruction. These comments are serving as the basis for the instructional design of a core project

in a Spring 2014 class on "Cultural and Linguistic Diversity."

          Professor Ivester provided the most concise evidence of her students' learning benefits.

At the end of the quarter she asked her "Social Psychology" (SOC 3500) students to complete an

online survey. Of the twenty students who completed her survey, 85% replied "yes" to the

question below:

> "This class was a part of the PIEL (sic) programs DSJ project to promote diversity and
> social justice in the classroom. Based on how this class was taught, do you believe that
> the professor was able to connect to the course material to you, promote diversity and
> social justice. [i.e.-are you able to apply social psychology concepts to your life and real
> life situations--did you feel included] FEEL FREE TO ADD COMMENTS!"

Table 1: Summary of Learning Opportunities Provided and Evidence of Student Take-Up (Research Question #3)			
Faculty Fellow/ Mentor/ Student Assistant	**Course/# Students**	**Learning Opportunities Offered**	**Evidence of Student Take-Up of Opportunities**
Duke Austin/ Colleen Fong/ Meleana Akolo	SOC 4800/ 24 students	- Day-long campus visit with students from Oakland International High School, during which CSUEB students interviewed the HS students and brought them to class, and gave them tours of the campus - Several DSJ-related guest speakers	Several examples of student work provided in the course portfolio show how students learned from their interactions with the HS students. CSUEB students applied macro sociological concepts to the micro-level experiences of the students they interviewed. For example, one student wrote, "Whether one is talking about legal immigration like in Student A's situation or illegal immigration coerced by economic forces like in [name]'s situation, the evidence points to the fact that large legislative acts influence people's immigration experiences."
Sukari Ivester/ Sarah Taylor/ Lee Porscha Moore	SOC 3500/ 40 students	- Co-created syllabus - Experimentation with Poll Everywhere to gather instant in-class student feedback - Social psychology theories and concepts related to culture, race, gender, and inequality were introduced throughout the course	Student papers reveal an understanding and application of the concepts of culture, race, gender, and inequality to their own lives. Student papers covered such topics as immigration, standards of beauty in the African American community, and cultural differences in inter-personal space.
Grant Kien/ Dianne Rush Woods/ Maria Yescas	COMM 3005/ 35 students	- Added new readings on race and social problems - Revised assignment to focus more directly on social justice in the media - Used Poll Everywhere to gather instant in-class student	Student papers reveal an understanding and application of the diversity and social justice concepts to their analysis of popular media. For example, one student explored misogynistic themes in hip hop music and how they might influence men's views toward women.

		feedback	
Nidhi Mahendra/ Dianne Rush Woods/ Tammy Moon	SPPA 4866/ 50 students	- Development of a new module on health disparities related to race, age, and SES, including in-class activities, a film, and a critical reflection paper	Discussion board posts show how students integrated the material and felt committed to addressing health disparities as speech-language practitioners. For example, one student wrote, "As part of SLP's knowledge on neurocognitive disorders, it should be their responsibility to do what they can to create a more balanced healthcare system where all people are treated equally and with the same quality of service."
Andrew Wong/ Colleen Fong/ Brian Alexander	ANTH 3800/ 35 students	-Development of an optional Service Learning assignment in an organization that serves non-native speakers and/or speakers of non-standard dialects of English -Required three Reflection Papers (Pre-Service; During Service; Post-Service) and an In-Class Presentation	Post-Service Reflections provide evidence that students have learned first-hand the difficulties of English Language Learners and the coping mechanisms some develop: "I've noticed that these [first-grade] students memorize the words in their books; they don't necessarily read them." Reflections also show how students can apply concepts they learned in class in the Service environment: "…knowing the differences between descriptive grammar and prescriptive grammar, I was able to differentiate what was necessary to correct and what was ok to leave as is. If something is grammatically incorrect then it must be corrected."

Teaching Guide

      Participants. The *DSJ Teaching Guide* team consisted of Rose Wong (Social Work, team leader), Shirley Yap (Mathematics), Ken Chung (Management), Eileen Barrett (English) and Derek Jackson Kimball (Physics). Colleen Fong (Ethnic Studies) provided significant guidance on design and content and conceptualized the CSUEB DSJ Efforts Timeline together with Eileen Barrett. Gale Young (Communication) also provided important direction on this project.

      Activities and process. We developed the Guide in three phases. In fall quarter, we discussed the purpose and objectives of the Guide, with Drs. Wong and Fong informing the team about findings from the Implementation Project and team members sharing faculty's DSJ needs and difficulties and barriers in DSJ-related teaching from their own disciplines and departments. In the winter quarter, team members agreed on the Guide's structure and contents, wrote initial drafts of the disciplinary sections, and gathered items for the Guide's 'resource' section. In spring and summer, team members and other contributors finalized their disciplinary sections of the Guide and Dr. Wong oversaw the development of the actual website.

      Our original objective for the Guide was to provide a quick reference of easy to integrate DSJ content and teaching methods drawn from outside sources. This objective was inspired by the syllabi analysis component of our *Planning Project*, which revealed creative DSJ teaching approaches in in both DSJ-specific courses (e.g., ethnic studies and history) and some non-DSJ-specific courses (e.g., physics and mathematics) and raised the important question of how to infuse DSJ teaching into non-DSJ-specific courses in particular. However, through a process of in-person and online email discussions amongst team members over two quarters, we came to

produce an "in house" guide showing *varied approaches toward DSJ faculty development*, which team members themselves carefully crafted reflecting their respective disciplines and assessments of their diverse students, rather than a guide with methods drawn from extramural sources. This shift in focus emerged out of our growing recognition of the importance of addressing the needs, characteristics, strengths and constraints of our own faculty and students.

The Guide's approach is based on what we learned from the *Planning Project*; specifically, that successful implementation of the DSJ ILO would require:

1. Consideration of student and faculty needs, characteristics and constraints, particularly our students' diverse sociocultural backgrounds and remediation needs and our faculty's level of preparedness and time constraints for developing their DSJ-oriented teaching at a public university where full-time faculty teach nine courses (36 units) per year.

2. Involvement of all disciplines, from humanities to the sciences, in developing and implementing DSJ education throughout the curriculum.

3. Involvement of the entire campus community, from instructional programs to student clubs and student and faculty support services and offices, in providing coordinated activities that support DSJ education.

4. Involvement of the university with the community to prepare graduates through structured learning and service/volunteer opportunities that bridge classroom and community.

5. **Development** of faculty, staff and administrators' capacity for providing DSJ-focused education and services and for practicing and modeling the values of openness, inclusivity, respect, fairness, and tolerance in interactions with students and each other as well as being agents of social change.

Outcomes and benefits with regard to student learning. The principal outcome is a

web-based guide, the *Diversity and Social Justice Teaching Guide (1ˢᵗ edition, July 2014)*

(http://www20.csueastbay.edu/faculty/teaching/index.html)*,* which explores and addresses how

CSUEB faculty can effectively teach and promote DSJ to a diverse student body. The Guide

showcases DSJ needs and difficulties identified by faculty and students and offers tips, effective

practices, and useful resources. The Guide is visually oriented and lively, containing videos and

audio recordings with stories about faculty and students' ideas and work, as well as interactive

and alive, intended to be an in-house resource as well as a resource for colleagues and students at

other universities and the public at large.

The Guide contains six sections:

1. *DSJ Timeline & Pedagogy at CSUEB* presents our university's history of DSJ-related

   efforts in historical context, statistics on faculty and students relevant to building our DSJ

   teaching capacity, and a first draft of faculty's guiding principles, intended to inspire and

   guide our faculty's development and commitment to DSJ-oriented education.

2. *DSJ Research at CSUEB* presents results from the DSJ Planning Project (institutional

   needs and linkages, focus groups with students, faculty and staff, and syllabi analysis).

3. *Highlights* shows the latest and most interesting pieces. In inspiring 'personal stories,'

   six faculty speak about their personal development and DSJ teaching practices (by

   Terezia Orosz, MSW student assistant). In 'managing hot topics,' our student assistants

   re-enacted two 'hot topic' or 'difficult dialogue' situations and give suggestions on how

   instructors can manage these. 'First steps all can take' contains tips for teaching our

   diverse student population. There is also a video of Dr. Alex Madva, whom we invited to

   speak on "Implicit Bias in Higher Education."

4. ***Faculty's Pilot Projects*** describes the projects of Drs. Wong, Austin and Ivester.

5. ***In Your Discipline*** contains approaches toward DSJ faculty development created by Drs. Yap, Chung and Kimball for their own disciplines. It also contains brief DSJ writing assignments that Dr. Barrett created for courses taught by Drs. Yap, Chung and Kimball.

6. ***Resources*** contains a speakers' bureau for compiling videos on diverse DSJ-related topics for faculty development or classroom use, news articles and reports and research articles on DSJ education related topics, and DSJ teaching support books and videos.

Benefits with regard to student learning will be evaluated next year through input given back to us in the 'Give Us Your Feedback' area of the Guide. In this section, we invite faculty, students and staff and other users to give input on DSJ education on our campus and what to include in the next edition of the Guide as well as read what others have posted. Evaluation of the website by viewers before the end of the project year was not possible due to a more complex and richer, visually oriented *Guide* being produced than originally planned, which required two additional months of work into the summer. Internal evaluations by our entire Implementation Project team in late spring during our End-of-Project Retreat, however, suggested that the *Guide* would serve as an important internal and ongoing 'live' source of inspiration and stimulation for DSJ teaching especially if it could be continually updated and built with new resources and stories on professors' new projects into future years. Team members expressed strong concern over poor continuity of important DSJ-related work such as this *Guide* due to disruptions in financial and institutional support.

Learning Community

　　　The *Pilot Program* created a learning community to provide support throughout the year and serve as a catalyst for ongoing DSJ-oriented cross-discipline collaborations across the

campus. Over 20 participants were involved in learning community activities, which included a minimum of three all-community meetings and events over the course of the year.

Participants. Participants in the learning community included all members of the leadership team, faculty fellows, student assistants, teaching guide team, collaborators, and research assistants. Many members of the broader campus community also participated in our Student Assistant Training and Celebratory Kick-Off Luncheon in November 2013.

Activities and process. As previously mentioned, each member of our learning community was given two project texts to use as a resource and provide a common foundation for our work. The texts were *Teaching for Diversity and Social Justice* by Maurianne Adams, Lee Anne Bell, and Pat Griffin and *Uprooting Racism: How White People Can Work for Racial Justice* by Paul Kivel.

Participants met three times as a large group, with additional meetings for various project-based sub-groups (e.g. leadership team, faculty fellows, student assistants, teaching guide team members, and faculty mentors with their fellows). The large group meetings included the Celebratory Luncheon and Kick-Off on November 15, a Winter Quarter check-in session on February 6, and an End-of-Project Retreat on May 9.

Outcomes and benefits. Most faculty members who were involved reported appreciating the opportunity to work with their colleagues. These perspectives were shared in the process interviews conducted by MPA Student Research Assistant, Kate Shaheed. For example, one faculty member commented, *[What] I really love is the opportunity to hear the perspective of all these other people, the students, the other faculty who are involved, sort of everybody in the group. It's not very common that faculty from different disciplines get together like this.* Another participant commented on how the being part of a larger project supported his work: *Sometimes*

it can feel like you're the only one trying to do this stuff and so having this as a faculty fellow

program really made me feel like, yeah, this campus is actually doing stuff. It's not just writing

these kinds of vacuous statements about diversity and multiculturalism and so on. There's

something tangible happening. So that really was a good boost. I'd say morale booster.

Eight learning community participants completed an evaluation survey of the year-end

retreat on May 9. Of these, seven rated the "opportunity to connect with colleagues" as *excellent*,

and one as *very good*. Three rated the "opportunity to reflect and celebrate" as *excellent*, and four

as *very good*. In open-ended comments about the most enjoyable aspects of the retreat,

participants noted that they appreciated *reconnecting with the team*, *connecting with colleagues*,

and *networking*.

A challenge in building the learning community was in having enough meetings for

participants to develop working relationships, but not so many that participants would feel that

too much time was being spent in meetings. As one faculty member noted in a process interview,

I think, more regular meetings would be nice, but at the same time, everyone is so busy. We are

all doing our own thing. Another colleague commented:

> *I think that this format is excellent because frankly a lot of people*
> *with the faculty learning communities are questioning the need to*
> *meet that many times for a very small money resource. I think that*
> *this had the nice balance of there was a lot of work time and then*
> *there were a few meetings, but I wonder about just bringing the*
> *faculty or just the faculty and student assistants together, or even*
> *some faculty that are connected because of the nature of their*
> *projects, would have enhanced it.*

This same participant thought that the a good model for support could involve the

resources of the *Pilot Program* combined with the more frequent opportunities for collaboration

as in the Faculty Learning Communities:*…in the FLC format, you wouldn't have the Student*

Assistant or the resources, but you'd have a heck of a lot of conversation and a very inter-

disciplinary conversation about this is how I plan to do this. What do you think? I think that

piece would have probably strengthened this.

A few learning community participants used the project texts and commented on how they did so. One faculty member noted, *I used the book, "Teaching for Diversity and Social Justice", and used - there's an entire section on immigration and so we were able to use a lot of the activities from that book and apply them to the class.* One of the Research Assistants, Terezia Orosz, used the *Teaching for Diversity and Social Justice* text in framing and analyzing her interviews with faculty about how they developed as DSJ-oriented educators.

Though it is too early to evaluate whether the *Pilot Program* has been successful in building an ongoing DSJ learning community, as noted in the introduction to this paper, several members have committed to present our work at Back to the Bay in 2014 and during the Week of Inclusive Excellence in 2015. At the year-end retreat, the Student Assistants voluntarily decided to meet again in June to reflect further on their experience and develop materials for the DSJ Teaching Guide, which attests to the high level of their involvement as well as the project's sustainability. Additionally, several members drafted a grant proposal to expand the faculty fellows program to STEM faculty and plan to submit this proposal in the next year to internal and/or external funders for consideration.

Discussion

Overarching Research Questions and Findings

The overarching research questions for the *Pilot Program* were:

- How do the DSJ Faculty Fellows Pilot Program and the DSJ Teaching Guide support the infusion and integration of DSJ-related teaching?

- What are some of the most promising components of the project for student learning and

  faculty development?

  The 2012-2013 *Planning Project* focus groups identified the following barriers to

infusing more DSJ content and process into teaching: concerns about workload, anxiety about

how to manage difficult dialogues, and need for additional training in DSJ. The *Pilot Program*

alleviated these barriers and thus supported infusion and integration of DSJ-related teaching

primarily by offering support and resources to faculty members. These resources included access

to trained student assistants, access to a faculty mentor, a modest stipend, funds for course

materials and guest speakers, two project texts, and with the release of the *DSJ Teaching Guide*

website, a rich repository of relevant DSJ-oriented teaching materials and inspiration for self-

development in DSJ teaching.

  We believe that all three project components are promising, but the most sustainable

aspects of the program, in terms of future funding, may be the continuing development of the

DSJ Teaching Guide website and creation of a DSJ-focused faculty mentor program. However,

we are concerned about how to encourage faculty, especially those who may be especially

uncomfortable with DSJ-oriented teaching, to take advantage of these resources. The Pilot

Program provided faculty with a several incentives to participate, including the stipend and

access to a Student Assistant.

Project Strengths and Areas for Improvement

  Strengths of the project included: 1) A leadership team that worked well together and

held one another accountable to completing the work; 2) A faculty-led initiative that minimized

issues related to Retention, Tenure, and Promotion and/or concerns about changes being imposed

from administration, thus allowing participants to take risks; 3) Committed participants that

completed project tasks, and often went beyond the minimal requirements. 4) At least two

Faculty Fellows have taken what they have gained from this project into their Spring quarter

courses or other courses they will teach in the future. 5) At least two FFs and SAs are continuing

to work together on related projects.

The main limitations were in the availability of resources. Despite availability of more

funds than are typically available for faculty projects, many felt that with more time, more could

be accomplished. Many participants wished for two years of funding so that progress made could

be more easily sustained. At the retreat, some faculty fellows expressed concern that they were

not sure how they would be able to maintain or build on the changes they made to their courses

without the support of the Student Assistants. Some faculty fellows were planning to apply for

funds to continue the new DSJ-related initiatives they begun during the project.

Though we utilized a number of preventative measures to ensure that all project

participants understood the commitment they were making, and the vast majority of team

members met or exceeded expectations, we did have a few challenges related to follow-through.

In the future, it may be helpful to be able to issue our call for applications earlier and make

ourselves more available to assist both faculty and students with the application process. This

would be contingent on receiving notification of PEIL funding earlier. We also feel that some of

the difficulties in follow-through highlight one of the problems our project was intended to

address: high faculty workload. This suggests that there may be a need for more institutional

support for DSJ-oriented teaching, to allow faculty sufficient time to plan and fully implement

broader changes.

A limitation of the DSJ Teaching Guide component is concerned with web development

technology. Web Services currently does not have a web design template for creating a modern

interactive website, which is essential for creating a 'live' in-house website resource where immediate input (e.g., through blogs, 'live' surveys, linkage with Facebook functions, etc.) can be shared and evaluation of outcomes and impact of the *Guide* can be conducted thoroughly and richly.

If the project were to be repeated or expanded, we would also make changes to the Student Assistant training, with more emphasis on the role of a Student Assistant in the classroom. Both Faculty Fellows and Student Assistants expressed a desire for more training in this area. Additionally, given that some participants commented on their desire for more opportunities to connect with colleagues, we would hold additional meetings throughout the year, perhaps monthly, to build a stronger learning community.

Conclusion

In our project proposal submitted in Spring 2013, we identified the following short-term outcomes, to be achieved within nine months from the start of the project:

- Up to 250 undergraduate students (50 per class) *will be exposed to* enhanced DSJ content

- Five Advanced Undergraduate or Graduate Students with an interest in future teaching at the college level will *be trained in* pedagogy and DSJ content (implicit and explicit curriculum)

- Two Advanced Undergraduate or Graduate Students with an interest in future research related to DSJ *will be trained in* research methods

- Five CLASS Faculty will be selected as DSJ Faculty Fellows and *make at least one substantial change to a course syllabus to incorporate DSJ* into the explicit *and* implicit curriculum

- A pilot program for training and using TAs for infusion of DSJ content into course syllabi *will be tested*

We met each of these outcomes. (Fewer students than anticipated were enrolled in the target courses, mainly due to the selection of faculty fellows and their selection of courses to enhance. As noted in the introduction, 184 students were enrolled in the target courses.) In our proposal, we also identified medium- and long-term outcomes, but it is too soon to report our progress in those areas. In particular, the *DSJ Teaching Guide* will be released in July 2014, and we look forward to assessing its impact.

The *Pilot Program* was an excellent opportunity to develop a faculty-led model for infusing DSJ-oriented content and process into teaching at CSUEB. The model appears to be effective, and with some relatively minor adjustments, could be repeated or expanded. In particular, we would like to see the model expanded to include faculty teaching in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math. We would also like to see the *DSJ Teaching Guide* maintained and updated so that new information is continuously being shared.