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FOREWORD

SCIENTISTS AND ADVOCATES

Considering the constellation of publications on educational access and equity, one may ask, “why another journal?” The answer to that question lies in our concepts of research. How do we define it? What is its purpose? For the scientist, research is the observation of controlled events to test a hypothesis or to see what new conclusions emerge from those observations. The scientist’s purpose may involve professional aspiration or just curiosity. But for the advocate, research is digging and searching for facts that support a particular position. The advocate’s purpose may also involve professional aspiration, but ultimately, the purpose is to advance a cause. Removing Vestiges is meant for the advocate. The cause is inclusion and diversity in higher education, particularly, community colleges.

Some who appear to be scientists are really advocates. Research language can influence seemingly objective observations to fall directly in line with a desired position. Consider, for example, opinion polls on affirmative action. When college admissions or employment policies are described as “preferential” or related quotas, respondents are much more likely to reject them, than those presented in the context of equal opportunity or affirmative action. The unspoken and erroneous assumption is that affirmative action grants privileges to unqualified people. Therefore, continued use of those terms in polls weakens conclusions regarding affirmative action public perception.

Context also influences the strength of conclusions drawn from advocacy research. In an academic context, the idea of linking advocacy and research would seem to conflict with the idea of objectivity. Meanwhile, in a legal context, that link is expected and remunerated. And despite the frequent misgivings about lawyers in general, legal research is respected. We may disagree with the ideas expressed in a particular legal brief, but we still treat the process of discovery as a valid intellectual enterprise.

As future issues of Removing Vestiges unfold, we will be measured by our ability to publish convincing articles containing facts, reasoning, and practical suggestions that foster diversity and inclusion. Our context is multi-dimensional. Each dimension—legal, political, and academic—is relevant because each represents means by which diversity has been challenged. Hopwood v. Texas and Podberesky v. Kirwan used legal means to restrict race-conscious admissions, financial aid or employment policies. California’s Proposition 209 used political means, an off-year referendum to achieve the same goals. Academic means are used by organizations such as the National Association of Scholars. Such organizations use the power of the pen to fervently resist diversity and multiculturalism in the curricula, classroom, and cultural milieu. Therefore, continued justification for diversity and inclusion must take the arguments of all three dimensions into account.

Although the economic dimension is also relevant, it is because economic arguments have been used to support diversity, not challenge it. An example of the economic argument is the consistent theme found throughout Texas in the wake of its recent litigation. Business, political and educational leaders agree that diversity is good for its economic future. As they analyze demographic trends, they recognize that if they do not educate the growing numbers of Hispanic and African American students, they will hinder their own ability to compete against other states. They recognize that an educated workforce draws jobs and bolsters productivity.

This first edition explores four subject areas. Alex Johnson and Audrey Wynn first offer ways for CEOs and presidents to implement AACC’s recent statement on inclusion, a statement intended to state the association’s position on diversity and inclusion. In the second, Nan Ottenritter offers a framework that institutions can use to assess their climate for sexual minorities on campus. Jeffrey Ayala Milligan’s article examines how cultural infusion of the curriculum or the creation of a critical pedagogy can bring cultural diversity to homogeneous rural areas. In the final article on service learning, Michelle Dunlap looks at how this new approach to scholarship can be used to expose white American students to diverse cultures.

As you read these articles, consider the climate for educational access and opportunity at your institution. How well is your institution meeting the needs of its diverse students? How well is it preparing its community of learners to work with an increasingly diverse society? Do the articles presented here provide insight into new ways to accomplish those tasks? Is more research or advocacy needed to bolster campus support for diversity programming?

Your comments are welcomed. Let us know about issues that should be covered in the future. Our success depends on an open exchange of knowledge between practitioners, researchers, and advocates.

--Arnold M. Kee, Editor
The Challenge to Presidential Leadership:
Promoting Inclusion at Community Colleges

by Alex Johnson & Audrey Wynn

The American Association of Community College’s (AACC) “Statement on Inclusion” makes clear the organization’s interest in promoting diversity at its member institutions despite growing opposition to affirmative action. Using the statement as a guide, community college presidents can expand diversity at their institutions and in their communities. In this article, strategies for promoting inclusion coincide with the four main areas of the statement. The four areas are relating inclusion to the mission, instituting practices that nurture inclusion, creating campus climates that support inclusion, and facilitating understanding of inclusion.

At its April 1997 meeting in Anaheim, California, the Board of Directors of the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) made public its official stance on diversity through formal adoption of the “AACC Statement on Inclusion.” The statement (figure 1) represents, in part, the work of the AACC Commission on Minority Resources, which advises the AACC Board on campus climate and other issues regarding diversity.

In brief, the AACC Board urges schools to:

► Make inclusion an integral component of missions and a visible part of everyday campus life.
► Institute and evaluate practices that conform to the concept of access.
► Shape campus environments to resemble a model community where individuals interact with understanding, tolerance, and respect for others.
► Help students gain fuller understanding of human rights and develop skills that allow them effectively to participate in a democratic society.

The AACC Board’s action is a bold step. Its position is in stark contrast to the current mood in America regarding affirmative action, as illustrated by the recent enactment of Proposition 209, The California Civil Rights Initiative.

The action by the AACC board is a bold step. Its position is in stark contrast to the current mood in America regarding affirmative action, as illustrated by the recent enactment of Proposition 209, The California Civil Rights Initiative.

The President’s Response

While most presidents understand the importance of diversity and its obvious benefits to their campuses, public opposition to affirmative action may serve to weaken the prospects for successfully implementing programs. In some instances opposition, or apathy, may emerge from the campus setting. Students oppose diversity when they are forced to compete among various cultural and ethnic groups for scarce resources. In the faculty, there is little sense of urgency regarding diversity except among minority and junior professors who often integrate information in courses and serve in key roles on committees (Levine 1990). Administrators may be apprehensive about publicly advocating inclusion for fear of offending supporters, including governing boards and political bodies. The AACC statement counters this climate by providing presidents with leverage. The statement represents more than 1,000 community colleges who continue or institute programs that value diversity.
Community colleges provide access to a broad spectrum of quality educational opportunities and life experiences. The colleges value diversity as an enhancement of those experiences, in their classrooms, administrative offices, and board rooms. They are committed to policies that promote fairness and inclusion for all in the life of the college. As a reflection of the colleges’ commitment, the American Association of Community Colleges strives to promote fairness and inclusion in its own policies and practices and urges its members to make these qualities a major emphasis of their mission.

AACC strongly endorses the continued use of admissions guidelines and employment practices that promote diversity in community colleges.
The colleges should be free to pursue standards and guidelines which allow them to fulfill their diversity missions and visions. The students they educate will help provide tomorrow’s leaders, and their colleges experience must demonstrate the richness and substance of our diverse, multicultural and global environment. The college environment should promote understanding and appreciation of others, while encouraging students to grow as individuals.

AACC reaffirms its commitment to diversity.
In accord with this philosophy, the Association encourages community colleges to evaluate their hiring, admissions, and financial aid policies to ensure diversity and equal access within their institutions. The colleges should ensure that the results of these evaluations conform to the concept of open access -- the cornerstone of the community college mission.

AACC believes that diversity is crucial to a democratic society.
Community colleges are, in effect, microcosms of our greater society. As such, they should encourage and enhance the fullest understanding of human rights and responsibilities and should teach the skills that allow their students to effectively participate in a democratic society. The colleges should be responsible for shaping an environment that mirrors the general culture and creates opportunities for all within the college community to interact with understanding, tolerance, and respect for others. In this way, diversity in education not only serves as a model for the world at large, but it also helps perpetuate social harmony for the future.

Adopted 4/12/97
The president, as chief executive officer, represents the entire institution as it deals with the public and is the “out-front” person in creating the programs that make the institution a more viable community resource. This out-front position engenders respect for presidential policy and aspirations for the institution (Kramer and Weiner 1994). In capitalizing upon this status, presidents must make inclusion a personal and institutional commitment and elevate it to a prominent position among other priorities.

A constructive response to the AACC statement will require presidents to exercise such authority. The implication is that presidents must assume a high profile role in advocating the advantages of a multicultural campus. In support of this claim, Roe (1992) concluded that there is a positive relationship between actions of community college leaders and the success of programs for students from diverse backgrounds.

To help the president develop a response to the AACC statement, the following sections offer strategies that coincide with the statement’s four areas: relating inclusion to the mission; instituting practices that nurture inclusion; creating campus climates that support inclusion; and facilitating understanding of inclusion.

**Relating Inclusion to the Mission**

Preliminary results of a national survey of community colleges (Kee 1997) showed that the mission statements of 52 percent of the schools responding contained the word “diversity.” This result affirms the traditional community college mission focus on access. It also suggests that the value an institution places on multicultural ideals should be evident in its mission.

The first element of the AACC statement reinforces this important notion. The mission is the fixed point from where the president launches concepts about diversity programming. These concepts should be introduced initially to a college’s board of trustees to convey the importance of inclusion in the academic community, to obtain input and consensus, and to gain advocates who can communicate the value of a diverse campus to differing public and political entities. The board should then adopt a policy that affirms its commitment to inclusion and that empowers the president to lead the development of a climate conducive to diversity (Kee and Mahoney 1995; Chait, Holland and Taylor, 1996).

The challenge to the president is to translate the board policy into specific action. The president’s vision of inclusion is an important element at this juncture. It must be sensitive to the dynamic needs of the campus and inspires creativity and participation (Mintzberg 1994). To determine the importance of vision to diversity programming, Gillette-Karam, Roueche, and Roueche (1991) interviewed 16 community college presidents and researchers concluded that:

> Vision is an intricate part of the presidents’ policies and programs and lays the groundwork of those institutional goals that the community college seeks to implement, essentially to exercise inclusionary practices in the American community college. (p. 179)

The researchers cite the work of Augusta Souza Kappner. While president of the Borough of Manhattan Community College, she envisioned a campus with different faces — the faces of women, ethnic minorities, and the disabled. President Kappner acted upon this vision through strategies designed to retain more women and ethnic groups, create an expanded hiring pool, provide support for faculty development, and offer a balanced curriculum.

**Instituting Practices That Nurture Inclusion**

To carry out the vision, goals must be developed that capture the organization’s desire to create a diverse community. From each goal
stem objectives that lead to measurable strategies depicting the institution’s strive toward diversity. The strategies mesh word and deed and are actual interpretations of the mission, vision, goals, and objectives. They are increments that nurture long-term commitment “to create a multicultural future rather than to emphasize simple problem solving” (Levine 1990, 6).

The strategies emanate from each level of the campus and form an institution-wide plan. In accordance with the AACC statement’s second element, periodic evaluation of the plan ensures that the goals and objectives remain timely, the strategies are accomplished, and the collective efforts of individuals are leading toward a diverse community.

The president is responsible for obtaining commitment. To accomplish this, the president must apply a personal leadership style that articulates the vision at gatherings of campus leaders and staff to demonstrate dedication to the diversity agenda. Management tools are effective for involving individuals at each level of the organization. For example, principles of continuous quality improvement, or CQI, can elicit genuine commitment, strengthen institutional processes, and focus on customer needs.

At Cuyahoga Community College (CCC) in Cleveland, Ohio, CQI was beneficial in addressing concerns by African American students that some health careers programs’ admissions policies were prejudiced. A CQI team, sanctioned by President Jerry Sue Thornton, reviewed the policies and concluded that the students’ concerns stemmed not from deliberate bias but from poor communication. The team recommended that the policies be revised and publicized widely to foster communication and promote consistent criteria across programs.

Creating Campus Climates That Support Inclusion

The third element of the AACC statement implies that a diverse student body helps the college community appreciate different cultures and the influence of these cultures on society. A diverse staff can heighten cultural identity. To create such a setting, programs must be established for recruiting students and staff (Kinlaw 1989).

In recruiting students at CCC, for example, visits to high schools help locate talented individuals who are scholarship possibilities. Faculty and staff identify students as early as the ninth grade and point out the benefits of a community college education. When these students enter the college, they enroll in programs for first-time students and learning communities that allow them to interact with other students, become familiar with institutional resources, and form relationships that enhance their success. These experiences help them move beyond current circumstances to develop a global view of society.

Once enrolled in college, they should encounter staff who reflect their ethnic and cultural backgrounds. Faculty play an important role here:

A diverse faculty is essential to a pluralistic campus. Faculty create the curriculum and determine the quality of the experience in every classroom. They serve as teachers, mentors, advisors, and role models. In a word, faculty are the core of the institution and without the contributions of minority individuals, no faculty or institution can be complete. (Green 1989 p. 81)

Objections to affirmative action have not curtailed the desire by some community colleges to diversify the faculty ranks. Kee (1997) reported that Clinton Community College in Iowa, Jackson State Community College in Tennessee, and Palm Beach Community College in Florida are among institutions that continue to operate minority faculty recruitment programs.

Involvement in the community can underscore the college’s commitment to inclusion. For example, while the primary purpose of one program at Cuyahoga Community College is to use its faculty and staff to supply preschool screening, General Education Development (GED) programs, and nutrition education for residents in local public housing, the outcome is the enrollment of a more diverse student base from the surrounding community. Tessa Pollock, president of Glendale Community College in Phoenix, pointed out earlier in her career that this is an important role for schools located in urban settings whose neighbors are often underserved. The college’s responsibility is to enliven and encourage individuals who desire to raise their educational and economic levels (Gillette-Karam, Roueche, and Roueche, 1991).

The physical attributes of the campus can symbolize the college’s commitment to inclusion. A center that accentuates multicultural values can benefit all students by serving as a place to study, create associations, and learn about diversity.
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Jr. Center serves as a reservoir of information for any student desiring to learn more about African American culture and life.

Facilitating Understanding of Inclusion

Helping all students gain fuller understanding of a multicultural society is an important aspect of the final element of the AACC statement. It underscores the value of a campus, like that described in the previous section, that reflects the cultural and ethnic makeup of the community. It argues for formal programs that:

1. Allow students from diverse backgrounds to interact;
2. Provide academic experiences that foster multicultural values; and
3. Offer cultural and social activities that reinforce the benefits of life in a pluralistic society.

These dimensions represent the educational core of diversity programming and are discussed separately in the following sections. Included in the discussion are implications for presidential leadership and examples of how each dimension is addressed at community colleges.

1. Opportunities for student interaction. Exhorting students from different ethnic groups to interact is an important responsibility. However, it is made more difficult when majority students feel victimized by efforts toward inclusion. These students observe scarce resources going to scholarships, support services, and facilities that do not benefit them. Such preferential treatment sometimes evokes skepticism and hostility. Minority students feel offended by this attitude and often create cultural enclaves that reinforce their sense of worth.

Taking this into account, the president must ensure that all students have access to opportunity, since exclusionary programs do not cultivate interactions among students. General orientation sessions before enrollment or freshman seminars for academic credit can allow students from diverse backgrounds a chance to discuss their views on inclusion. Clubs and organizations also can encourage students to collaborate for a common cause and help them develop the social and leadership skills needed for success in a broader community.

Phi Theta Kappa, the community college honor society, through its Student Leadership Program has been instrumental in helping CCC students develop these skills. Among other things, students learn how to gather information, hold meetings, and obtain group support for projects. One of these projects is a Habitat for Humanity home to be constructed in inner city Cleveland by students and community volunteers during the spring of 1998.

2. Academic experiences. Green (1989) concluded that “a curriculum that truly broadens students’ horizons and enables them to appreciate different cultures, different modes of thinking and inquiry, and different values and aesthetics will benefit all students” (p. 132). This can happen when the president supports innovative ways for transmitting knowledge about the contributions of various cultural groups to American society. Survey and introductory courses can highlight the various contributions of minorities in technical fields (i.e., engineering and health technologies). Students can also examine multicultural issues by working with a faculty member on an independent study or research project. Seminars and colloquia offer opportunities for students to encounter divergent views that help them form individual opinions about inclusion.

The importance of academic experiences is highlighted in the preliminary results of the survey conducted by Kee (1997). Fifty-eight percent of the respondents offered credit programs that address ethnic and race relations. For example, Mercer County Community College in New Jersey offers the Writing Across the Disciplines program in courses that consider multicultural values and life. At Santa Fe Community College in New Mexico students learn from courses and leadership activities offered through its Institute for Intercultural Community Leadership. Cedar Valley College in Texas uses technology to teach multicultural topics in its Meso-American Multi-Media Teaching Presentation program.

3. Cultural and social activities. Another way that presidents can facilitate inclusion is through social and cultural activities, which accomplish two things. First, they create more opportunities for students to learn about various cultures represented on the campus. For example, Diversity Day each year allows students to experience life in the countries represented by international students. Second, when these events are open to neighbors, they help communicate respect for the contributions of the community to helping form a diverse campus. At CCC the Cultural Arts Series contributes to this notion through performances that honor Cleveland’s African-American, Hispanic, and Indian communities.
Conclusions

Since its inception, the community college has played an important role in bringing together persons from diverse backgrounds. In 1995, almost half of all students of color in higher education were enrolled in community colleges. Forty-five percent of all African American, 52 percent of all Hispanic, 44 percent of all Asian/Pacific Islander, and 56 percent of all Native American students in higher education attend community colleges.

The AACC policy statement, however, was not designed to pay homage to the community college mission’s focus on access. It was developed to help college leaders and supporters offset the current public backlash against programs designed to increase the number of qualified minorities in higher education and to assert the community college’s leadership role in helping address the nation’s access agenda (Eaton 1994).

Presidents are at the forefront of this movement. They must form a vision and articulate it vigorously and extensively to gain support. Resources must be allocated to fund activities at each level of the college. These activities must be evaluated regularly to ensure that they are leading to a diverse campus. Through these actions the president will build a campus that values differences and demonstrates to the community that diversity is important to a well-rounded education.

Views on Leadership, Vision & Values

People in authority must develop the vision and authority to call the shots. There are always risks in taking the initiative, but there are greater risks now in waiting for sure things, especially since there are very few sure things in the current volatile climate. At the same time, the people have to admit their need for leadership, for vision, for dreams.

Warren Bennis 1989

A community lives in the minds of its members, in shared assumptions, beliefs, customs, ideas that give meaning, ideas that motivate . . . the leaders whom we admire most help revitalize our shared beliefs and values. They have always spent a portion of their time teaching the value framework.

John Gardner 1990

At its core, the process of values-based leadership is the creation of moral symmetry among those with competing values . . . [it] brings order to the whole by creating transcendent values that provide a tent large enough to hold all the different aspirations, and in which all can find satisfaction.

James O’Toole 1995
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The Courage to Care: Addressing Sexual Minority Issues on Campus

by Nan Ottenritter

This article provides a framework for assessing the community college's inclusion of sexual minority students: lesbians, gays, bisexuals, and transgender individuals. These students face many of the same issues as ethnic and racial minorities. An analysis of their status can lend itself to the understanding of all.

The topic of sex and inclusion of sexual minorities can be difficult. The fact that much of the research and discussion on minority groups has not included sexual minorities says volumes in itself.

Within circles of sexual minority persons, terminology is often unclear. Since homosexual often connotes solely male, in this paper the term gay will refer to male homosexuals and lesbian to female homosexuals. Bisexuals are individuals who possess a fluidity of sexuality that moves between attraction/behavior/identity oriented to same-sex and opposite-sex individuals. Transgender persons are those who “re-assign the sex they were labeled [both medically and sociologically] at birth” (Feinberg 1996). To reflect the fluidity of sexuality, authors of current literature use “L/G/B/T” to be inclusive of all groups. The term queer is also often used by activists and activist scholars in an attempt to create identity by using and converting the meaning of the oppressive language of the past.

The terms homophobia and heterosexism both imply the devaluing of sexual orientations other than heterosexuality. However, homophobia connotes more fear, prejudice, and discrimination than heterosexism, while one of the characteristics of heterosexism is rendering L/G/B/T persons invisible. Most of the material and research described here pertains particularly to lesbians and gays. However, all sexual minorities have a great deal in common regarding their relationship to society and the institutions within, therefore useful parallels can be drawn.

At Catonsville Community College, angry responses began as soon as a notice for All Inclusive—the gay, lesbian, and bisexual student group—ran in the spring 1994 alumni newsletter. Mary Hinton, director of annual giving and alumni affairs, says,

Five or six graduates wrote to say we were promoting a deviant lifestyle, and others said they wouldn’t give to the annual fund. (Van Wallach 1995)

Community colleges can be assessed, and thereby held accountable, for three functional domains: education, services, and procedures and policies. The above quote reflects a concern found in the services domain. The following Institutional Assessment of Sexual Minority Status Checklist describes the three functional domains by highlighting areas found within those domains. “Prompt questions” are then provided to guide the reader in reflecting upon some of the L/G/B/T minority issues found in each area (see figure 1).

Upon reviewing the list, one can see that inclusion of sexual minority students is an institutional affair. Campus climate and social climate are at least as important as textbook content in the creation of an equitable environment. Why are these three functional domains (and their accompanying areas) so important to the lives of L/G/B/T persons in the campus community? Why are they so important to everyone in the campus community?

I probably could have been involved a lot more, but I didn’t feel like it. All of the girls were talking about their boyfriends. My psychology teacher let it be known that gay issues were not to be talked about. So, I held back. I wasn’t going to risk my neck. (Anonymous lesbian student)

The measure of our humanity is found in how we regard those who are considered the “least” of us, and the denial of opportunity for...
Figure 1— Institutional Assessment of Sexual Minority Status Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDUCATION</th>
<th>1. CURRICULUM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>q Are L/G/B/T appropriately included in textbooks and materials used in class?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any stand-alone courses on L/G/B/T history, theory, etc.?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q Are there any programs of study on L/G/B/T history, theory, etc.?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q Are there L/G/B/T resources in the college library?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is physical space allocated for a L/G/B/T resources collection or studies center?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have student computer labs been assessed for equal Internet access to L/G/B/T Web sites?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROCEDURES &amp; POLICIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. THE CLASSROOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q Has a safe climate been created in which L/G/B/T issues can be raised and discussed, as appropriate to the course?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q Are interactions with L/G/B/T students equitable?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDUCATION</th>
<th>4. HEALTH CENTERS AND HEALTH FAIRS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>q Are L/G/B/T groups and agencies represented at health fairs?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is inclusive language used? i.e., use of partner instead of girlfriend or boyfriend?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do health center staff address the health concerns of L/G/B/T students and staff in a non-judgmental way? i.e., not assume that every student is heterosexual, be aware of health needs particular to L/G/B/T students and staff?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q Is confidentiality regarding sexual orientation honored and/or required?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q Are referrals made to L/G/B/T community services when appropriate?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDUCATION</th>
<th>5. GROUPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>q Are L/G/B/T groups welcomed and supported? i.e., through use of SGA funds and school facilities, availability of advisers, etc.?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q If there are affinity groups in the overall alumni support structure are L/G/B/T groups included?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDUCATION</th>
<th>6. ACTIVITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>q Are L/G/B/T-oriented programs included in the social/educational/entertainment programming by the SGA and other campus groups?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q Are L/G/B/T resources provided along with other student support resources at orientations, counseling and advisement, etc.?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDUCATION</th>
<th>7. RESIDENCE LIFE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>q Is a safe living environment provided for L/G/B/T persons?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q Is there housing for same-sex partners?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDUCATION</th>
<th>8. COMPLIANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>q Is the institution in compliance with federal, state, and local laws/policies? i.e., “Don’t ask, don’t tell” policies in ROTC programs, governors’ executive orders, state laws regarding same-sex marriage, etc.?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q Has the institution established its own policies to affirm L/G/B/T faculty and staff? i.e., nondiscrimination clauses, collegial support for L/G/B/T staff and their partners, etc.?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDUCATION</th>
<th>9. EMPLOYEE RIGHTS/BENEFITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>q Are domestic partner benefits offered?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are staff development opportunities for prejudice reduction and education about L/G/B/T issues offered?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDUCATION</th>
<th>10. CAMPUS SAFETY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>q Is there a mechanism for reporting hate crimes on the campus?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q Are staff members trained in how to mitigate conflict and reduce prejudice in their interactions with students?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDUCATION</th>
<th>11. GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>q Is there an effective grievance procedure that clearly states the policy, breaches of the policy, and sanctions for harassment, discrimination, and other offenses?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q Are all constituencies on campus aware of the procedures?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q Do the procedures operate in a timely and effective manner?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDUCATION</th>
<th>12. COLLEGE CONSTITUENCIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>q Are L/G/B/T persons visible members of different college constituencies, i.e., the faculty senate, administrative groups, student government association, etc.?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
some results in the denial of their gifts to all. No one knows how the student quoted above could have contributed to her college community. No one knows how she could have grown had the college community been open to her. Yet, on a grander scale, community colleges do know these things.

As one of the premier “democratizing” institutions in America, community colleges have long acknowledged their importance to the lives of many. Policies of open access ensure opportunities for nearly all in our society. Look at the mission statements of most community colleges. They include:

- maintaining a comprehensive and dynamic curriculum;
- promoting critical and creative thinking and academic honesty;
- supporting the personal and academic success of students;
- educating students for responsible citizenship, civility and mutual respect in a multicultural and global society;
- creating alliances with and beyond the college district;
- and advancing a college organization that learns continuously through team effort and draws upon everyone’s talents, work, and creativity.

(Old college of DuPage 1995)

Knowing all of this—the importance of every individual, the community colleges’ mandate to serve, the need for educators to shift from a monocultural to multicultural perspective, the disproportionately high suicide rate among lesbian and gay adolescents (Gibson 1989), and the consumer-driven nature of higher education—(lesbians and gays alone make up approximately 10 percent of the population (O’Connor 1991), so they account for a substantial contribution to the college), what’s needed to advance us beyond our present level of inclusion and understanding of L/G/B/T persons? There are three areas of understanding: individual development, the coming out process, and the nature of prejudice and discrimination.

**Critical Understandings**

The first area of understanding concerns that of **individual development**. Eric Eriksson stated that life experience is produced through the interaction of the biological, psychological, and societal systems. We experience different developmental challenges at different points in our lives; movement through a sequence of stages from birth to death requires successful completion of the developmental challenges of the previous stage (Newman and Newman 1995).

Eighty-four percent of community college students are younger than 39 (IPEDS 1995), the time of life when people solidify gender
Not only do community colleges serve sexual minority students, they also serve their families, train their caregivers, and interact with their communities.

identity and explore sexual relationships and forms of intimacy. What supports do community colleges provide for students and staff alike to accomplish these developmental tasks? Colleges provide role models for students and establish norms for permissible topics of conversation. Through cocurricular programming community colleges create safe spaces for students to develop social skills such as dating. College classes also provide opportunities to learn and think about human relationships, health, and personal development.

In order to heighten the awareness of individual development for L/G/B/T persons, let’s reframe the question: What supports do community colleges provide for L/G/B/T students? When community colleges have teachers, staff members, and students who are “out” (that is, have disclosed their sexual identity), there are role models. Role models can be important for lesbians and gays because they help to counteract widely accepted myths and can also help in stigma management. When partners/significant others or L/G/B/T issues are discussed in the lunchroom, critical thinking has been promoted. When L/G/B/T clubs are chartered as part of student government associations, same-sex couples are welcomed to the dance floor, and family discounts are offered, students have been educated for responsible citizenship, civility, and mutual respect in a multicultural and global society. When developmental psychology texts discuss same-sex coupling, mental health courses explore homosexual attractions, and health courses acknowledge same-gender sex, academic honesty has been achieved.

*I have said to you to speak the truth is a painful thing. To be forced to tell lies is much worse.* (Wilde 1909)

The second area of understanding concerns that of the coming out process. At the same time that L/G/B/T persons are progressing through Erikson’s developmental stages, they are also progressing through stages in the coming out process. This is a unique characteristic shared only with others who belong to invisible minority groups, for example those who have a learning disability. The case of a gay adolescent will illustrate the point. The boy’s family typically does not know or acknowledge that he is gay, so he must assume the burden of informing them and risk possible expulsion from the family and home. In many instances, he has not had a gay culture with which to identify and has been quite isolated in his experience of sexuality and community up until this point. This experience is different from, say, an African American adolescent growing up in an Afrocentric home and community.

There have been many models formulated to describe this coming out process (Cass 1979; Myers et al. 1991). In an effort to consolidate these models and provide a brief, yet understandable framework, consider a Room of Life model (Ottenritter 1995). The “rooms” of all lives are decorated with possessions, events, values, and beliefs. People decorate,
accessorize, and rearrange all of these as deemed fit. The room of an L/G/B/T person has a mobile hanging in the middle. This flexible, moving piece of art represents sexual identity. It can be bumped into, walked around, seen through, decorated and celebrated, or disguised and hidden. The tiers of the mobile represent the four stages of sexual identity formation: difference, identification, acceptance, and integration. The stage of difference lies close to the ceiling, while integration lies close to the ground.

Difference involves feelings of marginality, not “fitting in.” There is no conscious awareness of the mobile, yet its presence is most certainly sensed and it influences behavior. This first stage was suggested in Janice Ian’s song Seventeen. Years later she came out as a lesbian.

In the stage of identification, there is a great deal of confusion. The mobile is now recognized as a possible homosexual orientation. Confusion abounds as feelings and attractions clash head-on with societal norms. The anxiety produced is the result of a cognitive dissonance that pushes for resolution through alienation and isolation or reaching out to others. The mobile in the room of life is now a focus of interest and interaction.

Closer to the ground (and to being grounded), is the stage of acceptance. Could a magic wand of sexual orientation be waved, the person’s wish would be to remain gay. Social contact with other lesbians and gays prevail, with some, to the point of possibly dichotomizing the world into straight and gay. Some people become involved in political activity. For all, the mobile has assumed great importance in their room of life, making it a greater part of that room.

The last stage, of integration, is the stage of congruency. Homosexual identity is recognized as one of several core identities with which one identifies. The cognitive dissonance of the past has been resolved. The mobile has now become a balanced part of the room of life. One has the ability to freely shift focus to and from the mobile and other aspects of the room.

The importance of understanding this model can be found in two domains: individual and institutional. It is important to recognize that just as students are at different stages in their life development according to Erikson’s model, L/G/B/T students are at different stages in their coming out process. Programming and services need to provide for this full range. A reticence to talk in class may be considered as a natural part of the stage of difference. The choice of a homosexual theme for a psychology paper may be the first step in the stage of identification in which a person can use the terms lesbian and gay and study homosexuality. L/G/B/T political activism can be an indicator for the stage of acceptance. A staff member’s inclusion of their partner at the staff holiday party may be seen as a statement of integration.

The other side of this picture is that L/G/B/T persons are always coming out. In becoming a new member of any group, they must constantly make choices on how to manage the process. Not only do community colleges serve sexual minority students, they also serve their families, train their caregivers, and interact with their communities. The members of these constituencies may be at their own stages in the coming out process, not for themselves but in their roles as someone in relationship with a person of sexual minority status.

The second area of importance concerns the use of this model as a guide for institutional assessment. While the Institutional Assessment of Sexual Minority Status Checklist highlights important areas of intervention, the Room of Life model describes the journey toward integration. For the individual this concerns sexual identity. For the institution it concerns becoming an institution that is not only welcoming of sexual diversity but has woven acceptance of sexual minorities into its fabric. Perhaps your institution is at the stage of difference, skirting around sexual minority issues. Perhaps it is in the midst of turmoil as honest recognition of one of its constituencies clashes with community norms. Perhaps the campus has moved into acceptance, refuting attempts to eliminate sexual orientation from the nondiscrimination clause. Perhaps it is in the stage of integration in which, for instance, the L/G/B/T student club is just one more group clamoring for funds.

We are all caught in an inescapable network of mutuality, tied into a single garment of destiny. Whatever affects one directly, affects all indirectly. (King, Jr.)

The third area of understanding harkens back to the “democratizing” function of community colleges and concerns understanding the nature of prejudice and discrimination. Prejudice is formed and fueled by stereotypes,
myths, academic dishonesty, and invisibility of oppressed peoples. In a discussion concerning why student affairs personnel do not attempt to provide a just and supportive environment for L/G/B/T persons, Marszalek (1995) cites the belief that providing a supportive environment means the same as advocating a L/G/B/T lifestyle. This is one myth surrounding sexual minority persons. Another belief is that students will report a greater willingness to engage in gay positive behaviors following exposure with gay and lesbians, for instance, on a speakers panel. This hypothesis was not supported in a study by Reinhardt (1994).

One of the greatest burdens of all oppressed people is internalized oppression, the tendency to self-censor according to societal beliefs. Persons of sexual minority status live daily with internalized homophobia and heterosexism. The activation of prejudice results in discriminatory practice that flourishes, at times, because of simple hatred and, at times, because of simple inattentiveness. The Council on Interracial Books for Children of the National Parent and Teacher Association (1983) cites the following reasons for preparing a special bulletin in homophobia and education: (1) homophobia oppresses at least one-tenth of our population, (2) homophobia is the ultimate weapon in enforcing rigid sex-role conformity that oppresses all females and limits male options as well, and (3) young people are generally appallingly misinformed about homosexuality. In the community college’s quest to impart democratic ideals, the creation of life-affirming community college environments for persons of sexual minority status is simply the next step in the quest for social justice.

Best Practices

Community college leaders need not reinvent the wheel. While sexual minority issues remain difficult for many, there are institutions and leaders who have made great progress. The American Council on Education’s 1989 publication Minors on Campus: A Handbook for Enhancing Diversity provides important institutional program descriptions and contacts for minority issues in general. Their important strategies include: recognizing climate as an issue, recognizing the issue belongs to everyone on campus, providing education and training, involving students, keeping an eye on the classroom, paying attention to symbols, building a critical mass of minorities on campus, cultivating pluralism in cultural and extracurricular activities, and establishing a policy and mechanism for dealing with bias. Many of the resources cited at the end of this chapter provide guidance for dealing specifically with L/G/B/T issues.

What can one person, regardless of position on the community college campus, do? The following tips have been gleaned from community college leaders across the nation:

- **Personalize and put a face on your efforts.** Get to know your L/G/B/T students and colleagues. Learn about their world and share yours with them. Invite L/G/B/T persons to the college to speak. Changes efforts are made more for people than for causes.

- **Be a challenger.** Challenge the language and symbols present on your campus. Are they inclusive? Remember that social context is defined, to a large degree, through language and symbols.

- **Be a leader.** Help in setting inclusive policies, modeling just behavior, and bringing difficult issues to the table. Invite students, faculty, administrators, community members, and representatives of all minority groups. Model the inclusive situations you seek.

- **Be a team player.** Be direct and assertive and willing to meet conflict in the spirit of creating common ground. Seek out support from colleagues, community members, students, and others as you go about this work.

Minority issues are complex affairs. Values and beliefs that lie close to the heart undergird discussions of minority concerns. Assuring that the needs of sexual minority students are met can be particularly complex and troublesome for community college leaders. Yet community colleges have the rare privilege and challenge of bringing community back to the lives of many Americans.

Community must be defined not only as a region to be served, but also as a climate to be created in the classroom, on the campus, and around the world. (Commission on the Future of Community Colleges 1988)

If the values of these communities are about inclusivity and social justice, then the needs of sexual minority persons must be included as well. And those who work for these goals should be upheld and supported as they work to fulfill the missions of their community colleges.
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Critical Pedagogy: Socially Responsible Teaching for the Rural Community College?

by Jeffrey Ayala Milligan

This article explores the relevance of critical pedagogy as a means of addressing social justice issues in the context of rural community colleges serving predominantly white student populations. While strongly advocating critical pedagogy as a response to a "moral imperative" to resist continuing racist, sexist, and homophobic bias in U.S. society, it also acknowledges difficulties faced in homogenous rural settings.

Over the past three decades one of the most influential currents in contemporary educational discourse in the U.S. has been the efforts of feminists and other cultural critics to identify and critique the ways in which education participates in the oppression of women and minorities (Sleeter 1991; Giroux and McLaren 1994). While much of this scholarship focuses on problems associated with race, it also includes discourses on gender, ethnicity, and sexual orientation as well as the ways these socially constructed categories interact. Some of the more recent contributions to this conversation—McCarthy and Crichlow (1993) on race in education, the AAUW report (1992), Code (1991), Pipher (1995) on gender biases, and Carlson (1994) on homophobia—testify to the enduring nature of these problems. According to at least one recent critic of American education, we live in an “age of triage” that sorts rather than educates young people, and these biases constitute some of the more important criteria for selection (Books 1995).

Ironically, this climate of racism, sexism, and homophobia persists after decades of effort—and some success—to bring about change in a context of growing cultural diversity. According to the American Council on Education, almost 42 percent of students will be from minority or poor groups by the year 2000 while nearly 75 percent of the workforce will be composed of women and people of color (Mohandy 1994). Many scholars have responded to the persistence of bias amid this growth in diversity by exploring and exposing the mechanisms of social oppression and proposing means to eradicate it. In recent years these efforts have inspired a conservative backlash against the so-called “political correctness” of the multicultural movement, charging multiculturalists with a reverse discrimination that unfairly privileges women and minorities. Celebrated authors and prominent public figures decry quotas and affirmative action, defend the Western intellectual tradition against the multicultural “visigoths,” and suggest that poverty is a result of the personal and cultural deficiencies of the poor rather than the result of the economic policies of the powerful (Aufderheide 1992). Clearly, the culture war is being vigorously prosecuted by both sides.

In the smoke and confusion of such cultural battles it is particularly difficult to decide on a responsible course of action. If racism, sexism, and homophobia continue to plague society, how should the community college respond? Does a heavy emphasis on occupational training mean that such issues are peripheral to other missions? Or are such issues critically important to efforts to educate thoughtful, well-informed citizens for this multicultural democracy? Can rural, predominantly white community colleges where such conflicts rarely arise responsibly ignore them? Such institutions have as compelling a moral duty to address problems of racism, sexism, and homophobia as the most urban, culturally diverse community colleges. Even if these issues are “not a problem here” there is a moral duty to raise them. In what follows, an approach to education in the rural community college is proposed that can help discharge that moral duty: critical pedagogy.

Critical Pedagogy as Transformative Education

Acknowledging the significance of the problems of racism, sexism, homophobia, and other forms of discrimination, many scholars have accepted the moral imperative to act. One of the most prominent educational theories promoting this kind of activism is critical pedagogy. Rooted in the philosophies of Karl Marx, Antonio
In literature survey courses, I take the now rather standard approach of attempting to broaden the canon.

Gramsci, Michel Foucault and others and given explicit educational relevance in the pioneering thought of Paulo Freire (1990), critical pedagogy constitutes an education for critical consciousness that focuses on the existence, evolution, and operation of oppressive social structures and how they function to disempower particular groups in society (Noddings 1995). It attempts to reveal the social mechanisms that enable economic inequality and cultural hegemony by calling into question the notions of epistemological objectivity on which they rest and revealing the power of subjective individual positions to both conceal and expose what Foucault has named the “will to power” (Code 1991). It examines culture from the perspective of a variety of subject positions, particularly those that have been traditionally ignored. Thus the concept of voice, the power to articulate one’s subjective experience, becomes important to any attempt to understand and change existing institutions. Critical pedagogy, therefore, requires the inclusion of different “voices” in the curriculum. But it is more than simple inclusion. It is more than a celebration of diversity. Critical pedagogy is an explicitly political critique of the status quo from the perspective of these long-silenced voices that challenges both teachers and students to cross the borders of dominant ideologies and taken-for-granted assumptions about the way the world is and should be. It constitutes an education for social transformation rather than simple cultural transmission.

The literature on critical pedagogy, however, tends to be written from the perspective either of minority teachers or of majority teachers in urban, culturally diverse settings where the issues of voice are embodied in the presence of minority students and teachers. It does not address the particular context of the rural community college serving primarily white students. But surely the need for a transformative pedagogy is just as great, if not more so, in rural community colleges with predominantly white faculties serving predominantly white student populations. In Oklahoma, for instance, community colleges serve approximately half of the students in higher education (Oklahoma Regents for Higher Education 1994). This number includes large populations of rural students who have often not had the opportunities of their urban, university counterparts to experience a more diverse cultural milieu. It also includes large numbers of students who are enrolled in vocational programs with no intention of transferring to four-year colleges or universities. Surely, if critical pedagogy is to be successful in transforming oppressive social structures, we must not ignore this particular context. And this effort need not, and perhaps cannot, await the presence of minority faculty or large minority enrollments.

Crossing Borders in “Little Dixie”

In my own teaching as an honors English instructor, I have attempted to use the perspective of critical pedagogy in both the development of curricula and my teaching of that curricula. In literature survey courses I take the now rather standard approach of attempting to broaden the

---

Figure 1: Total Number and Percentage of Institutions, by location, 1995

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: IPEDS, 1995
canon of what is traditionally taught by including more work by women and minority authors in order to challenge my students’ assumptions about who writes and what constitutes literature and to engage them in discussion about the implications of canon construction. In composition courses I incorporate readings that not only illustrate the characteristics of effective expository writing but also engage students in critical discussion of racism, sexism, and homophobia. In effect, the instruction has two goals. It aims to transmit conventions of effective communication and cultural literacy and foster the critique of the social, political, and economic status quo that may empower them to more fully understand their own experience and transform what is in light of what ought to be.

Explicit to my practice then is a conception of multicultural education as empowerment; however, given the peculiar cultural milieu in which I teach, multicultural education may actually constitute a kind of dis-empowerment, or more accurately, a kind of re-empowerment, for many students. Located in southeastern Oklahoma in a region commonly referred to as “Little Dixie,” Murray State College also serves a predominantly rural 10-county area far behind the lines of the so-called culture wars. Our administration, faculty, and staff is overwhelmingly white and, with the exception of some non-professional staff, largely middle class. The student population at the main campus in Tishomingo is also largely white, though there are small minorities of Native American and African American students. Generally, MSC students come from poor and working-class backgrounds in a cultural milieu as permeated by racist, sexist, and homophobic attitudes as the rest of U.S. society, if not more so. And, given the generally conservative orientation of the area, they often espouse class values that seem to contradict their own socioeconomic positions. Thus a critical, multicultural pedagogy premised on empowerment can become in this context disempowerment or re-empowerment in that it encourages students to reexamine assumptions that unfairly privilege straight white men and that unnecessarily separate them from the poor and working-class people of color whose economic predicament they share.

Challenges to Critical Pedagogy in the Rural Community College

Although the practices described here are, perhaps, not terribly unusual, especially in university or urban settings, they face particular challenges in the context of a rural, largely monocultural community college. These challenges include the somewhat predictable resistance to such an explicitly political pedagogy from some administrators, faculty, and students as well as an apparent contradiction in critical pedagogy that its use in such a setting reveals. These challenges do not, however, release teachers in the rural community college from a moral imperative to help dismantle social injustice, nor do they necessarily disqualify critical pedagogy as a method of discharging that responsibility.

Credibility. Some administrators, faculty, and students will no doubt see critical pedagogy as yet another manifestation of that bugbear of the Right known as “political correctness.” It represents, in their view, an unwarranted and divisive politicization of education concerned more with claiming unearned and illegitimate power for its proponents than educating students. And some might contend that it is inconsistent with the mission of the community college, which is to provide occupational training and to transmit the cultural heritage so students can become productive members of society. Such criticisms should not be lightly dismissed as they correctly identify points where proponents of critical pedagogy are vulnerable to the excesses that are a real danger in any transformative agenda driven by ethical ideals. However, if social injustice, economic inequality, racism, sexism, and homophobia continue to exist in our society, then education that transmits such a culture unchanged or fits students to the needs of business and industry as if they were but one more input into the economic machine is morally irresponsible. A democratic society requires critically conscious citizens.

Empowerment. The second challenge to critical pedagogy in the predominantly white, rural, community college is an apparent contradiction on the issues of empowerment and voice that arises from the implementation of critical pedagogy in such a context. Though Freire (1990) and other advocates of critical pedagogy acknowledge a role for members of “oppressor”
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETHNICITY</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL ENROLLMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFRICAN AMERICAN</td>
<td>47,041</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMERICAN INDIAN</td>
<td>12,816</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASIAN AMERICAN</td>
<td>8,051</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HISPANIC</td>
<td>28,312</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: IPEDS, 1995
classes in the transformation of oppressive social structures, this role is typically articulated in the context of a “majority” or upper-class teacher teaching minority students or the oppressed. But what happens in the context described here: a straight, white, middle-class man teaching straight, white students with middle-class values to resist racism, sexism, homophobia and class biases? Does the multicultural empowerment agenda become, in this context, disempowerment as suggested? What sort of disempowerment is it? Surely the empowerment of women and minorities requires the transformation of values that have been deployed to illegitimately claim social power. However, carrying out such an agenda clearly involves the exercise of power on the part of the teacher, power which has its own questionable sources: age, gender, race, grades, bureaucratic power, etc. This does not sound like the critical pedagogy Freire described, for it seems to come uncomfortably close to the ideological puritanism that obscures individual agency by attributing a “false consciousness” to students, a trap into which Marxist-inspired social criticism has often fallen.

**Voice.** A related problem is that of voice. The concept of voice refers to the individual’s freedom to name his or her own experience and to articulate that experience from the particular subject position he or she occupies. Using this concept, feminist and other cultural critics have long examined the ways in which the voices of women and minorities have been silenced by patriarchal social authority which has routinely either ignored those voices or assumed the authority to speak for them. One aspect of empowerment then is allowing members of oppressed groups to speak for themselves, to name their own experience. But how does the white teacher of predominantly white students who takes seriously the moral imperative to participate in the dismantling of oppressive social structures make room for the voices of the oppressed? Obviously such a context can and should make room for the voices of women, who are present in the classroom, and the deliberate inclusion of texts by minority authors might seem to give voice to some of those groups not represented in the classroom. However, course instructors select the authors and their works that will be read in class. Does this constitute another instance of speaking for minorities since the instructor translates the voices of these authors? As for the women in the class, who hold more traditional values about the status and role of women, is there room for their voices when the instructor asks them to read and discuss essays written from a feminist critical perspective?

Freire shows how false generosity...perpetuates inequality in that it denies the agency of the oppressed and maintains the unequal power relationships that persist in our society.

Roman (1993) addresses these questions by suggesting the possibility of speaking *with* as an alternative to speaking *for*. Describing a teaching situation not too different from my own, Roman argues that it is possible for the white teacher of white students to speak in the interests of the oppressed “other” even if that other is not physically present in the classroom. But what does Roman mean by speaking *with*? Clearly she does not mean speaking *to*, since she has stipulated that the other need not be present in the classroom. She apparently means that it is possible to give voice to interests that are consistent with the interests of the oppressed. But how is this not speaking *for* the oppressed “other”? Is this not a case of a white teacher describing to white students the concerns of African Americans, Native Americans, etc.?

The issue here is much more than a simple question of prepositions if we take seriously the concepts of voice and empowerment as central to critical pedagogy and any educational efforts to transform oppressive social structures. The white male teacher in the largely white classroom functions within a historical and social context that is steeped in values and attitudes that often have served to perpetuate racism, sexism, and homophobia. As suggested earlier, one of the most common characteristics of racist and sexist practices has been the long tradition of patriarchal authority figures speaking for women and minorities, telling women what they think and feel and what is good for them, telling minorities who they are and what role is proper for them in society (Woolf 1938; Said 1978). Any attempt to work toward the transformation of such values and attitudes must be approached with great care in order to avoid perpetuating stereotypes and unequal power relations. Freire (1990) and Greene (1978) have shown how there is something of a prepositional minefield that can threaten a teacher’s attempts to act on that moral imperative that our awareness of social injustice places on us. For instance, the emotional gratification such a teacher may receive from playing the role of the “good white guy” standing up for the oppressed against the bad oppressors is very powerful and seductive. Freire shows how false generosity—malefic generosity according to Greene—perpetuates inequality in that it denies the agency of the oppressed and maintains the unequal power relationships that persist in our society.

Clearly, negotiating such a prepositional minefield is difficult. The moral imperative to act in dismantling oppressive social structures means that some of us will have to surrender power, that we turn the power we have acquired through such structures toward dismantling
them. However, because the values that enable these forms of oppression are so deeply imbedded in our culture and because we benefit from them, it is exceedingly difficult to act on this moral imperative in ways that do not simply perpetuate the inequality. The easiest response to this problem, the easiest thing to do in a minefield, is to just stand still, to say to ourselves, “I teach English composition and literature; I am not a social missionary. I will remain carelessly apolitical in my work.” But this response leaves existing social structures intact. Though we might disagree about the extent to which such structures are oppressive, we surely cannot ignore the fact that inequality, racism, sexism, and homophobia exist. Since they do exist, such a response constitutes a failure to act on our ethical responsibilities. A second response to this problem, to our predicament in the middle of this cultural minefield, it to choose what appears to be the right direction to take and move. Though such a course of action runs the risk of degenerating into another case of malefic generosity, it is the better alternative because it at least contains the possibility of improvement over the status quo.

**Responding to a Moral Imperative**

What does all this mean for those who would work to transform society through a critical pedagogy in a rural community college? It means we must be willing to take risks. We must recognize that there may be times and contexts in which it is ethically necessary to speak for women and minorities. Rural community colleges may be one of these contexts. Where limited diversity and the weight of unexamined cultural assumptions effectively silence discussion of social injustice, someone must begin the dialogue. Where feminism is commonly associated with lesbianism or reduced to a prefix for “Nazi,” speaking for the rights and concerns of women is not just a women’s issue. Where coming out of the closet can be literally dangerous, someone must speak for the rights of gays and lesbians so the climate is changed. Those of us who are often in a greater relative position to speak in such environments—white and/or male administrators, faculty, and staff—should do so, should initiate critical dialogue via curricula, policies, and campus activities on issues of social injustice. Critical pedagogy is the most effective means of engaging in this vital dialogue in the classroom because it goes deeper than the colorful and comfortable facade of simple inclusion to address difficult questions: Why are things as they are? Who benefits? What will it mean to change?

This is not to suggest that straight, white male teachers at rural community colleges are or should be the moral “lone rangers” rescuing the “oppressed” on their campuses. There are and will be others in such environments who are sympathetic and actively committed to transforming oppressive social structures. I am suggesting that such teachers and others in authority in rural community colleges have a crucial role to play. These issues should be a concern as well. Neither should we perpetuate the stereotype of southern, rural communities as bastions of racial and gender bias. Such an image is unfair. However, racial and gender bias and the oppressive social structures that perpetuate them do exist in urban and rural communities. In light of this fact, educators in rural community colleges where the so-called “culture wars” are little more than a distant rumble over the horizon should bring the “war” to their own campuses, for it is not a war but a crucial debate over the kind of society we have been and the kind of society we will be. As such it is crucial to the education of thoughtful, ethical citizens for an evolving democracy. And it requires a critical pedagogy of transformation, not an unreflective pedagogy of simple transmission.

Implementing such a pedagogy will require a willingness to take risks and receive criticism. It will require careful scrutiny of instructional methods: Do they rely upon the teacher’s exercise of power and control, or do they empower students to engage in critical reflection? It will require curricula that are more than a museum collection of cultural artifacts lumped together to demonstrate our “inclusiveness.” It also requires curricula composing differing, competing, even contradictory cultural responses to basic existential questions, responses which embody and inspire critical debate and reflection. In responding to the moral imperative to dismantle racism, sexism, and homophobia, we must recognize that our power to speak for oppressed others is partly a result of the oppression we seek to dismantle. Instructors’ statements, spoken from positions of privilege, as well as the various positions expressed in our curricula, are tentative, provisional, subject to change or even outright contradiction by the voices of the oppressed in the classroom, or in the texts presented to students. We must be constantly aware of the possibility of our own biases tainting our pedagogy and suspicious of the powerful seductions of playing moral lone ranger. We must be willing to step on mines, recognizing that the resulting explosion, is not fatal, and in fact is an opportunity to learn in dialogue with others as we respond to the moral imperative to speak for others in order to speak against racism, sexism, homophobia, and other forms of injustice.
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Multicultural Service Learning: Challenges, Research, and Solutions for Assisting Students

by Michelle Dunlap

This article focuses on formal service learning among privileged European American students. Given the paucity of studies available on the multicultural aspects of service learning, this article articulates the need for multicultural experiences within service learning, and offers information on multicultural challenges, issues, and solutions that occur from students’ points of view.

There is a desperate need for the multicultural challenges, issues, and solutions in all educational contexts, particularly in the service learning context, to be more thoroughly examined within the higher education literature (Damon-Moore 1997). Service learning has an obvious connection to minority-related issues and goals, because it is often majority or traditionally privileged people in our society who formally engage in volunteer efforts to help or reform those whom they see as in need. The traditionally disenfranchised also volunteer, perhaps as much or more than do the privileged, but often on an informal basis that cannot be as easily measured or quantified.

This article first considers a working definition of service learning. It then considers service learning as a multicultural issue. Next, it considers multicultural service learning as a community college issue. Last, it offers resources, practical ideas, suggestions, and solutions for improving racial and multi-ethnic awareness and understanding among students through the medium of service learning.

Definition of Service Learning

“Service learning” has been defined in a number of ways ranging from a form of learning that promotes civic responsibility and community action toward improvement, to learning that moves beyond volunteerism because it emphasizes critical reflection upon one’s community experiences (Boss 1994; Berson 1997; Campus Compact 1993; Giles Honnet and Migliore 1991; Howard 1993; Markus Howard and King 1993; Morton and Troppe 1996; Sigmon 1994). The current working definition for this paper will include the concept of “critical reflection.” This is the act of regularly writing about, talking about, reflecting upon, or otherwise grappling with one’s service-related experiences, feelings, and connections to course content (Berson 1997; Goldsmith 1993). Critical reflection transcends volunteering, and distinguishes service learning from volunteerism.

Thus, for the purposes of this article, service learning is defined as experiential learning that encourages critical observation of, reflection upon, and analysis of real world interactions and experiences and their connection to course and self-concept. It includes setting aside and using time for reflecting on one’s own background, experiences, and observations and experiences within the service learning context, and connecting of all of this to course concepts and issues. This does not exclude other definitions of service learning, but contains the bare minimum that the author has required of hundreds of her students in her own service learning courses for the past four years.

Studies of service learning have revealed that it is very useful not only for illuminating course curricula (Boss 1994; Damon-Moore 1997; Howard 1993), but also for helping students to:

- Mature and improve interpersonally (Dunlap 1997; Miller 1997);
- Increase international understanding and to reduce their racial prejudice (Myers-Lipton 1994);
- Decrease the tendency to focus on personal shortcomings rather than difficulties created by situations when addressing the needs of social service clients (Giles and Eyler 1994);
- Become more realistic and feel more competent about their own capabilities (Dunlap 1997);
- Feel greater satisfaction with their courses, instructors and assignments, and earn higher grades (Berson 1997); and
- Improve their mastery of curriculum concepts (Boss 1994).
The Berson (1997) controlled study also demonstrated that withdrawal rates, class attendance, course completion rates, and self-reported levels of effort for service learning students did not differ significantly from those of their control group counterparts.

However, very little research exists on the topic of the interplay between multiculturalism and service learning (Damon-Moore 1997). In one analysis of 250 works about service learning literature, “only four made reference to a multicultural theme (and two of them were authored by the same person),” Damon-Moore reports (p. 5). Nonetheless, this interplay holds much pedagogical hope in terms of helping students to become more prepared for today’s multicultural society, with its many strengths and resources, and with its many past and present issues such as prejudice, racism sexism, joblessness, poverty, and homelessness. As one college administrator states:

By offering their assistance to and participating in our local community, students gain intellectual insight into the issues that concern communities in the United States as well as other nations around the world today. The Community that we serve is multicultural as are our students and others on our campus who provide the service. It stands to reason then that the objectives of [our] Unity House [multicultural center] and the Office of Volunteers for Community Service share some overlap. (Williams 1997, 3)

Service Learning as a Multicultural Issue

Service learning is one way that multicultural understanding can be nurtured in students. However, as in any multicultural context, several barriers may prevent real cultural awareness and understanding in a service learning context (Damon-Moore 1997). Even the study of service learning within a multicultural context may face its own barriers. We do not yet have a strong understanding of what the specific multicultural challenges are from students’ point of view nor from the community’s points of view. We do not really know how these challenges manifest themselves, nor how people in service learning contexts attempt to overcome such challenges.

Three recent studies (Dunlap, 1997; Dunlap, in press; Dunlap, forthcoming) have begun to address the psychosocial challenges and personal growth opportunities that are experienced by many students who volunteer or work in unfamiliar multicultural settings. In these studies, 44 liberal arts college students were engaged for two-four hours per week during a semester in service learning in a variety of settings, including a children’s laboratory program, public schools, day care centers, after-school homework programs, and athletic programs. They were recruited from one Child Development: Social World of the Child course, 87 percent of whose students were from European American backgrounds. Because the college is located within a very diverse multicultural municipal community, the majority of their clientele came from multicultural and/or lower socioeconomic backgrounds.

The college students were supported through several resources, including Beverly Tatum’s 1992 article, “Talking about Race, Learning about Racism: The Application of Racial Identity in the Classroom,” which helps black and white students acknowledge and understand how their own stages of racial identity affect how they relate to their multicultural education curricula. Tatum’s main point is that students must explore and understand their own and others’ ideas about race before they attempt to function in multicultural environments.

A second resource was a video presentation featuring the work and philosophies of distinguished educator Marva Collins, who has successfully taught and worked with children and families of color of inner-city Chicago for more than 20 years (Collins and Tamarkin 1990). In addition, students read Kanter and Stein’s (1980) A Tale of O, a story based on a wealth of social psychological literature that delineates the experiences of prejudice and exclusion from both the victim’s and the perpetrator’s perspectives. The Tale of O reads somewhat like a cartoon, and features only Xs and Os as characters. Students report that in spite of its pictorial simplicity and brevity, it is extremely powerful in its analysis of prejudice.

At the end of the semester, students were invited to submit their journals for inclusion in a study of service learning processes. Virtually all gave written permission, and in the interest of time, 30 were randomly selected for word processing into one combined qualitative data set. Of the journals randomly selected for inclusion, 80 percent belonged to females; 83 percent belonged to European American students, and 93 percent belonged to students 17 to 21 years old, with the vast majority being college freshmen.

The journals’ content was analyzed using qualitative methods. A variety of issues arose for these service learners. For example, the
Dunlap study (1997) revealed that one out of every three service learners struggled with their own well-intentioned, partially unrealistic (though age-appropriate) heroic desires for “saving the needy.” The students also experienced a variety of emotions, including guilt and anger about events they witnessed involving prejudice, racism, or systematic oppression. They seemed to become aware of their own privilege relative to the members of the community with whom they interacted, especially if the clientele were poverty-stricken. Most began to resolve those heroic desires as their semester came to an end, and they broadened their definition for success (e.g., “If I have touched and made a difference in one life, then my time has been worthwhile”).

Miller’s work (1997) helps put these findings into greater perspective. His work involving 327 service learners illustrated that their sense of personal power to effect the world is humbled because they begin to understand the multifaceted nature of social problems and the complexity of solutions better. They seem to experience what could be either a “loss in idealism” or a “gain in realism” during service learning experiences (p. 19). As students observe for themselves and better understand the complexity of social challenges, they realize that such challenges cannot be resolved easily or “fixed” by individual do-good efforts alone; but that systemic issues must also be addressed. Interestingly, this tendency to become less idealistic occurs more readily for males, students of color, social science majors, and older students (pp. 18-19). Another study (Dunlap, in press) illustrates that students may grapple with difficult issues and emotions. However, they tend to view these experiences as rewarding and to evaluate their service learning experiences and critical reflection processes (Berson 1997) favorably.

These studies suggest that students attempt to work creatively and competently through their multicultural service learning experiences and challenges when they are offered support from appropriate college faculty, staff, and administrators. Service learning not only helps increase students’ awareness of their own strengths, weaknesses, and maturity (Dunlap 1997; Miller 1997), but also can be used to broaden racial and ethnic awareness, understanding, and acceptance of others.

Multicultural Service Learning as a Community College Issue

Multicultural service learning is certainly an important issue for community colleges today, as the overwhelming majority of colleges “are either actively involved in or interested in offering service learning on their campuses,” although this fact is often overlooked in the service learning literature as eloquently pointed out by Berson (1997, 35). Citing recent AACC statistics (1996), Berson further notes:

Community colleges, which enroll 49 percent of all first-time freshmen college students, are a logical choice for building a service learning infrastructure. There is no better marriage than the one between service learning and community colleges, as these institutions are already well-connected to the community and are composed of students who are residents of the community and are more likely to remain there after graduation (Berson 1997, 35).

Like their four-year counterparts, many community colleges, especially those that are suburban, have a majority of students that are disproportionately from European American or White backgrounds. But even in urban rather than in suburban community colleges the majority of students are of European American background (e.g., Berson 1997, 56; Miller 1997, 17). In these instances, it is not all that unusual for students to have had little equal-status interactions with people of color (Feagin 1991; Feagin and Sikes 1994; Feagin and Vera 1995; Pettigrew and Martin 1987; Stephan and Brigham 1985; Tatum 1992, Terkel 1992).

Dealing comfortably and competently in cross-cultural communications and interactions is a minimal requirement for our work with children, families, and other human beings. Community colleges and other higher education institutions more than ever are realizing the need for all students to be well grounded academically, and practically, especially when it comes to understanding and dealing with other people. At the same time, service learning is experiencing a renewed energy as the country recommitts itself to volunteerism, community service, and experiential learning. Campuses across the country...one out of every three service learners struggled with their own well-intentioned, partially unrealistic (though age-appropriate) heroic desires for "saving the needy and the like."

...students may grapple with challenging and sometimes difficult issues and emotions during their service learning experiences, they nonetheless tend to find the experiences rewarding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impacts of Service Learning on Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 1996 Rand Corporation study looked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at the impact of service learning on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participants in the Corporation for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Service’s Learn and Serve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>America initiative. The study found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Service participation positively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affected students’ commitment to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>serving their communities, helping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others in difficulty, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promoting racial understanding.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray et al., 1996</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

American Association of Community Colleges
are seeing a renewed “revolution” of volunteerism and service learning (Berson 1997, 32). Educated individuals of all backgrounds are finding they need to be adequately competent in communications, beliefs, interactions and dealings with increasingly diverse populations (Chideya 1995; Damon-Moore 1997; Feagin and Sikes 1994; Galvin and Cooper 1996; Ladson-Billings 1994; Locke 1992; Lynch and Hanson 1992; Sleeter and McLaren 1995; Thompson and Tyagi 1993). Even students of color are called upon to improve in their understanding of and interactions with their own cultures, as even their beliefs have to some degree been negatively influenced in their beliefs by inaccurate educational and media messages (Chideya 1995; Foster 1994; Schofield 1986; Shuja 1994).

In other words, now more than ever, students need to be able to apply their academic learnings to everyday functioning in the real and ever-changing world. Service learning is one way that community colleges and other higher education institutions are attempting to bring their curriculum more to life and assist their students in making connections between the classroom and real life in a multicultural world.

Suggestions for Multicultural Service Learning Implementation

The following examples of multicultural service learning support services emanate from the author’s experiences. These examples include:

1. Establish a Central Office. A college’s Office of Volunteers for Community Service, with a multicultural mix of one educator/administrator, two program coordinators, and a variety of student staff members, helps facilitate the practical aspects of the service learning process. This office can initiate and build important relationships among the administration, student service learners, and the community agencies for which the students opt to work. This office is crucial to the success of inclusion of service learning in the author’s individual courses’ curricula;

2. Readings. Specific readings that are made available from OVCS (e.g., works by ACTION 1989; Center for Academic Excellence 1997; Damon-Moore 1997) and from individual professors (e.g., Kanter and Stein 1980; Tatum 1992).

3. Instructor Access. Course professors are available during and after class, by phone, by e-mail, and by the academic course server or campus computer network as needed on a case by case basis (Dunlap, in press).

4. Time. Time is set aside every few weeks during class for students to discuss connections that they are making to the course curriculum and to share their issues and concerns with one another about their service learning experiences.

Four years of structured service learning in multicultural settings have produced many important and rewarding lessons. Engaging with students, analyzing their journals, documenting the emerging themes in their critical reflections, and sharing experiences with service learning on and off campus, all have enabled the author to approach multicultural service learning in a manner sensitive to and supportive of students’ basic educational and psychosocial needs.

Additional Suggestions

1. Use the Central Office to Generate Ideas and Resources. Colleges that desire to make service learning readily available, may want to consider seriously undertaking the creation and support of an office that can assist in the building of strong relationships with a variety of diverse agencies, such as the Office of Volunteers for Community Service described above. Of course, any college should be building such relationships on more of a “macro level,” and individual faculty and staff should be building them on more of a “micro level.” This special office operates on more of a “meso-level,” further facilitating the relationships among all components of the system (Bronfen and Brenner 1986, in Berger and Thompson 1995, 4-5). This office also should handle the basic logistical issues (initial student orientations to service learning, transportation, scheduling, and interviewing to match interests to placement options). The professors then can spend their energies facilitating pedagogical aspects (making connections to curriculum, critical reflection and processing, and supporting students through individual challenges).

Such an office, as well as individual faculty, should provide resources that students will find helpful in developing their psychosocial adjustment in service learning, including discussions of multicultural and socioeconomic support issues (e.g., Berson 1997; Dunlap 1997; Helms 1990; Miller 1997; Tatum 1992).

2. Provide Opportunities for Reflection. Students must have ample opportunity to discuss, process, critically reflect, brainstorm and solve problems with regard to their service learning.
experiences and the issues—including the multicultural-related issues—that may surface. Students may need to be supported through feelings of frustration, disappointment, guilt, and disillusionment. They need to be reassured, and should understand that such feelings are normal and that they can emerge en route to improved understanding and maturational mastery of challenges. It is important that students, faculty, staff, and administration explore their own ideas about race before they attempt to function in multicultural environments (Helms 1990; Tatum 1992).

3. Access and Community Involvement. Colleges, administrators and faculty involved in service learning should adopt policies and approaches that promote the issue of college student community involvement from a mutual and multidirectional approach. In other words, service learning approaches should encourage learning and growth for everyone involved in the entire process. Often, when we think of volunteer or service-related learning, the assumption is that the volunteer is attempting to give, teach, or reform the clients or community members being served. This rather ethnocentric approach assumes a paternalistic superiority of standing, intellect, and competency on the part of the service learners and the people and institutions supporting them.

4. Review the Philosophy and Structure of Service Learning on Your Campus. Learning beyond the superficial involves mutual and multidirectional exchange, and can be transformative for all partners. To summarize, implementing the kinds of resources, practices, or tools discussed above should improve or enhance the racial and ethnic awareness through the medium of service learning. These methods can help improve relationships not only with previously unfamiliar communities and individual community members, but also their relationships with their current educational colleagues and future fellow workers of diverse backgrounds.

This way of conceptualizing service learning as a mutual exchange is so fundamental and so important to the entire system of any educational program that it can be argued that service learning is impossible without it. If one does not position oneself as a learner—a learner prepared and eager for growth—rather than as teacher only, then there is no room for mutual exchange of ideas, knowledge, and possibilities. This calls for re-articulating or reshaping the definition of service learning offered earlier, particularly as it is applied to multicultural contexts. Service learning must be viewed not only as learning that encourages the connection of academic course concepts with critical observation and analysis of real world interactions and experiences, but it must also welcome, expect, and acknowledge the teaching, wisdom, strengths, and competencies shared with the service learner by the clients or community members.

Conclusions

Multicultural service learning might be new to some institutions, depending on the current of diversity, multicultural understanding, civic responsibility, experiential learning, and service learning. These ideas are not necessarily cost-prohibitive, and are well worth the investment. There can be high returns in improved college image, strengthened relationships with community agencies, potential funding from and partnerships with community donors, increased student marketability, and improved skill and competencies development (Berson, 1997, p. 30-31). Together, these elements put graduates in a better position for supporting and promoting their colleges and state economies, and for becoming better citizens in a diverse and multicultural society.

To summarize, implementing the kinds of resources, practices, or tools discussed above should improve or enhance the racial and ethnic awareness through the medium of service learning. These methods can help improve relationships not only with previously unfamiliar communities and individual community members, but also their relationships with their current educational colleagues and future fellow workers of diverse backgrounds.

Learning beyond the superficial involves mutual and multidirectional exchange, and can be transformative for all partners.
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HOW TO ORGANIZE A SERVICE LEARNING PROGRAM ON YOUR CAMPUS

-USE THESE SEVEN STEPS TO GET STARTED-

1. **START SMALL**
   Begin with service learning in one or two courses. This gives practitioners the opportunity to identify what works and what doesn’t.

2. **FIND KEY PEOPLE**
   Identify a few faculty members who are interested in integrated service into their existing course curricula. A good place to start is with individuals who are already involved in community service activities. Focus on revising existing curricula to incorporate service. Think about including service in proposed new courses. Colleagues in other community colleges are excellent sources for simple syllabi, course requirements, service activities, and reflection and evaluation instruments, as they are eager to widen the reach of service learning and share best practices, successful ideas, and replicable program tools and publications.

3. **GET HELP**
   - **FACULTY GROUPS**—Consider organizing a faculty advisory board or council. These groups can be invaluable advocates of service learning as a teaching tool. They can help to establish handbooks, guidelines, brown-bag lunches or other faculty development opportunities.
   - **ADMINISTRATORS**—Enlist the support and guidance of a key administrator. This may be a department chair, director of student services or an academic dean. Findings from an AACC Service Learning survey (1995) suggest that faculty and administrative support are the two most significant factors contributing to the success of service learning programs.
   - **TEAM**—Some community colleges successfully manage their programs through a service learning team, comprising one or more faculty members, student services staff and an administrative or academic dean. The sharing of responsibilities strengthens the team.
   - **OFFICE**—A separate service learning coordinator of office may be needed. A service learning office is often housed in student services or in student life, where staff can provide assistance in structuring the program, identifying community partners and placing students according to mutual needs.
   - **VOLUNTEERS**—Volunteers can be key to getting the program underway while waiting until a funded position is possible. A volunteer could contribute several hours per week to help organize a service learning program, make contact with faculty and community agencies and start placing students at service sites.

4. **CONSIDER THE COMMUNITY**
   Before making student placements, a community needs assessment or resource inventory should be done, either informally through personal and telephone contact or formally through surveys or assessment forms. Community agency staff are invaluable in determining where students are needed the most. This process also helps educate community agencies about service learning. Community advisory boards often help ensure continual contact between agencies, students, faculty, and staff and ascertain evolving community needs.

5. **ENGAGE STUDENTS**
   Use groups such as Phi Theta Kappa, student government, the student life office, or campus media to inform students about service learning. Service learning’s best promotion comes from students, who attract new candidates by word-of-mouth.

6. **GET THE BEST FIT**
   Successful service learning programs work in a variety of ways. No two programs are exactly alike. What works well at one college might not at another. Remember that it may be useful to distill approaches from a number of sources to create a custom-made service learning program that fits local needs.

7. **CELEBRATE SUCCESSES**
   As a service learning program grows, celebration and recognition are important. Make opportunities to express appreciation to student, faculty, and local supporters. Plan a recognition day to thank participants for their contribution. Use these occasions to inform, educate and acknowledge community members.

AACC, COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND SERVICE LEARNING (1995)
REFERENCES

Removing Vestiges


The Author

Michelle R. Dunlap, Ph.D., a social psychologist, is Assistant Professor in the Human Development Department at Connecticut College. Her research focus is on intergroup relations, and social and personality development. She currently supervises students in their service learning work in the community of New London, Connecticut. She previously taught at Santa Fe Community College in Gainesville, Florida, and at the Gainesville, Florida, extension of Bethune Cookman College. She can be reached at Connecticut College, 270 Mohegan Ave., Box 5322 New London, CT 06320-4125. Phone: 860-439-2634. E-Mail: mrdun@conncoll.edu.
GUIDELINES FOR PROSPECTIVE AUTHORS

PROPOSAL PROCESS
Prospective authors are invited to submit a 700 word proposal comprised of: a) an abstract that summarizes the paper and what the reader will learn from it; b) a short discussion that answers the questions set forth in the content guidelines; and c) a writing sample. Once the review committee accepts the proposal, contributors will be asked to submit a full manuscript.

CONTENT GUIDELINES
The goal of this serial is to provide a forum where advocacy and research can be forged into policy direction for community college leaders. The audience includes CEOs of community colleges and the practitioners of diversity programs on their various campuses. Ideal submissions will follow one of two approaches:

Program Implementation—Submissions in this category will provide a blueprint for diversity practitioners to implement model diversity programs by discussing the following:

- Genesis - What is the origin of the program? Who initiated it? What was the reason for its creation?
- Justification - What data or research was used to justify the need for the program?
- Implementation - What are the goals and objectives of the program? What is the process for implementation? Was the process based on another model? If so, what is the citation of the model? Who is involved in the implementation? To whom do they report?
- Assessment - How is the program assessed? Who is responsible for applying the assessment? Is the assessment published?
- Fine tuning - What obstacles were overcome to ensure the program’s success? How did you overcome them?

Issue Examination—Submissions in this category will examine the intersection of educational issues and minorities in community colleges. Among issues of interest: a) how technology can influence educational access for minority students; b) consequences and solutions for community colleges resulting from recent changes in race-based educational policies; c) how community involvement in campus activities can affect campus climate; d) the role of immigration on diversity programming relevancy; d) how welfare-to-work programs can be modified to meet new regulations; and e) how community colleges are meeting the financial needs of minority students. Submissions should devote at least one-third of the examination to a discussion of solutions. The most useful submissions will achieve at least two of the following objectives:

- Suggest policies, programs or practices for institutions to implement based on quantitative data or other documented results.
- Explore issues that have not been covered previously in a minority context.
- Explore issues previously covered in a minority context, but take a new approach at suggesting solutions.
- Identify current events and examine their implications for community colleges.
EDITORIAL PROCESS
Manuscripts will follow a refereed editorial process. The reviewers are composed of AACC’s editorial staff, researchers, and practitioners in higher education. Editorial decisions will be made within sixty days after receipt of the manuscript at AACC. Accepted manuscripts will be published in the next available edition of Removing Vestiges.

STYLE GUIDELINES
- Follow the AACC Style guide (provided upon proposal acceptance).
- Clearly identify captions/legends/notes with the corresponding illustration.
- Make all margins one-inch (left, right, top and bottom) on 8 ½ x 11 size paper.
- References should be double-spaced on a separate page. Do not use footnotes. Such information should be incorporated into the narrative of manuscript or else shown as a reference. For example: (Mahoney 1999). Follow guidelines in Chicago Manual of Style, Fourteenth Edition.
- The manuscript title should be centered on the page in all caps. The author’s name only should be centered two spaces below the title. The second and succeeding pages can bear the name(s) of the author(s) as a footer along with the page number.
- Each manuscript should be 8-12 pages, double-spaced. Charts, graphs, artwork, etc. are strongly encouraged, preferably prepared with PC-based software.
- Each manuscript should be accompanied by a 100-word abstract, along with brief biographical sketch(es) of the author(s) including name(s), title(s), complete mailing address(es), telephone number(s) and e-mail addresses of the authors.
- Editorial changes will be shared with writers before publication.
- If there are several contributors, the editor of the manuscript is responsible for maintaining consistency.
- Send copies of all copyright permissions that may be required to reproduce any illustrations or to quote from any previously published material. Permissions must be obtained in writing.

Proposals should be submitted in duplicate (with an accompanying computer disk) to:
Arnold Madison Kee
American Association of Community Colleges
One Dupont Circle, Suite 410
Washington, DC 20036-1176

©
Revisions to the Standards for Race and Ethnicity Classification

The standards for racial classification are changing. Spurred in part by the concerns of people born of multiracial parentage, the Office of Management and Budget began a process in 1993 to review the current categories for data on race and ethnicity. The results of their findings were released October 30, 1997 in the *Federal Register* (vol. 62, no. 210). One significant change is that multiracial persons will be able to report more than one race whenever the federal government collects data on race and ethnicity.

### CURRENT CATEGORIES

**American Indian or Alaska Native:**
A person having origins in any of the original peoples of North America, and who maintains cultural identification through tribal affiliations or community recognition.

**Asian or Pacific Islander:**
A person having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, the Indian subcontinent, or the Pacific Islands. This area includes, for example, China, India, Japan, Korea, the Philippine islands, and Samoa.

**Black:**
A person having origins in any of the black racial groups of Africa.

**Hispanic:**
A person of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American, or other Spanish culture or origin, regardless of race.

**White:**
A person having origins in any of the original peoples of Europe, North Africa, or the Middle East.

### REVISED CATEGORIES

**American Indian or Alaskan Native:**
A person having origins in any of the original peoples of North and South America (including Central America), and who maintains tribal affiliation or community attachment.

**Asian:**
A person having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, or the Indian subcontinent including, for example, Cambodia, China, Japan, Korea, Malaysia, Pakistan, the Phillipine Islands, Thailand, and Vietnam.

**Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander:**
A person having origins in any of the original peoples of Hawaii, Guam, Samoa, or other Pacific Islands.

**Black of African American\*:**
A person having origins in any of the black racial groups of Africa.

**Hispanic or Latino**\**:**
A person of Cuban, Mexican, Puerto Rican, South or Central American, or other Spanish culture or origin, regardless of race.

**White:**
A person having origins in any of the original peoples of Europe, the Middle East, or North Africa.

\*Includes terms such as “Haitian” or “Negro”.

\**Includes the term “Spanish Origin”.

The Interagency Committee, which developed the new standards, also developed principles to govern their review process. These principles included:

1. The racial and ethnic categories set forth in the standards should not be interpreted as being primarily biological or genetic in reference. Race and ethnicity may be thought of in terms of social and cultural characteristics as well as ancestry.

2. Respect for individual dignity should guide the processes and methods for collecting data on race and ethnicity; ideally, respondent self-identification should be facilitated to the greatest extent possible, recognizing that in some data collection systems observer identification is more practical.

3. Foremost consideration should be given to data aggregations by race and ethnicity that are useful for statistical analysis and program administration and assessment, bearing in mind that the standards are not intended to be used to establish eligibility for participation in any federal program.

For more information, visit the Government Printing Office website at www.whitehouse.gov/wh/eop/omb/html/fedreg.html. You can also send for a paper copy by contacting the OMB Publications Office, 725 17th Street, NW. NSOB, Room 2200, Washington, DC 20503. Phone: 202-395-7332 Fax: 202-395-6137
ON THE IMPORTANCE OF DIVERSITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION

America’s colleges and universities differ in many ways. Some are public, others are independent; some are urban universities, some are two-year community colleges, others, small rural campuses, both large and small. Some offer graduate and professional programs, others focus primarily on undergraduate education. Each of our more than 3,000 colleges and universities has its own specific and distinct mission. This collective diversity among institutions is one of the great strengths of America’s higher education system, and has helped make it the best in the world. Preserving that diversity is essential if we hope to serve the needs of our democratic society.

Similarly, many colleges and universities share a common belief, born of experience, that diversity in their student bodies and faculties, and staff is important for them to fulfill their primary mission: providing a quality education. The public is entitled to know why these institutions believe so strongly that racial and ethnic diversity should be one factor among the many considered in admissions and hiring. The reasons include:

- **It enriches the educational experience.** We learn from those whose experiences, beliefs, and perspectives are different from our own, and these lessons can be taught best in a richly diverse intellectual and social environment.

- **It promotes personal growth - and a healthy society.** Diversity challenges stereotyped preconceptions; it encourages critical thinking; and it helps students learn to communicate effectively with people of varied backgrounds.

- **It strengthens communities and the workplace.** Education within a diverse setting prepares students to become good citizens in an increasingly complex, pluralistic society; it fosters mutual respect and teamwork; and it helps build communities whose members are judged by the quality of their character and their contributions.

- **It enhances America’s economic competitiveness.** Sustaining the nation’s prosperity in the 21st century will require us to make effective use of the talents and abilities of all our citizens, in work settings that bring together individuals from diverse backgrounds and cultures.

American colleges and universities traditionally have enjoyed significant latitude in fulfilling their missions. Americans have understood that there is no single model of a good college, and that no single standard can predict with certainty the lifetime contribution of a teacher or a student. Yet, the freedom to determine who shall teach and be taught has been restricted in a number of places, and come under attack in others. As a result, some schools have experienced precipitous declines in the enrollment of African-American and Hispanic students, reversing decades of progress in the effort to assure that all groups in American society have an equal opportunity for access to higher education.

Achieving diversity on college campuses does not require quotas. Nor does diversity warrant admission of unqualified applicants. However, the diversity we seek, and the future of the nation, do require that colleges and universities continue to be able to reach out and make a conscious effort to build healthy and diverse learning environments appropriate for their missions. The success of higher education and the strength of our democracy depend on it.

Association Endorsements

AACSB - The International Association for Management Education; ACT (formerly American College Testing); American Association for Higher Education; American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education; American Association of Colleges of Nursing; American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers; American Association of Community Colleges; American Association of Dental Schools; American Association of State Colleges and Universities; American Association of University Professors; American College Personnel Association; American Council on Education; American Indian Higher Education Consortium; American Medical Student Association; American Society for Engineering Education; APPA: the Association of Higher Education Facilities Officers; Association of Academic Health Centers; Association of American Colleges and Universities; Association of American Law Schools; Association of American Universities; Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities; Association of Community College Trustees; Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities; Coalition of Higher Education Assistance Organizations; College and University Personnel Association; Consortium on Financing Higher Education; Council for Advancement and Support of Education; Council of Graduate Schools; Council of Independent Colleges; Educational Testing Service; Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities; Lutheran Educational Conference of North America; NAFSA: Association of International Educators; National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education; National Association of College and University Business Officers; National Association of Graduate and Professional Students; National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities; National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges; National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators; National Association of Student Personnel Administrators; National Collegiate Athletic Association; National Council of Educational Opportunity Associations; NAWE: Advancing Women in Higher Education; The College Board; The College Fund/UNCF; The Education Trust; and University Continuing Education Association.
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