1991

Managing Diversity Through Faculty Development

Marie A. Wunsch

Virgie Chattergy

Managing Diversity Through Faculty Development

Marie A. Wunsch
Virgie Chattergy
University of Hawaii at Manoa

The Changing Demographic Landscape

Few American institutions of higher education have failed to notice the changing demographics of students, faculty, or their communities. Even if a campus is not yet affected, the nation is. Projections for the year 2000 suggest that one-third of all school age children will be from ethnic minorities and by the year 2010, one-third of the nation will be African American, Hispanic, Native American, or from an Asian background (Commission on Minority Participation, 1988). The Asian designation is made further complex by subgroups such as Japanese, Chinese, Vietnamese, Cambodian, Korean, and Pacific Islander; a similar complexity results from Hispanic ethnic and national subcultures (Smith, 1989). African Americans, Hispanics, and Asians are now found in significant numbers in almost every major urban center. Since 1965, 60% of immigrants to the U.S. have been from non-European countries (Madrid, 1989; Estrada, 1988). In brief, we now live in the most demographically diverse nation in the world. The reality of this increasing number of non-white "majorities" has raised concerns about the role that educational institutions must play in upholding the nation's commitment to equality of opportunity. Further, it has raised concerns about the effectiveness of the educational process for both minority and majority students.

Colleges and universities have begun discussing the implications of diversity and multiculturalism on their campuses, as well as in specific educational programs. Many have gone beyond engaging in intellectual exchange, to implementing far-reaching, sometimes controversial, master plans and curriculum changes to develop faculty and student awareness of the meaning of ethnic and cultural pluralism in American society (Shalala,

141

1989). Others have moved from theory to practice by initiating systematic programs to change practices in teaching and learning to respond to the multicultural classroom (Morrison and Vom Saal, 1990). Through these efforts and those now in progress, there is little doubt that the face of higher education will change drastically by the year 2000.

Educational systems have made three types of responses to diversity. One is to ignore the demographic trends and believe that in time the situation will resolve itself. Another is to identify those specific aspects of diversity that will enable the system to respond sensibly to the changes that diversity brings to an individual campus. The third, and the most visionary, is to recognize the rich potential that the new diversity can bring to a university for transforming and redefining its mission and traditions, using the opportunity to strengthen its ability to respond to what will be the major challenge of the 21st century—that of creating and maintaining a sense of community within the cultural plurality of the campus.

Whether an institution responds only in part, (e.g., through course revision, aggressive minority student recruitment) or comprehensively (e.g., through re-examining mission, priorities, policy) the proposed changes need to be predicated on a contextual master plan with outcomes going beyond response to a crisis. If the impetus for change comes only from the need to pacify a minority or diffuse a crisis on campus, such initiatives may receive faculty support only until the crisis passes. Gains will be superficial and short-lived.

Our thesis suggests that colleges and universities must respond *comprehensively* to the moral, social, and political issues of diversity and multiculturism *as they affect the individual institution.* Responses, whether quick or measured, must take the form of programs and an implementation process that are compatible with the individualized needs of a particular campus. Success may depend less on a program here or an activity there with interested departments, than on a sense of overall priority and a systematic effort on a united front.

A number of challenges accompany such a comprehensive approach. The first is to assess the campus cultural climate in order to define the diversity issues and the operating assumptions about diversity relevant to the institution. Will diversity agendas include ethnic minorities? cultural differences? non-traditional students? gender and alternative lifestyle issues?

The second challenge is the development of criteria to guide program development. Since campuses differ in their philosophical stance, historical development, and geographic character, their definitions and responses widely vary and their program options differ. For example, on some cam-

puses, increasing the number of minority students and staff may be a serious first step. Creating a campus environment free of racial tension and violent eruptions may take priority among the changes to be made. On other campuses, the challenge may be in managing existing diversity to enrich the social and academic experience of students and faculty.

The third challenge is to consider whether special new programs must be developed or whether integrating new initiatives into existing structures may have the highest chance for success and impact. In this context, the questions can evolve into specific strategies. Which new programs should be developed? Which ongoing programs can be modified to include the new emphasis? What resources can be shifted to accommodate and highlight new priorities? Mission and goal statements, naturally, will have to be modified to add new perspectives and to allow for new practices. No matter how the questions are answered, the clear message to the campus community must be that dealing with diversity is simply part of the normal business of the university and basic to the commitment to educational opportunity and excellence.

The Traditional Role of Educational Institutions

American educational institutions have always played a major role in socializing diverse immigrant populations from Europe and Asia by providing a common language, a set of democratic ideals, and a capitalist promise of success through education and hard work. Common values were expected to forge diverse groups into a unified whole. "Minority" became a term distinguishing the yet unmelted or those who by virtue of their "native" status remained unassimilated. Because as a nation we are still much divided by ethnic, cultural, and religious groups, by gender, sexual orientation, language differences, and physical abilities, the metaphor has shifted from melting pot to stew, or even salad.

More and more the new language of education, while seemingly inclusive, still focuses on the "other." Now we have the new immigrant, the non-traditional student, the alternative lifestyle. Women students are now the majority on most campuses, but the white male minority has the power. People of color are regarded as minorities in classification systems to determine affirmative action goals, yet are majorities in many geographical areas. Thus, minority and majority are essentially social and political designations shifting with the progress and power of the individuals or groups that use the terms. For educators, rather than continued discussion of the semantics, the choice should be to shift focus to the visionary aspects of the diversity

issues—that is, the recognition and the celebration of the richness of diversity.

The Role of Faculty Development Programs on a Multicultural Campus

Faculty will always be a key element in implementing academic changes; administrative or legal mandates rarely transform campus climate, teaching, or learning. To effect changes in curriculum, educational policy and practices, or student support services attuned to the changing needs of a diverse campus, the faculty must have an awareness level equal to the task of bridging the very different perceptions of reality and experience held by members of different ethnic and racial groups on a campus. They must have equal commitment to supporting change through *normal collegial processes*. A campus culture that acknowledges and respects diversity can also include tolerance for controversy that often grows out of rising expectations and which may be a genuine search for understanding and respect for differences (Weiner, 1990).

Managing diversity through alteration of the campus culture and values can, thus, be seen as an *organizational, faculty, and staff development initiative.* A key strategy, then, is to infuse and integrate the search for equity and excellence into the normal development practices of a campus. Including activities to expand knowledge and awareness of diversity issues is a natural emphasis for development programs; most professionals are more likely to participate in training when it involves changes they need to deal with in their professional capacities. While faculty are often reluctant to admit they require teaching development, even in the face of new pedagogical and technological advances, they face more readily the fact that social issues do influence the curriculum, student learning, and their own effectiveness. Regular professional development programs offered to faculty may wholly, or in part, deal with multicultural issues. (For our emphasis here we have not included the multicultural curriculum, which is a complex issue in itself.) The following traditional faculty development activities can include multicultural aspects.

- **New Faculty Orientation**

Faculty are generally recruited from a national pool and may come to a campus from a different geographical region or a foreign country. They have varying degrees of experience with local multicultural issues. How can we orient newcomers to the new campus climate, demographic profile, and the

diversity issues as part of the positive activities associated with department and campus orientations, rather than when problems arise? How can we help new faculty develop self-awareness and culturally-sensitive teaching strategies? How can we motivate senior faculty to mentor new women and minority faculty beyond orientation? How can we make department chairs aware of the crucial initial years in the retention of minority faculty?

- **Teaching Assistant Training**

    Teaching assistants also may come to a campus from various national or international settings. Changing from student to quasi-faculty status may require cultural as well as psychological reorientation. How can we orient new TAs to the campus environment so they become culturally and ethnically sensitive peers and instructors? How can we help international TAs become more aware of peculiarly American issues reflecting the new demographics, gender issues, and ethnic and cultural minorities? How can we use TAs to enrich the experiences of minority students in undergraduate courses?

- **Department Chair Leadership Development**

    Departmental administrators are the crucial link between campus initiatives and faculty involvement. The chair sets the tone for faculty expectations and monitors performance. How can we help chairs develop their own cultural sensitivity and intercultural communication skills? How can we encourage chairs to evolve strategies to facilitate faculty discussions of the issues of multiculturalism in curriculum and teaching practices?

- **Instructional Development Programs**

    Entering a multicultural classroom poses challenges for any professor, new or experienced, who may encounter a student body different from the one he or she has expected. How can teaching enhancement programs deal with culturally-oriented classroom behaviors, learning styles, course content expectations, and faculty-student communication and interaction? How can a teaching development program help faculty modify courses to include multicultural themes and content? How can course content and teaching strategies help students from various cultural backgrounds interact so that their experiences enrich rather than compete?

- **Incentive and Reward Programs**

    Traditional merit, promotion, and tenure systems generally undervalue faculty efforts for teaching and curriculum innovation. How can we adapt these collegial incentives and rewards to encourage and value faculty who

make substantial changes in their interaction with students, teaching methods, and courses in an attempt to enhance the learning of mutlicultural, multiethnic, and non-traditional students? What other rewards, valued by the campus, can highlight success in these areas? Can institutional funding be reoriented toward grants and awards in these areas to show administrative commitment to change?

- **Classroom/Campus Research**

Each campus in its own way is a living laboratory for research in teaching and learning. How can we support and reward faculty research on teaching and learning on a multicultural campus that leads us toward a clearer understanding of successful teaching strategies, student learning styles, and compatible classroom environments? How can we better evaluate teaching and classroom practice to ensure meeting the needs of women and minority students?

One Institution's Response: The University of Hawaii

Deriving from Hawaii's multicultural heritage and location as an island community at the crossroads of the Pacific, diversity is the most distinctive feature of the University of Hawaii. The University has capitalized on its diversity as a natural resource for curriculum, international programs, research, and service. Over 400 courses have some multicultural or ethnic focus; there are more languages taught here than in any other institution, including some Asian and Pacific ones taught no where else. The University's strategic plan (1987-91), its educational development plan (1991-96), and its accreditation self-study (1989-90) all take managing diversity as their major themes.

On the face of it, the University's academic community is more ethnically diverse than most institutions. However, even on a multicultural campus, diversity means differences, and differences can result in conflict displayed through intolerance, competition, and stymied growth. While the student statistics are impressive—25.5% Japanese, 23.5% Caucasian, 12.1% Filipino, 9.5% Hawaiian, 16.4% other Asian and Pacific Islander—a closer look reveals striking socioeconomic differences and under-representation in the community, and, indeed, within different segments of the campus. Native Hawaiians and Filipinos, the fastest growing groups in the State of Hawaii, are under-represented.

By contrast, the faculty still reflects national norms, being predominantly male and white. The majority of academic administrators (deans, research directors, and department chairs) are also white. While the percentage of women full professors is only 9% (unchanged since the 1960's), hiring is bringing more women into the pipeline. In fall 1990, 41% of the new tenure track assistant professors were female and 22% were members of minority groups.

In this setting, there is understanding that differences and conflicts based on gender, ethnicity, and culture need to be acknowledged and addressed. Affirmative action measures to improve diversity among students and faculty continue and the improvements in the academic climate are expected to reflect the University's mission statement and values concerning diversity in such a way that an ethos of diversity becomes a constituent of the intellectual experience of students, faculty, and staff (UHM Accreditation Self-Study, 1990).

Expecting to play a pivotal role in the climate and value changes, the Office of Faculty Development and Academic Support has begun to integrate diversity issues into nearly all of its development and support programs for faculty. The office hopes that the cumulative effect of a menu of different activities to reach individuals and groups of faculty will secure the essential awareness of change and enrich the institutional culture.

New Faculty Orientation

New faculty orientation comprises the traditional introduction to the campus's key administrative offices, its resources for teaching, and its in-house research support. The general orientation covers the global topics and campus concerns that transcend departmental affiliations; colleges and departments conduct internal orientations on matters of particular disciplinary concern such as research, tenure, and promotion. One full day is now spent on "cross-cultural awareness and cultural diversity: faculty and students on a multicultural campus." Presentations on campus demographics, cultural interactions, and curriculum and climate implications prepare new faculty for experiential activities designed to help them identifty their own cultural, racial, gender orientations. Senior and junior faculty, as well as students, take an active role in discussion groups and activities. New faculty report having both traumatic and confirming reactions to examining the issues, but also report an encouraging growth in awareness. In fall 1990 about one-half the new assistant professors (space was limited and not all volunteers could be accommodated) followed up initial orientation activities with an eight-session series on teaching skills, including dealing with specific

cultural aspects of teaching practice, student learning styles, and classroom problems.

Teaching Assistant Training

Teaching assistant training is approached much like new faculty orientation. Few TAs have prior teaching experience so emphasis is placed on skill development, managing classrooms, and orientation to student resources. About one-half of the TAs are international students and one-third come from Hawaii's ethnic minorities. Orientation sessions include discussions of campus demographics, sensitivity to gender and ethnic issues, as well as experiential activities to develop awareness of differences in students and in the TA's own cultural orientation. Senior TAs, including one who specializes in working with international students, are assigned follow-up responsibilities with first-year students. Plans are to have new TAs work more closely with special underrepresented minority student programs (Operation Manong for Filipinos and Operation Kua'ana for Hawaiians).

Junior Faculty Mentoring Program

A Junior Faculty Mentoring Program began in fall 1990 with special emphasis on women assistant professors. The activities are multi-level to bring the widest resources to support the retention of junior and minority women faculty. Colleague-pairing of junior and senior women comprises the first level, with an additional separate monthly group meeting for mentors and mentees, and directed workshops on career-mapping, research funding and collaboration, and working with department chairs and writing groups. Informal lunches and social activities are scheduled for the junior cohort to provide opportunity for wider interaction with senior men and women faculty. As yet the new minority faculty are few and a separate program has not been needed. If desired, efforts are made to pair new faculty with a member of the same ethnic group.

Educational Improvement Fund

The Educational Improvement Fund provides monies for individual faculty grants to revise, develop, and enrich the curriculum, the process and evaluation of teaching, or student academic support projects. Annual priorities are set by the Vice Presidents for Academic and Student Affairs so that funds can make a major impact in one area of development. The current topic is "Excellence Through Diversity: Promoting an Understanding of Diversity Through the University Curriculum and Co-Curricular Activities." Thirty-four faculty are currently working on projects related to the diversity theme.

The usual grants are $2,000 to $5,000. Grantees meet for progress reports and cross-fertilization of ideas during the grant year and a final report is published and widely distributed by OFDAS. A five-year follow-up study on the impact of these grants on the core curriculum, teaching practices, and student learning is underway.

Faculty and Staff Professional Development Travel Fund

Likewise, the Faculty and Staff Professional Development Travel Fund gives priority for grants to faculty and academic administrators who attend conferences or training sessions involving multicultural themes. Grantees are expected to share the information via presentations in their departments or through the Center for Teaching Excellence. Faculty inquiry groups, one of the most popular Center activities, have incorporated multicultural and diversity issues into sessions about student learning styles, collaborative learning, and student awareness of diversity.

Center for Studies in Multicultural Higher Education

Supporting faculty classroom and campus-based research on multicultural issues is the major role of the Center for Studies in Multicultural Higher Education, another unit under the Office of Faculty Development and Academic Support. The Center provides diversity awareness training for faculty and departments based on current research in the field and commissions faculty research on topics that will provide information about cultural aspects of teaching methods, student learning climate, and retention of minority students. The Center publishes an annual directory of faculty involved in this research agenda as a means of fostering interchange and research collaboration. During spring 1991, the center cosponsored a conference with the writing program on "Academic Literaries in Multicultural Higher Education," with over one hundred fifty campus and visiting faculty and students attending.

Conclusion

While each of these activities is a traditional one in faculty development, and each has independent goals, we hope that the long-range impact will come from the cumulative effect of addressing diversity issues in a variety of ways and in a range of programs. The campus climate benefits from this normalcy. These are, simply, part of the institutional values expressed through emphasis in faculty professional development and academic support.

References

Bernstein. A. (1989). On changing American culture from the inside: An interview with Donna Shalala. *Change,*21, 20-29.

Commission on Minority Participation in Education and American Life (1988). *One-third of a nation.* Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Estrada, L.F. (1988). Anticipating the demographic future. *Change,* 20, 14-19.

Hsia, J., & Hirano-Nakanishi, M. (1989). The demographics of diversity: Asian-Americans and higher education. *Change,* Special Issue, November/December, 20-27.

Madrid, A. (1988). Quality and diversity. *AAHE Bulletin,* 40, 8-11.

Morrison, K. C., & Vom Saal, D. (1990). Curriculum and communication in the multicultural classroom: From theory to practice. Paper presented at the Professional and Organizational Network in Higher Education Conference, Lake Tahoe, CA.

Pickens, W.H. (1989). California perspectives: Three viewpoints. *Change,* 21, 43-51.

Ravitch, D. (1990). Multiculturalism yes, particularism, no. *Chronicle of Higher Education,* 8, A44.

Richardson, R.C., & Bender, L.W. (1987). *Fostering minority access and achievement in higher education: The role of the urban community college and university.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Richardson, R.C., & Skinner, E.F. (1991). *Achieving quality and diversity: Universities in a multicultural society.* American Council on Education & Macmillan.

Skinner, E.F., & Richardson, R. C. (1988). Making it in a majority university. *Change,* 5, 34-42.

Smith, D. G. (1989). *The challenge of diversity.* ASHE-ERIC Reports, 5. Washington, D.C.: George Washington University.

View of Manoa: Self-Study report for the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (1990). Honolulu: University of Hawaii.

Weiner, S.S. (1990). Accrediting bodies must require a commitment to diversity when measuring quality. *Chronicle of Higher Education,* 6, B1-3.

Wilkerson, M.B. (1989). Majority, minority and the numbers game. In C.S. Pearson, D.C. Shavlik, J.C. Touchton (Eds.). *Educating the majority.* New York: ACE/Macmillan, 25-31.