

**Educ 692B**  
**X. Zúñiga**

**Spring 2008**  
**Monday 3-6:30pm**  
2/2; 2/3 & 2/8-9 9-5pm

**Teaching Practicum in SJE: Facilitating Intergroup Dialogues**

“Dialogue is the opportunity available to me to open up to the thinking of others, and thereby not wither away in isolation.”

Paulo Freire

“To engage in dialogue is one of the simplest ways we can begin as [people], teachers, scholars and critical thinkers to cross-boundaries, the barriers that may or may not be erected by race, gender, class, professional standing, and a host of other differences.”

bell hooks

“The range of what we think and do is limited by what we fail to notice. And because we fail to notice that we fail to notice, there is little we can do to change until we notice how failing to notice shapes our thoughts and deeds.”

R. D. Laing.

“We teach to change the world (...) But our attempts to increase the amount of love and justice in the world are never simple, never unambiguous. What we think are democratic, respectful ways of treating people can be experienced by them as oppressive and constraining. One of the hardest things teachers have to learn is that the sincerity of their intentions does not guarantee the purity of their practice”

Stephen Brookfield

“Becoming a teacher and continuing our professional development thereafter is a challenging and complex business. We argue that reflection-on-practice is an essential part of this process. We also argue that at the heart of this process is reflective conversation.”

Anthony Ghaye and Kay Ghaye

**Course description:** This course is designed to prepare SJE graduate students to become reflective practitioners of intergroup dialogue. This course applies theories, principles and practices of intergroup dialogue, critical pedagogy and social justice education to the design and facilitation of identity- based dialogues across race/ethnicity, gender and sexuality. The course draws on democratic, active learning and reflective practice methods of teaching and learning to guide and support thoughtful conversations and meaningful interaction and learning across and within lines of difference. Intergroup dialogue facilitators strengthen their competencies - knowledge, awareness, skills and passion – through ongoing cycles of immersion “in the experience” and reflection “on the experience.” To support competency building and reflective

learning, the practicum relies on a range of methods such as peer debriefing, consultation sessions, reflective writing, micro facilitation and micro teaching methods.

**Course goals:**

- To apply concepts and principles of intergroup dialogue theory and practice, democratic education and social justice education to the planning and facilitation of intergroup encounters
- To use and assess the value of a range of experiential and dialogic methods that support generative dialogue and learning in intergroup dialogue
- To practice team development through goal setting, relationship building, intentional dialogue, peer debriefing, process consultation, and reflective learning
- To carefully consider one's autobiography, participants' eyes, colleagues' eyes and relevant literature in the analysis and examination of intergroup dialogue processes and practices
- To support the development of critically and reflective practitioners of intergroup dialogue

**Teaching and Learning Approach:** We will strive to function as a multicultural learning community that actively supports relationship building, team development, personal growth and development, and reflective learning. This is a highly interactive course, in which there are no "experts" but many perspectives and ways at looking at and addressing a problem or issue. In our weekly meetings, we will debrief previous dialogue sessions, talk about the upcoming dialogue session, review and practice specific methods or skills, examine emerging issues, and analyze the dialogue and co-facilitation experience. Co-facilitation teams will work closely with a process and curriculum consultant to address specific needs, review designs, seek feedback and trouble-shoot as needed.

**Class Schedule:** We will meet every Monday from 3:00-6:30. During the first hour teams will meet with their assigned consultant. We have also scheduled FOUR all day training sessions at the beginning of the semester. Friday 2/1 & Sat 2/2 from 9-5pm; Friday 2/8 and Saturday 2/9 from 9-5pm.

**Special Needs:** If you have any physical or other condition that makes it difficult for you to participate in class or carry out the work as outlined for this course, please let me during the first of the semester so we can make appropriate arrangements.

**Required Texts:**

Hunter, D., Bailey, A., & Taylor, B. (1995). *The art of facilitation*. MA: Fisher Books.

Brookfield, S/D. & Preskill, S. (2005). *Discussion as a way of teaching: Tools and techniques for democratic classrooms*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Ghaye, A. & Ghaye, K. (1998). *Teaching and learning through critical reflective practice*. London: David Fulton Publishers.

hooks, bell. (2003). *Teaching community*. New York: Routledge.

Lederach, P. (2003). *The little book on conflict transformation*. Good Books: Intercourse, PA.

Schoem D., & Hurtado, S. (2001). *Intergroup dialogues*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Zúñiga, X., Nagda, B. Chesler, M., & Cytron-Walker, A. (2007). *Intergroup dialogues in higher education: Meaningful learning about social justice*. ASHE-ERIC report series. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

A selection of readings on SPARK

### **Recommended Texts:**

Adams, M., Bell, L. A., & Griffin, P. (Eds.). (2007). *Teaching for diversity and social justice: sourcebook (2 Edition)*. New York: Routledge.

Arnold, R., Burke, B., James, C., Martin, D., & Thomas, B. (1991). *Educating for a Change*. Toronto: Between the Lines & Doris Marshall Institute for Education and Action.

Boler, M. (2004). *Democratic dialogue in education: Troubling speech, disturbing silence*. NY: Peter Lang.

Brockbank, A. & McGill, I. (2000). *Facilitating reflective learning in higher education*. Buckingham, U.K: Open University Press.

Brookfield, S. (1995). *Becoming a critically reflective teacher*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Cooke, A.L., Brazzel, M., Craig Saunders, A., & Greig, B. (1999). *Reading book for human relations training*. 8<sup>th</sup> Edition. Alexandria, NTL

Fox, H. (2001). "when race breaks out": Conversations about race and racism in college classrooms. New York: Peter Lang.

hooks, bell. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. New York : Routledge

Freire, P. (2003). *Pedagogy of the heart*. New York: Continuum.

Isaacs, W. (1999). *Dialogue: The art of thinking together*. Toronto: Double Day.

Johnson, David W & Johnson, P.F. (2003). *Joining Together: Group Theory & Group Skills*. 8<sup>th</sup> Edition. Boston: Alley & Bacon.

Johnson, A. G. (1997). *The gender knot: Unraveling our patriarchal legacy*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Johnson, A. G. (1997). *Privilege, power and difference*. New York: McGraw Hill

Posner, G. (2005). *Field experience: A guide to reflective teaching* Boston: Allyn and Bacon

Tatum, B. D. (1997). *“Why are all the Black kids sitting together in the cafeteria?” And other conversations about race*. New York: Basic Books.

### **Course Assignments:**

1. A personal learning goals paper (6-8 pages long, due on Spark and in class on 2/1): There are three steps to this paper;

Step 1: Read Hunter et al., chapter 1,2, 3 & 4 and revisit Schoem & Hurtado, chapter 15 & Zúñiga et al., 2007, chapter 4. Then, identify and summarize key highlights from the readings that in your view would be helpful to keep in mind as you work to improve your intergroup dialogue facilitation knowledge, skills and dispositions. (2-3 pages)

Step 2: Summarize and describe your areas of strength and areas that need further development as a dialogue facilitator based on the insights and feedback you’ve gathered so far; For instance, based on your work in Educ 795E, the three inventories you completed during the winter break – KASP Inventory, Co-facilitation Inventory, and the Group Skills Inventory- and the conversations you’ve had so far with your co-facilitation partner. (2-3 pages)

Step 3: Keeping in mind your “findings” in step 1 and 2, identify TWO learning goals for each of the four KASP competency areas (knowledge, awareness, skills and passion) discussed in Schoem & Hurtado, chapter 15 and map a fairly detailed action plan (2-3 pages).

For each goal you will develop a DETAILED action plan that includes:

- Your reasons for working on this learning goal
- Concrete and specific action steps you will take to meet your learning goal (e.g., behaviors you will practice, feedback you will gather, knowledge you will acquire)
- Reflective practice methods you will rely upon to support the achievement of your goals
- Evidence and criteria you will use to determine you have achieved or are achieving your learning goals

2. Reflective practice assignment (6-8 pages long, due on Spark on 4/1).

Brookfield (1995) identifies four lenses for practitioners who wish to embark on this journey: (1) our autobiographies as students and teachers, (2) our student eyes’, (3) our colleagues’ experiences, and (4) theoretical literatures.

Building on Brookfield’ s conceptualization, we are asking you to inquire into your own dialogue facilitation practice using various sources of “data” (e.g., video tape, consultant in-class observation notes, participant feedback, peer feedback, self-feedback, mid-semester evaluations).

You will be asked to describe, dissect and analyze “moments” of your dialogue facilitation of session 5, to consider alternative courses of action to transform your practice, and raise new questions for consideration.

To guide the meaning making and reflection process, this paper asks you to rely on Schon's (1987): (1) reflection- in-action (reflection in the here-and-now) and (2) reflection-on-action (reflection about what happened). Refer to Ghaye & Ghaye (1998) for a detailed discussion of the kinds of conversations that support different types of reflection-on-action.

In framing your goals for this assignment, it will be helpful for you to keep in mind your learning goals as well as some of the skill sets involved in planning and facilitating participatory and dialogic conversations across differences (Hunter et al., 1995; Brookfield & Preskill, 2005; Zúñiga, Nagda, Chesler & Cytron-Walker, 2007).

This assignment is divided into four parts. Detailed guidelines will be posted on Spark and distributed in class on March 3<sup>rd</sup>.

Part 1: Microteaching of session 5: Review data gathered and identify possible patterns/themes/questions concerning dialogue facilitation for further examination. (Due before Monday, 3/10<sup>th</sup> class).

Part 2: Microteaching of session 5: Debrief your experience watching the video-taped material of session 5 and take a closer look at a segment (s) that you would like to further study (during class time, Monday, 3/10<sup>th</sup>).

Part 3: Dissect, examine and reflect on the data gathered during, and after, session 5 regarding a theme or issues concerning dialogue facilitation.

Part 4: Write a 6-8 page reflective practice paper on a theme or question that emerged for you in session 5 dialogue facilitation for which you have 3 sources of data. This paper also requires you to draw from the theoretical literature. (Due Monday, 4/1 on Spark).

3. Five reflective logs (4-5 pages long, due Monday 2/18, Monday 2/25, Monday 3/10, Monday 3/31, Monday 4/7 or Monday 4/21).

Prompts will be posted on Spark and distributed in class. Of the six logs, one can be drop but logs due on 2/18 or 3/10.

Your first log will be due the Monday after your second dialogue session. Of the six due dates, you can drop one but NOT 2/18 or 3/10.

In drafting your logs, you will draw on some of the cognitive organizers and examples outlined by Ghaye, A. & Ghaye, K. (1998) & Posner (2005)

Reflective logs will be submitted on Spark by 11pm on the due date. Ximena and your assigned consultant will review your logs and provide written feedback.

4. A theory-practice paper (8-10 pages long, due May 16<sup>th</sup>.) This paper addresses specific content/process issue related to our dialogue topic (e.g. race/ethnicity, race/ethnicity and gender,

gender, sexuality) that came up in planning and/or facilitating your intergroup dialogue this semester. Detailed guidelines will be posted on Spark and distributed in class on Monday, April 14<sup>th</sup> (Due on Spark on 5/16).

### **Leadership Responsibilities:**

1. Timely submission of weekly Ed 395Z designs to assigned consultant. Weekly designs are due via email to your consultant on Sunday by 8pm for input and feedback. Your final version is due on Spark with the corresponding session evaluation form the following Sunday. Keep in mind the following guidelines in drafting your weekly designs:

- In your Facilitator Manual, you will find designs for all ten-dialogue sessions. You are expected to closely follow the designs for session 1-4 as they provide the foundation for subsequently exploring controversial topics in stage 3 (session 5-7). Similarly, you will be asked to follow session 8-10 designs relatively closely to support a consistent facilitation approach across sections as we bring the experience to an end. Session 5-8 design can be tweaked or changed as long as the basic parameters are upheld re: process and content goals, open dialogue structure right after a short dialogue starter, etc.
- In planning your weekly sessions, carefully review the corresponding session design before you meet with your partner to plan the upcoming session. Jot down any questions or concerns that may come up as you consider the goals and sequencing of the design in relation to what happened (or didn't happen) in your previous dialogue session. Should any questions and concerns remain as you and your partner develop your own design, make sure to raise these with your consultant as well as with other facilitators during the practicum. Feel free to note questions/concerns in the design you turn to your consultant on Sunday at 8pm.
- Submit a detailed draft of your design to your consultant for review; be sure to specify clear learning goals (content and process), guidelines or skills you are planning to encourage participants to work on during that session, rationale for any new decisions that depart from original curriculum, transition statements to help segue from one activity to the next, questions to help open a dialogue segment, questions to help deepen a dialogue segment, time allocation, and what segments will be co-facilitated and/or solo facilitated and why.
- If some of your design decisions relate to specific group dynamics or concerns identified in the previous session, make sure to summarize concerns in your rationale so your consultant can more effectively understand your planning process (particularly if your design departs from the established curriculum).
- Make sure to create a running list of materials you will need to prepare before the upcoming session and to be very clear about who will do what.
- Should you and your co-facilitator choose to depart from the established curriculum in terms of content, process and/or sequence please articulate a clear rationale for doing so.

Having a clear rationale for your decision will prove helpful when meeting with your consultant. This will also help you and your co-facilitator navigate more effectively the session if things don't go as you had expected.

- Keep your eyes focused on the “art of facilitation.” A good design will help you map the “what, why and how” of a session but it certainly not a substitute for good facilitation.

## 2. Ed 395Z leadership & course management:

- Keep and maintain records of student attendance and completion of log & short assignments, ICP action project, and final paper
- Provide timely feedback to dialogue participants on weekly log entries, testimonial assignment, make up assignments, and ICP action project proposals and progress report.
- Submit a copy of your section attendance and assignment records on March 10<sup>th</sup> (before Spring break) and April 14<sup>th</sup> (before the last dialogue session) to the course TA.
- Provide timely feedback on your section final reflection papers to the course TA.

## **Course Expectations:**

We are each “works in progress.” As we strive to create a multicultural learning community, we encourage you to consider following foundational guidelines developed by Jamie Washington, Ph.D., Washington Consulting Group for diverse learning communities.

1. Communities are build through relationships of trust and commitment
2. We are all doing the best we can (most of the time)
3. We don't know all there is to know
4. Just because you are, doesn't mean you understand
5. Oppression is pervasive and impacts us all
6. It is not our fault, but we must accept responsibility to create change
7. Conflict and discomfort are often part of growth
8. Inquire to first understand, then share your own perspectives and experiences
9. We must do our personal development and healing work
10. Individuals, groups and organizations DO grow and change
11. Practice forgiveness and letting go
12. There are no quick fixes
13. There is HOPE

More specifically, we encourage everyone to keep in mind the following expectations:

1. Active Participation: This course relies heavily on active participation from everyone involved, including the instructor. Every person has a different comfort level, interpersonal and cultural style as they participate in group activities and classroom discussions. We will find (and

at times push against) those comfort zones. It is our hope that in those moments you will remain present and ‘hang in there’ with your discomfort, voice where you are at, and gradually “trust” the group process.

2. Come Prepared. Be ready to describe “bits and pieces” of what went on in your last dialogue session or specific behaviors, entertain possible interpretations for some of these dynamics or behaviors, discuss key concepts and issues drawing from assigned readings, and to verbally express reflective thoughts or feelings stimulated by your previous dialogue session. As we share and consider multiple perspectives, let’s keep in mind that a multicultural learning community unfolds from the “barn raising” of layered and conflicting observations, perceptions, ideas and experiences.

3. Take risks. The more we share our “queries,” “qualms,” “ouches,” questions and places of confusion, the more we will learn from each other and gain a common understanding of some of the complex and intricacies of intergroup dialogue work. This will not always be easy. We will, as a group, need to make sure that we have created a safe (not necessarily comfortable), and constructive learning environment to fully grapple with our experiences across and within lines of difference (e.g., philosophy, values, interpersonal, cultural and leadership styles, social identities, teacher and student role and status).

4. Let’s put our perceptions and assumptions in check! Our cultural, internal emotional states, intellectual orientations, and stereotypical biases often filter our perceptions of other people’s behaviors. Our values, feelings and roles often mediate what we notice and fail to notice, shaping the attributions we make to explain an event or a relationship. Let’s interrogate our perceptions of an event or incident by asking questions, checking our interpretations or assumptions, and asking for feedback from multiple perspectives and positionalities!

**5. Lets embrace our work together this semester with passion, compassion, and respect!**

### **Evaluation and Grading Criteria:**

This is a graded course. Professional leadership, participation, competency building, self/other observation, reflection and analysis are integral to this practicum. Therefore:

1. Attendance to all practicum and training class sessions is mandatory. Three absences from practicum class means automatic fail. This includes long days.
2. In class small group leadership and facilitation of all 395Z dialogue sessions is required. If you cannot be at a particular session or emergency occurs please inform your co-facilitation partner and course director right away.
3. Assignments must be completed on the due date. Should you need an extension please contact the course director and your co-facilitation partner where appropriate.
4. Active and reflective participation in classroom activities, consultation and feedback sessions.

### Grading criteria

<i>Grading Categories</i>	<i>Points</i>	<i>Due Date</i>
Personal learning goals paper	15 %	2/1 In class & on Spark
Reflective practice assignment	15 %	3/25 On Spark
Ten Weekly designs & session evaluation forms	30 %	First draft is due via email on Sunday by 8pm to your consultant Final version is due on Spark with session evaluation form the following Sunday
Five Reflective logs*  (* ) Of the six due dates, you can drop one but 2/18 or 3/10	20 %	Due on Spark Monday 2/18*, Monday 2/25, Monday 3/10*, Monday 3/31, Monday 4/7 and Monday 4/21
A theory-practice paper focusing on your dialogue foci	20%	5/16 On Spark
Total Points Possible	100	

**Grading: Letter course grades are based on a scale of 1-100 points**

A = 100 -94 points	A- = 93-90 point
B+ = 89-87 points	B = 86-84 points
B - = 83-80 points	C+ = 79-77 points
C = 76-74 points	D+ = 69-67 points
D- = 63-60 points	

## Readings Available on SPARK

### Part I. Key Principles of Dialogic Communication and intergroup Learning

Bidol, P. (1986). Interactive communication. In NTL Institute, *Alternative conflict management approaches: A citizen's manual* (pp. 205-208). Ann Arbor, MI: Environmental Conflict Project, University of Michigan.

Cooke, A. (1999). Perception. In L. Porter, Ed.D. & B. Mohr, M.Ed., (Eds.), *NTL Reading Book for Human Relations Training* (pp. 193 – 198). Virginia: NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science.

McCormick, D. (1999). Listening with empathy. In L. Porter, Ed.D. & B. Mohr, M.Ed., (Eds.), *NTL Reading Book for Human Relations Training* (pp. 57 – 60). Virginia: NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science.

### Part I: Putting Theory into Practice

#### Section II-A: Co-facilitation & leadership development

Huang Nissen, S. (1999). Being an effective group leader. In *Dialogue groups: A practical guide to facilitate diversity conversation* (pp. 49 - 62). Blue Hill, Maine: Medicine Bear Publishing.

Luft, J. (1982). The Johari Window: A graphic model of awareness in interpersonal relations. In L. Porter, Ed.D. & B. Mohr, M.Ed., (Eds.), *NTL Reading Book for Human Relations Training* (pp. 34 – 35). Virginia: NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science.

Porter, L. (1982). Giving and Receiving Feedback: It Will Never Be Easy But It Can Be Better. In L. Porter, Ed.D. & B. Mohr, M.Ed., (Eds.), *NTL Reading Book for Human Relations Training* (pp. 42 – 45). Virginia: NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science.

Wasserman, I. & Dorna, R. (1999). Creating inclusive learning communities. In NTL Institute, *Reading book for human relations training (8<sup>th</sup> edition)*, (pp. 307-312). Arlington, VA: NTL Institute.

#### Section II-B: Becoming a reflective practitioner

Brockbank, A. & McGill, I. (2000). The requirements for reflection. In *Facilitating reflective learning in higher education* (pp. 56-69). Buckingham, U.K: Open University Press.

Brockbank, A. & McGill, I. (2000). Reflection and reflective practice. In *Facilitating reflective learning in higher education* (pp. 70-88). Buckingham, U.K: Open University Press.

Brookfield, S. (1995). What it means to be a critically reflective teacher. In *Becoming a critically reflective teacher* (pp. 1-27). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Brookfield, S. (1995). Becoming critically reflective: A process of learning and change. In *Becoming a critically reflective teacher* (pp. 28-48). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Posner, G. (2005). Reflecting on field experiences: Fieldwork logs. In *Field experience: A guide to reflective teaching* (pp. 21-28). Boston: Allyn and Bacon

### **Section II-C: Planning and Facilitating Intergroup Dialogues**

Arnold, R., Burke, B., James, C., Martin, D., & Thomas, B. (1991). Working by design: Putting together a program for change. In *Educating for a Change* (pp. 33-67). Toronto: Between the Lines & Doris Marshall Institute for Education and Action.

Romney, P., Tatum, B., & Jones, J. (1992). Feminist strategies for teaching about oppression: The importance of process. *Women's Studies Quarterly* 1992(1&2), 95-110.

Silberman, M., Ph.D. (1998). Facilitating Structured Activities and Promoting Team Learning. In *Active Learning* (pp. 265 – 282). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

### **Section II-D: Working with group dynamics & conflict**

Andrews, R. (1999). Being the Only. In L. Porter, Ed.D. & B. Mohr, M.Ed., (Eds.), *NTL Reading Book for Human Relations Training* (pp. 83 – 86). Virginia: NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science.

Parham, P. & Spoth, J. (1999). Flee, Flight or Fix: Managing Interpersonal Conflict. In L. Porter, Ed.D. & B. Mohr, M.Ed., (Eds.), *NTL Reading Book for Human Relations Training* (pp. 157 – 161). Virginia: NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science.

Schein, E.H. ( 1982). What To Observe in a Group. In L. Porter, Ed.D. & B. Mohr, M.Ed., (Eds.), *NTL Reading Book for Human Relations Training* (pp. 72 – 74). Virginia: NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science.

Weber, R.C. (1982). The Group: A Cycle from Birth to Death. In L. Porter, Ed.D. & B. Mohr, M.Ed., (Eds.), *NTL Reading Book for Human Relations Training* (pp. 68 – 71). Virginia: NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science