

Connecting Deliberative Democracy to Campus Diversity Initiatives
A Call to Offices of Diversity and Institutions of Higher Education
By Ande Diaz and Stephan Hiroshi Gilchrist

Introduction

We believe higher education and Offices of Diversity (the formally or informally identified chief diversity officer) have a fundamental responsibility and role in creating equitable and inclusive systems that are both internal to the organization and connected to an institution's broader purpose of educating for social responsibility, and for living in a pluralistic democracy and in a globally interdependent world.

Currently on our campuses, we have two distinct initiatives of diversity and deliberative democracy working independently, narrowly focused within their individual fields. However, there is nascent recognition that these unconnected initiatives share a common vision of creating equitable, diverse, and inclusive campuses and communities. Along with a common vision, these initiatives also have mutual learning outcomes that include:

- Collaborative leadership
- Collaborative decision making
- Intercultural relationship building
- Intercultural communication
- Intercultural understanding and conflict transformation
- Non-violent communication and deep listening
- Self-reflection
- Self-awareness of one's own cultural biases, assumptions, and preferences
- Understanding cultures and groups different than one's own
- Understanding shared human needs and interests
- Understanding the interconnectedness of the local, national, and global systems
- Understand power and conflict.
- Empathy, flexibility, curiosity, and social responsibility
- Ability to analyze the macro and micro social, economic, and political systems in which diversity and inclusion operate

With this shared vision and learning objectives as a foundation, it is imperative that the disparate initiatives of deliberative democracy and diversity be linked together. By intentionally connecting these two initiatives, a more comprehensive and effective approach can be established on our campuses. Without this, it will be difficult to achieve the vision of a diverse, inclusive, and democratic campus. This paper attempts to make the case for connecting deliberative democracy to the work of Offices of Diversity by exploring: (1) the concept -what is deliberative democracy; (2) the practice -how is deliberative

democracy applied in the higher education setting; and (3) next steps and overcoming obstacles –what is needed to engage in this transformation?

What is deliberative democracy?

Deliberative democracy is not just a mode of operating for government, but a concept that can be applied in any community or social organization – including higher education (Dewey, 1916). Deliberative democracy seeks collaboration and holistic understanding of a community. It engages diverse perspectives, explores concerns and assumptions, transforms conflict and disagreement, and works collaboratively to find creative solutions and constructive change. “It is a set of principles and practices that guide how people interact and work together every day to improve [the community] and to create a more just society” (The Democracy Imperative, 2009).

The Democracy Imperative (2009) further describes *Deliberative democracy* as a form of democracy that has the characteristics of:

- educated and informed community members;
- vigorous participation of ordinary people in matters of community concern at the local, national, and global levels;
- a community process of reasoning and deliberation for decision and policy- making;
- political and social inclusion and equality;
- involvement in decision-making by those most likely to be affected by the outcome;
- public officials who are responsive to ideas generated through public discourse, and who are accountable to the public for their decisions;
- respect for free expression;
- an openness to multiple viewpoints, dissent, and criticism; and
- an understanding that when disagreements arise, community members will continue to work to overcome differences to reach more acceptable outcomes.

Three key practices of deliberative democracy explored in the pages ahead include conflict transformation, dialogue, and deliberation.

Conflict Transformation

Conflict transformation is an essential element of deliberative democracy and that of diversity work. As many Offices of Diversity can attest to, diverse perspectives and experiences naturally give rise to disagreement and conflict – whether it is at the intrapersonal, interpersonal, or intergroup level. These conflicts can be debilitating and if not approached constructively, detrimental to individuals and the organization. However, when handled appropriately, conflict can be a powerful and necessary stimulus for individual change, and for

constructively changing relationships and social systems such as institutions of higher education.

There are many approaches to conflict transformation, e.g., non-violent communication, mediation, dialogue, ceremony, and storytelling. Whatever the approach, the conflict transformation process helps surface and clarify the values, preferences, assumptions, and unmet needs that lie underneath our opinions, perspectives, and behaviors. Conflict transformation asks us to answer the questions: what are my (my groups) values, preferences, assumptions, and needs; from where do these come; why is this important to me; and how do we create systems that work for all people when we come from such different backgrounds and have such different perspectives? (Needs can include autonomy, a sense of belonging, self-esteem, and security -physical, financial, psychological.)

Probing these questions helps create mutual understanding, as well as understanding of one's self, and helps transform relationships and the systems in which these relationships exist. By establishing a deeper understanding of ourselves, of others, and of the situation, we can develop effective and creative solutions that meet the interests and needs of the diverse parties involved.

The conflict transformation process is especially helpful in generating new solutions that meet the interests and needs of the community. For example, when faculty decide to revise their promotion and tenure process, there will be many diverse perspectives. Through the conflict transformation process (and the use of dialogue and deliberation), the institution can leverage these diverse perspectives in a constructive way that allows for a deeper and broader understanding to emerge. This emergence of "new" knowledge leads to creating a more effective promotion and tenure system that works for the institution and the people involved.

Dialogue

The dialogue process, in essence, is a collaborative and inclusive approach that engages community members in an effort to hear diverse perspectives and develop shared understanding needed for effective and sustainable action. Implied in this process are two ideas: first that dialogue is the space between people or the *vessel* or container in which communication flows (Bohm, 1996) and second that the interaction with another person must be founded in a deep respect or sacred honoring of the other person (Buber, 1970).

Dialogue provides the opportunity for participants to come together, and reflect on our personal and culturally influenced assumptions, judgments, and thought processes. These assumptions, judgments, and thought processes are manifestations of our unconscious frameworks through which we view and evaluate the world around us. Dialogue opens us up to examining our frameworks, thereby transforming the understanding of ourselves, others, our relationships, and the organizational and social systems in which we interact.

By communicating our perspectives with others in a dialogue, the way we look at ourselves and the world changes through the involvement and negotiation of the different truths or realities that are present. These differing perspectives come together to provide a more complex and holistic understanding of a given situation or relationship. As Bruner (1987, 4) states, “Once a concept is explicated in dialogue, the learner is enabled to reflect on the dialogue, to use its distinctions and connections to reformulate his own thought.” From this dialogic interaction, a shared understanding emerges through the negotiation of diverse meanings, perspectives, and truths that are present. From this newly created, shared understanding (i.e. transformed perspectives), we begin to construct inclusive systems in our institutions that work for all those involved.

The table below, adapted from the work of Daniel Yankelovich (1999), provides a helpful contrast between what is considered dialogue and the way we usually engage with one another.

Debate	Dialogue
This is where I want the meeting to go.	Let’s see what we can come up with.
Speak as representatives of a group.	Speak as individuals from their own unique experience.
Unwavering commitment to one’s own views and ideas.	Open to hearing and understanding other perspectives.
Trying to convince others to see the situation from your perspective or to agree with you.	Asking questions to understand other people’s point of view.
Combative, where participants attempt to prove the other side wrong.	Collaborative, where participants work together toward common understanding.
Assuming there is a right answer, and you have it.	Assuming that there are multiple perspectives and that integrating these perspectives provides a more effective solution.
Listening to find flaws and counterarguments.	Listening to understand and find meaning.

Critiquing others' views and ideas.	Reexamining all views, ideas, and assumptions –including one's own.
Seeking closure with agreement to your view and ideas.	Discovering new options.
Narrow	Holistic

Deliberation

The Democracy Imperative describes deliberation as a process that “brings people together to study an organizational, community, social, or political issue. It asks it’s participants to identify possible solutions, consider the advantages, disadvantages, and trade-offs for each choice, and make decisions about how an issue should be addressed. Dialogue provides the comprehensive and shared understanding needed for quality deliberation and effective decision making to occur.” (The Democracy Imperative, 2009). In other words, dialogue helps creates the foundation for the decisions made during the deliberation process.

DOES “DIALOGUE PERMIT DELIBERATION?” NOT SURE MYSELF BUT LET’S CHECK WITH DEMOCRACY GODDESS NT ASK NANCY

The Practice of Deliberative Democracy on Campus

After having briefly described the concepts of deliberative democracy above, we now turn to the practice of these concepts on our campuses. The practice of deliberative democracy engages five areas particular to higher education. These are: (1) the curriculum, (2) the co-curriculum, (3) pedagogy, (4) scholarship, and (5) administration and governance. (Nancy Thomas in her Catalyst Paper #1, *Why It is Imperative to Strengthen American Democracy through Study, Dialogue, and Change in Higher Education*, identifies these five areas under the rubric of understanding, promoting, and modeling deliberative democracy.)

Deliberative Democracy in the Curriculum

Intergroup dialogue is an example of deliberative democracy that has been adopted by colleges and universities. Several dialogue programs have been established on campuses across the U.S. as part of a formal course of study (National Coalition on Dialogue and Deliberation, 2007). Universities have established their own programs as well as adapting community-based programs from organizations such as the National Issues Forum, Everyday Democracy and the International Institute of Sustained Dialogue. Whether developed in-house or in collaboration with a community organization, formal campus programs often focus on issues of intergroup relations, diversity, and social justice. Several

colleges have developed these formal dialogue programs through various departments and divisions on campus (Schoem & Hurtado 2001).

The Multiversity Intergroup Dialogue Project is a well established program that “brings together teachers and researchers from across ten institutions of higher education to develop best practices in intergroup dialogue including the development and implementation of a shared curriculum. In addition, these institutions are participating in a research project that studies the educational benefits of student learning through intergroup dialogue” (Syracuse University, 2009).

The University of Michigan is a member of this consortium of ten universities and colleges and has created the Program on Intergroup Relations as part of their undergraduate curriculum (University of Michigan Program on Intergroup Dialogue, 2007). The program, in coordination with the Division of Student Affairs, and the College of Literature, Science, and Arts provides students “the opportunity to learn, cognitively and experientially, about issues of intergroup relations, explicitly focusing on the relationship between social conflict and social justice (Thompson, Brett & Behling 2001). Courses in the Intergroup Dialogue Program are structured to help students explore different social identity groups such as culture, race, religion, gender, class, sexual orientation, and national origin. Providing opportunities to earn college credit, structured dialogue courses push students to interact with those outside their own social groups, and allows for the creation of deeper, empathic relationships to develop. These transformed relationships and newly created understanding of one another, and of oneself, can have a profound impact on creating a positive campus climate. Recent research on curricular dialogue has shown that such models increase intergroup understanding, relationships and collaboration and engagement (Nagda, Gurin, Sorenson, & Zuniga, 2009).

Wake Forest University is another example where a course on deliberative democracy was taught as part of a first year seminar (Harriger & McMillan, 2007). This was part of a larger Democracy Fellows Program that incorporated dialogue and deliberation into a cohort’s classroom experience. In this program, using the National Issues Forum model, students learned the skills of dialogue and deliberation, and honed these skills through various courses and the exploration of various topics. Instructors found that students in this cohort developed openness to diverse points of view, the ability and motivation to apply deliberation and dialogue skills to situations outside of the classroom, and planned to continue using these skills upon graduating from Wake Forest (Harriger & McMillan, 2007).

As a fundamental aspect of deliberative democracy, conflict transformation is being added to multi-disciplinary programs as well as being developed into stand alone degree granting programs. For example, law, education, public affairs, international studies, business, and other fields are incorporating conflict transformation into their curriculum. At the same time,

there is a growing number of established graduate and undergraduate programs in conflict transformation. These include George Mason University, Portland State University, University of Notre Dame, Syracuse University, University of Denver, Eastern Mennonite, Marquette University, Brandeis University, and Georgetown University. Courses in these programs cover a broad range of conflict transformation topics such as intercultural, international, interpersonal, organizational, community, ethnic, environmental, religious, and gender.

Deliberative Democracy in the Co-Curriculum

Similar to the section on pedagogy, there are ample examples and opportunities to incorporate deliberative democracy into the co-curriculum. These include dialogues in response to bias incidents; residence hall dialogues on current events; dialogue groups after a speaker or film, restorative justice programs, residence hall community standards, peer mediation training, and service learning opportunities with communities.

For example, in the residence halls, dialogue is central to creating successful community standards. Led by trained resident assistants, all students in their respective residence halls, collaboratively develop community standards which provide a shared understanding of the expectations and responsibilities of each student and the community as a whole. The dialogue process is used by students in both developing the community standards, and as a process to help resolve conflicts that occur when the standards have been transgressed.

Dialogue, in this setting, creates an opportunity for each student and the community to better understand the effects that their behavior has on others, and the deeper needs and values that motivate individuals and groups. Through these conversations, students negotiate their experiences, different perspectives, and values to create a shared understanding of how to live with one another. Instead of the traditional punitive approach, the approach of community standards and dialogue creates a transformative learning experience that fosters self reflection, empathy, social responsibility, cross-cultural communication, and constructive conflict transformation.

Recent research on co-curricular dialogue models suggest that civic outcomes ranging from cognitions and behaviors to attitudes, skills, and hopes and plans for the future, are influenced by undergraduate dialogue initiatives. It also suggests that such civic outcomes last years past graduation (Diaz, 2009).

Numerous colleges and universities also employ peer mediation to help with campus conflicts. Students learn the mediation and facilitation skills necessary in helping transform intercultural, interpersonal, intergroup, and intragroup conflicts. Among many others, colleges and universities with such programs include University of Rhode Island, Syracuse University, Portland State University, University, University of Massachusetts Amherst, University of Louisville, Grinnell College, and Texas A&M. (Campus ADR, 2009)

Deliberative Democracy and Pedagogy

Changed perspectives and more inclusive approaches emerge through such practices as conflict transformation, dialogue and deliberation. Such a perspective change motivates more active civic engagement or the living of a civic life or life of commitment to a human commons from the recognition of the interdependence of our lives (Parks Daloz, Keen, Keen, & Daloz Parks, 1996).

This approach to pedagogy draws from the idea that a critical consciousness cannot be developed from a curriculum that is disconnected to human lives (Freire, 1973), and that encountering a person or perspective different from one's own, triggers a discord between what one believes and the reality of the other that one encounters. The experiential learning from that encounter breaks down what is known. Through deeper reflection on what one knows, and a reintegration of that knowledge, one's perspectives are transformed (Mezirow & Associates, 2000). This type of transformative learning as well as civic motivation are associated with moral and ethical development and are rooted in the critical self-reflection and construction of knowledge that occurs through collaborating with the other (Bruffee, 1993). The scholar-practitioners of Popular Education calls this dialogic learning space, "a circle of learners" or "a circle of culture" and avoids the term of "teacher" -instead calling those who facilitate learning "coordinators of discussion or debate and dialogue" (Horton & Freire, 1990, p. 84).

There are many ways in which a professor can incorporate deliberative democracy and this type of transformative learning into educational practice. Such practice will in turn, help create an inclusive environment and teach students the skills to: listen to diverse perspectives and life experiences; examine personal preferences, biases, and assumptions; and create a shared a more complex understanding of an issue.

Instead of convincing others of the "rightness" of their opinions, the practice of deliberative democracy as pedagogy provides an alternative, where students (and professors) can ask each other and oneself, reflective and transformational questions. Cranton (1994) suggests reflecting on such questions as:

1. Why do I believe this perspective is important?
2. Why do others believe that a certain perspective is important?
3. How did I come to think this way?
4. How did others come to think in such a way?
5. Why should I question this perception?
6. How have I come to have this perception of myself?
7. What do I believe about myself?
8. Why should I question this perception?
9. What are the social norms of my community of others' communities?
10. How have these social norms been influential?

11. Why are these norms important?
12. What knowledge do I have?
13. Where did this knowledge come from?
14. Why is this knowledge important/not important?
15. What knowledge and experiences have I been exposed to?
16. How does this affect the way I see the world?

These questions, when effectively facilitated, promote self-reflection, dialogue, and opportunities for conflict transformation and learning. An important aspect of ensuring such effects is creating trust amongst students, and between students and the instructor. There are several ways this can be done. As a professor, one can begin the new term by asking students what it takes to establish trust in the classroom as a foundation to their learning. If it isn't raised in the initial conversation, a question asking students, "how do we respond when we disagree, have a different perspective, or have a different experience from the person who just spoke"? The ideas generated from this dialogue can be formed into a written agreement by the class. When tension or conflict occurs, students and instructors can refer back to this agreement to help constructively transform the situation. An agreement could include:

1. Listen actively to each other with attention and respect.
2. Do not interrupt and allow each person to represent her/his views fully.
3. Be sensitive to the amount of time each of us speaks.
4. Make an effort to understand the other person's experience.
5. Acknowledge the experience of others even though it may be different than your own.
6. Speak from your own experience, not as a representative of any group.

Service-learning or the more overarching term of "community-based learning" is an example of a more participatory and engaged pedagogy that can include direct service, community organizing, advocacy, public policy, and/or public-private partnerships. Faculty who use such teaching practices involve the community as part of achieving academically-rigorous learning goals for their students, include a course-based activity co-determined by those in the community, provide opportunities for deep reflection and for integration of the activity and other course content (Saltmarsh, 2009). Together a student's reflection and integration yield a greater understanding both of the students themselves and of the academic-discipline specific knowledges. Ultimately such teaching practices impact and foster student civic engagement. Faculty who situate their students in a public realm, expose them to relevant and often opposing viewpoints, and help them reflect on their experience in the context of a larger social world, have the impact of fostering citizens prepared to engage in a deliberative and inclusive democracy.

The book, *Deliberation & the Work of Higher Education* (Dedrick, Grattan, Dienstfrey, 2008) provides specific examples of courses using the pedagogy of deliberative democracy. The case studies shared in this book provide examples of the adaptability of dialogue and deliberation to various contexts, as well as their effectiveness as an educational approach. The range of courses include first year diversity education, English composition, civic engagement, an American studies senior capstone, and teacher education. The professor from the diversity education course states that the use of dialogue and deliberation helps create “spaces where people can safely remain open to new perspectives, be self-reflective, and examine their underlying assumptions” (Doherty, 2008). A teacher education student comments that “the process of deliberation helped me to move beyond my habits of thought, perception, and close-mindedness. Deliberative pedagogy is not about being taught but about waking up” (Alfaro, 2008).

Deliberative Democracy and Scholarship

The critical questioning of the priorities of the professorate has invited a scholarship of engagement (Boyer, 1996). The engagement itself –whether it be research, teaching or service – is academic work that has relevance to the public good. Engaged scholarship can contribute to a deliberative democracy – one that it (1) is inclusive, (2) contains different viewpoints, and (3) weighs different ideas that yields informed decisions made by the people who are most likely to live with the results of those decisions. In order to expand and improve the practice of deliberative democracy on our campuses, it is essential that we pursue a robust research agenda. This scholarship can be categorized into two main areas: (1) the research process –how is the research process itself reflective of a deliberative, participatory approach; and (2) the content of the scholarship – what’s being done currently in the area of deliberative democracy and what is its impact?

Many researchers are engaging in a variety of approaches to participatory scholarship. The Institute for Participatory Action Research and Design at the City University of New York Graduate Center’s work is a prime example of a democratic research process. Situated in both historically oppressed and in elite communities [The Center’s] projects “develop social theory and social action, intrigued by resuscitating conceptions of research validity and generalizability in ways informed by the deep participation of those most affected by social injustice” (The Institute for Participatory Action Research and Design at the City University of New York Graduate Center, 2009).

Their research projects include:

- studying privilege and constructions of "merit" in racially integrated suburban schools
- investigating the subjectivities and hetero-normative violence of white elite masculinity within exclusive private all-boys schools

- documenting the material and psychological consequences of opportunity gaps in wealthy desegregated schools
- developing school-based internships in which students in small progressive public schools investigate finance inequity and college access
- researching, in a longitudinal design, with urban youth, educators and parents in the midst of school restructuring

(The Institute for Participatory Action Research and Design at the City University of New York Graduate Center, 2009)

Along with incorporating participatory processes into the research itself, scholars are pursuing questions aimed at describing and analyzing current deliberative practices on campuses. A short list of studies include: Diaz (2009), Harriger & McMillan (2007), Nagda, Gurin, Sorenson, & Zuniga, (2009), Schoem, Hurtado, Sevig, Chesler, & Sumida, S. (2001), Zuñiga & Nagda (2001), and the Multiversity Intergroup Research project lead by the University of Michigan.

Deliberative Democracy and Administration and Governance

Deliberative democracy embodies the type of administrative and governance processes we are striving for when we envision a diverse and inclusive campus. Deliberative democracy allows for open communication, opportunities to create shared meaning, a course of action to transform interpersonal and intergroup conflicts constructively, and to develop creative and effective solutions. These qualities of open communication, shared meaning, conflict transformation, and developing effective solutions are fundamental in creating inclusive structures and processes that engage diverse perspectives.

In this manner, deliberative democracy serves as a fundamental approach in implementing inclusive decision making processes. This means implementing dialogue, deliberation, and conflict transformation at regular meetings (e.g. departmental, staff, faculty, trustees, students, etc.), visioning and strategic planning sessions, as well as campus-wide assessment processes. Meetings and conversations conducted in this manner provide an environment where ideas, data, and perspectives are explored fully without defensiveness. And where views are fully heard and questions are posed to better understand the assumptions behind people's ideas.

In contrast to where a limited number of perspectives are solicited in decisions that affect the entire campus, the deliberative democracy approach increases the number of participants and perspectives involved. There is open, transparent communication about the issue and an effort to hear the views of all constituents –even if one believes they may be different from one's own. Deliberative democracy not only provides an opportunity for input from those affected by a decision, it allows for the creation of a shared and comprehensive understanding of the issue, and increases the success of the change the institution is attempting to implement.

A recent example of an inclusive and dialogic approach to decision making appeared in AAC&U's *Liberal Education*. In the article by Susan Gano-Phillips and Robert Barnett (2008), the authors describe a process-driven initiative on general education that involved the entire campus. Instead of attempting general education reform through traditional means of a single committee-created plan (or top-down approach), those involved made a pivotal decision to include the perspectives of students, staff, faculty, administrators, and the governing board. At every step of the way the process was reflective, open, and inclusive. They found that the insularity and the hindrance and lack of progress that usually comes from having only a handful of administrators or faculty making broad decisions, was overcome by involving a wide-range of perspectives. "Silos were dismantled, barriers were crossed, and the culture of secrecy and suspicion that pervaded the campus was transformed into one of openness, inclusiveness, collaboration, and engagement" (Gano-Phillips & Barnett, p. 41, 2008).

Next steps

As we attempt to link deliberative democracy to the work of Offices of Diversity, there are important next steps for institutions to consider.

1. Raise awareness of the link between diversity, inclusion, equity, and deliberative democracy with Offices of Diversity.
2. Raise awareness of the link between diversity, inclusion, equity, and deliberative democracy with senior administrators and faculty.
3. Raise awareness of the link between diversity, inclusion, equity, and deliberative democracy with students.
4. Articulate an institutional vision that connects diversity, inclusion, equity, and deliberative democracy.
5. Identify an appropriate administrative structure to coordinate current disparate initiatives (i.e. assessment, planning, implementation, and communication).
6. Develop a one year action plan that includes next steps and possible barriers on your campus.

Of the steps noted above, a suggested first step is to connect with the individual or office that coordinates institutional diversity on your campus. Whether a formal and bestowed authority such as a chief diversity officer, or informal and non positional leadership, as in the case of an influential multicultural affairs office in student affairs, these key people are located on many of our campuses. Identifying and connecting with them will help produce a coordinated and coherent institutional effort towards policies of diversity, deliberative democracy, and inclusion. For those schools who may not have such an office, it is important for senior administrators to identify some mechanism

for disparate diversity efforts across the campus to be identified, coordinated, and communicated back to internal and external stakeholders.

In order to truly fulfill the vision of creating inclusive campuses, communities, and global society, it is imperative for higher education institutions to encourage Offices of Diversity to incorporate deliberative democracy in their work. By incorporating deliberative democracy as a central part of their work, Offices of Diversity can play a vital role in helping create, coordinate, and implement deliberative democracy initiatives on campuses and in communities. Because of the nature of its work, Offices of Diversity are in positions to expand their efforts to facilitate the integration of deliberative democracy into the pedagogical, curricular, co-curricular, and in the administrative and governance structures of higher education.

As these issues are brought to the attention of Offices of Diversity, it is important to simultaneously raise awareness with administrators and faculty, and to encourage them to see the same connections. One approach is to raise awareness of the interdependence between diversity, inclusion, equity, and deliberative democracy through related professional organizations and conferences, such as The Democracy Imperative, the National Coalition on Dialogue and Deliberation, and the American Association of Colleges and Universities. Another is to hold campus dialogues (forums) to explore the link between these various concepts and one's own institution's initiatives. Inviting speakers from within one's own institution and/or from outside the institution may help stimulate interest. These forums can be followed with senior administrators and faculty deliberating the appropriate administrative structure that would allow for the connection and coordination of these initiatives. Of course the culture of each campus is different, so approaches may vary.

If a decision is made for Offices of Diversity to take a central role in this endeavor, it is critical that colleges and universities appropriately position them within the organizational structure. This means moving Offices of Diversity out of Student Affairs (where they often reside) and establishing them in a central location such as the president's office, the provost's office, or having them report directly to the president as a member of senior staff. This reflects the significant value placed on this initiative by the institution, and for the ability of the "new" office to collaborate effectively with divisions and departments across the campus.

As we take these initial steps, it will be important to keep in mind the possible barriers that might exist on one's campus. These may include territoriality and the lack of imagination or openness to new ideas. Holding a campus-wide dialogue, inviting speakers from outside one's campus, and sending a team of faculty and administrators to conferences may help overcome these barriers.

This expansion of "diversity work" becomes central in our institutions ability to graduate engaged citizens that are prepared to live, work and study in

an increasingly interdependent global society. It links diversity, democracy and full throttle pluralism in areas ranging from socio-economic class and race to a respectful pluralism of faith. This expansion will fundamentally alter the way institutions are organized and run. The rewards for such a change are positive impacts on student learning, institutional effectiveness, campus climate, and recruitment and retention. It also has broader social implications as graduates begin to integrate inclusive, democratic, and socially equitable systems into their own organizations and communities –locally, nationally, and globally.

References

- Alfaro, C. (2008). Reinventing teacher education: The role of deliberative democracy in the K-6 classroom. In J. R. Dedrick, L. Grattan & H. Dienstfrey (Eds.), *Deliberation and the work of higher education*. Dayton, Ohio: Kettering Foundation.
- Bohm, D. (1996). *On dialogue*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Boyer, E. L. (1996). The scholarship of engagement. *Journal of Public Service & Outreach*, 1, No.1(Spring).
- Bruffee, K. A. (1993). *Collaborative learning: Higher education, interdependence, and the authority of knowledge*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Buber, M. (1970). *I and thou*. New York: Touchstone.
- Dewey. (1916). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. New York: Macmillan.
- Diaz, A. (2009). *Composing a Civic Life: Influences of Sustained Dialogue on post-graduate civic engagement and civic life*. Unpublished Dissertation, Fielding Graduate University, Santa Barbara, CA.
- Horton, M., & Freire, P. (1990). *We make the road by walking: Conversations on education and social change*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Mezirow, J., & Associates. (2000). *Learning as transformation: Critical perspectives on a theory in progress*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Nagda, B. R. A., Gurin, P., Sorenson, N., & Zuniga, X. (2009). Evaluating intergroup dialogue: Engaging diversity for personal and social responsibility. *Diversity and Democracy*, 12, No. 1.
- Parks Daloz, L. A., Keen, C. H., Keen, J. P., & Daloz Parks, S. (1996). *Common fire: Leading lives of commitment in a complex world*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Schoem, D., Hurtado, S., Sevig, T., Chesler, M., & Sumida, S. (2001). Intergroup dialogue: Democracy at work in theory and practice. In D. Schoem & S. Hurtado (Eds.), *Intergroup dialogue: Deliberative democracy in school, college, community, and workplace* (pp. 1-21). Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Zuñiga, X., & Nagda, B. (2001). Design considerations in intergroup dialogue. In D. Schoem & S. Hurtado (Eds.), *Intergroup dialogue: Deliberative democracy*

in school, college, community, and workplace (pp. 306-327). Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.