An In-Depth Look at a Comprehensive Diversity Training Program for Faculty

Nancie J. Hudson

California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo

Abstract

This ethnographic research project examines a five-month diversity training program that 16 faculty participated in voluntarily at a university in the western United States. In addition to reviewing diversity issues and challenges in higher education, this article provides information about the program, describes my participant-observer experience, and provides evidence that assesses the program's effects on teaching practices. This annual program includes learning, reflection and application and helps the participants develop new inclusive teaching strategies for the courses they teach. A post-program survey of the participants indicates that the majority felt that the program had a lasting beneficial effect on their teaching practices, and the results include specific inclusive teaching strategies that faculty can use in the classroom.

INTRODUCTION
Many of today's higher education classrooms are diverse learning environments where students can become more open and accepting of differences in social identity (Antonio, 2004; Astin, 1993; Chang, 1999). Teaching in a multicultural setting thus gives educators the opportunity to support diversity and inclusion in the classroom. Research has shown, however, that many educators are not receiving diversity training that would prepare them to teach in a multicultural setting. For example, a national survey of college campuses found that most required their students to attend diversity training events, but only five percent reported that they required their faculty to attend diversity workshops (McCauley, Wright & Harris, 2000). Academic researchers have advocated that faculty also need diversity training (Booker, Merriweather & Campbell-Whatley, 2016; Boysen, Vogel, Cope & Hubbard, 2009; Boysen, 2012; Caplan & Ford, 2014; Jones, 2017; Marcus, Mullins, Brackett, Tang, Allen & Pruett, 2003; Minikel-Lacocque, 2013; Samuels, 2014; Sue, Lin, Torino, Capodilupo & Rivera, 2009; Torres, Howard-Hamilton & Cooper, 2003). As educators, we are preparing our students to work in multicultural workplaces after college (Burnell & Schnackenberg, 2015; Goldstein Hode, Behm-Morawitz & Hays, 2018; Jones, King, Nelson, Geller & Bowes-Sperry, 2013; Rogers-Sirin & Sirin, 2009). To accomplish that objective, educators can learn and model language and behavior that will not be offensive or discriminatory to any individual or group.

Diversity training is needed, but a review of 40 years of research on diversity training programs found that many programs have been ineffective (Bezrukova, Spell, Perry & Jehn, 2016). One of the problems with diversity training initiatives is that most are facilitated as workshops that span less than one day (Chrobot-Mason & Quinones, 2002). For example, Dena Samuels (2014), an experienced facilitator who has conducted three-hour diversity training workshops in a university setting for three years, reported that at the end of each training session, 100 percent of her participants agreed that three hours was not long enough to accomplish the objectives of the workshop. Pendry, Driscoll and Field (2007) define diversity training as a program "which aims to influence participants to increase their positive – or decrease their negative – intergroup behaviors, such that less prejudice or discrimination is displayed towards others perceived as different in their group affiliation(s)" (p. 29). The goals of diversity training programs are

inclusion, harmony, justice, and transformation (Rossett & Bickham, 1994). Unfortunately, studies have shown that the positive effects of a one-time, half-day diversity training session do not last beyond a day or two and in some cases increase racial bias and incite backlash if they are mandatory, not voluntary (e.g., Dobbin & Kaley, 2016). Surveys indicate that more than 50 percent of employees who participate in one-day or half-day workshops report that diversity training had no long-term effect (Noe, 2010).

Bezrukova et al. (2016) found that the most effective diversity training programs are conducted "over a significant period of time" (p. 1227). Indeed, voluntary diversity training programs for faculty that spanned one week to several months positively impacted higher education by giving faculty new awareness of multiculturalism that they utilized to develop the courses that they teach (Campbell-Whatley, Merriweather, Lee & Toms, 2016; Clark, 2005; Goldstein Hode et al., 2018; Mayo & Larke, 2010; Potthoff, Dinsmore & Moore, 2001; Waite & Colvin, 2018). These findings pose practical questions for universities that are seeking to make their campuses more inclusive. RQ#1: From an individual perspective, what is it like to be a participant in a comprehensive diversity training program for faculty? RQ#2: From a collective assessment standpoint, does participation in a comprehensive diversity program for faculty have a lasting beneficial effect on teaching practices?

To answer these questions and contribute to literature on the most effective type of diversity training, a comprehensive program, this study examines "Teaching Inclusion and Diversity Everywhere" (TIDE), a comprehensive diversity training program for faculty at a university in the western United States. I am a White woman who teaches communication courses at that university, and I was a participant in the 2018 TIDE program. In this article, I provide an in-depth look at this program based on: (a) my firsthand experiences as a participant-observer during the five-month program; (b) my subsequent interview with the two program facilitators; and (c) my follow-up survey of the other faculty members who participated in the program.

First, I will provide background information about the TIDE program and the university where this the training program is conducted annually.

BACKGROUND

The program was launched in 2016 as a collaboration between the university's Center for Teaching, Learning and Technology (CTLT), which provides professional development opportunities for teachers at this university, and the university's Office of University Diversity and Inclusion (OUDI). The purpose of the program is to create a community of faculty who gain scholarly and personal insights and practical knowledge of diversity principles and inclusive teaching practices that will help accomplish the university's diversity learning objectives.

The program has been held for three consecutive years, and each year at least 20 faculty members submitted application proposals; from that pool, the CTLT selected 12 to 16 faculty, depending on its annual budget. Faculty interest in the program has been created by a $1,500 stipend from the university, direct referrals when the previous participants recommended it to their colleagues, and faculty book circles that read three books about diversity issues (D'Angelo, 2018; Samuels, 2014; Steele, 2010). The CTLT regularly holds social events for all faculty who have completed the program, and those events have helped build a community of practice that supports us in our ongoing efforts to be better educators.

The program is funded by the CTLT, OUDI, and the Provost's Office. The costs of the program included $624 for course materials ($544 for books and $80 for binders), $2,160 for food and beverages, and $36,300 in personnel expenses (a $1,500 stipend for each of the 16 participants, a $5,000 stipend for the trainer who is a professor, $7,000 in salary for the OUDI trainer, and $300 for the guest speakers). The total cost was approximately $42,000. The number of participants varies every year; there were 16 in 2016, 12 in 2017, and 16 in 2018. The CTLT conducts an online anonymous survey of the participants, and all feedback is used to improve next year's program.

Next, I will review the diversity issues and challenges that we learned in the training program and explain why discrimination in the classroom is an issue for educators.

Diversity Issues and Challenges

Many people claim that they are not racist because they don't see race. This is the concept of colorblindness with regard to racism (Bonilla-Silva, 2009). Multicultural education expert and diversity trainer Robin D'Angelo (2018) explains that this ideology originated as a strategy to solve the social problem of racism after Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.'s "I Have a Dream" speech. "According to this ideology, if we pretend not to notice race, then there can be no racism" (D'Angelo, 2018, p. 40-41). For example, Forman and Lewis (2015) surveyed White high school students and found racial apathy and a lack of concern for race relations. Colorblindness is a covert form of racism because it ignores the social and structural inequalities between White people and people of color (Bonilla-Silva, 2009; Gallagher, 2009).

Another closely-related form of covert racism is oppression-blindness (Ferber, 2007). Oppression-blindness ignores social and structural inequalities on the basis of meritocracy, the so-called American dream, which posits that anyone can succeed through hard work regardless of race, gender, class, and life circumstances. As a result, many White Americans believe that racism no longer exists (D'Angelo, 2018) or that racism against Whites is more prevalent than racism against people of color (Norton & Sommers, 2011). Colorblindness and oppres-

sion-blindness are part of post-racialism, a political movement that is based on the ideology that "race does not matter, and should not be taken into account or even noticed" (Cho, 2009, p. 1595). Because White people have been socialized to believe covert racist ideologies, we need to be educated that racism is still a problem in society and in the academy (Ford, 2011; Franklin, 1999; Pierce, 1988; Samuels, 2014; Steele, 2010; Solorzano, Ceja & Yosso, 2000; Sue, Capodilupo & Holder, 2008).

D'Angelo (2018) argues that White people who think they are not racist do not understand socialization. In addition to meritocracy, we learn two other Western ideologies that perpetuate the myth of equality. The first ideology, individualism, claims that we are all unique and race is not a factor in one's success because failure is a result of individual character. The second ideology, objectivity, makes us feel that it is possible to be unbiased and treat everyone the same. Yet it is impossible to treat everyone the same because of implicit bias, discrimination that is based on unconscious prejudices that we learn against specific social groups based on cultural stereotypes (Sue, 2010). For example, one of the stereotypes about young Black men is that they are prone to violence (Steele, 2010). Lee and Hopson's (2019) study of Black millennial college students includes a discriminatory incident that occurred in a university bookstore. Three male students who were preparing to buy textbooks for their first semester were surrounded by police officers. The students had to show their student I.D. cards to convince the police that they were not criminals who were planning to rob the store. Other research studies of male African American college students found similar discrimination based on the assumption of criminality (Bennett, McIntosh & Henson, 2017; Harwood, Huntt, Mendenhall & Lewis, 2012; Nadal, 2011).

Discriminatory behaviors and comments against individuals who have marginalized identities based on cultural stereotypes are known as microaggressions. Racial microaggressions are defined as "brief and commonplace daily verbal, behavioral, and environmental indignities, whether intentional or unintentional, that communicate hostile, derogatory, or negative racial slights and insults to the target person or group" (Sue, Capodilupo, Torino, Bucceri, Holder, Nadal & Esquilin, 2007, p. 273). Jokes and other types of microaggressions also can discriminate based on gender, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, age, mental/physical illness, disability, and religion. Microaggressions are physically and mentally harmful to individuals who have marginalized identities because over time they increase stress levels (Sue, 2010) and contribute to fatigue, depression, anxiety and a loss of confidence (Nadal, 2011).

Numerous studies have found that microaggressions are common on college campuses (Bennett et al., 2017; Boysen et al., 2009; Boysen, 2012; Caplan & Ford, 2014; Harwood et al., 2012; Jones, 2017; Lee & Hopson, 2019; Marcus et al., 2003; Minikel-Lacocque, 2013; Sue et al., 2009). It is a salient issue for faculty because many microaggressions occur in the classroom (Boysen et al., 2009; Boysen & Vogel, 2009; Boysen, 2012; Caplan & Ford, 2014; Marcus et al., 2003; Sue et al., 2009). Solorzano, Ceja and Yosso (2000) found that faculty make assumptions about Black students' (lower) intelligence, ignore, distort or stereotype those students' life experiences, and segregate students into small groups based on race. Jones (2017) found that most of the incidents in the classroom were caused by professors who had lower expectations for Black students, told racist jokes, or never called

on them when they raised their hands. Intentional and unintentional microaggressions in the classroom that are directed toward students of color stigmatize their social identity in a new environment and cause them to feel frustrated, marginalized and excluded (Franklin, 1999; Jones, 2017; Pierce, 1988; Sue, Capodilupo & Holder, 2008). Microaggressions in the classroom often are not challenged, so it is important for faculty to become aware of their own biases regarding stereotypes and replace them with inclusive teaching practices (Samuels, 2014).

 Discrimination in the classroom negatively impacts academic performance. Steele (2010) conducted numerous experiments in University of Michigan classrooms and found that academic underperformance was caused by stereotype threat, social pressure that "othered" students with stigmatized identities. Stereotype threat is the fear of being judged and treated differently because of a stigmatized social identity regardless of individual ability. Discrimination is a serious problem in higher education because stereotype threat reduces working memory capacity (Schmader & Johns, 2003) and exposure to racial prejudice disrupts cognitive functioning (Salvatore & Shelton, 2007), both of which lead to suboptimal academic performance.

White educators in particular need diversity training because we cannot understand the burden of racism, having been born into a culture where Whiteness is framed as the norm and respected as the ideal human social identity in the best occupations, media images and history books (D'Angelo, 2018). For example, I experienced social rejection in school because I grew up in poverty (Hudson, 2016), but as an adult I have never been unable to rent an apartment or buy a house due to White privilege, which is like an invisible knapsack of social and structural advantages that give Whites power (e.g., McIntosh, 1989). Furthermore, when people of color tell White people about their discriminatory experiences, White people become uncomfortable talking about race (D'Angelo, 2018; Samuels, 2014). Because racism in our society is framed as a binary in which colorblind people are morally good and racist people are morally bad, we react defensively. D'Angelo (2018) calls this trend White fragility, and she observed responses among the White participants in her diversity training workshops that included "emotions such as anger, fear, guilt and behaviors such as argumentation, silence, and withdrawal from the stress-inducing situation" (p. 2).

Therefore, more diversity training programs are needed for faculty in higher education because socialization in a covertly racist system perpetuates cultural stereotypes, implicit bias causes discrimination in the classroom, and discrimination in the classroom adversely affects academic performance. In the next section, I will explain the methods that I used to gather and analyze data regarding the long-term faculty training program in which I was a participant-observer.

METHODS
For this study I used two types of ethnography. Ethnography is a qualitative method in which the researcher is immersed in and describes the environment that is being studied to provide in-depth understanding of context, community and culture (Blommaert & Jie, 2010). Rooted in anthropology, traditional ethnography requires comprehensive fieldwork that includes gathering a large amount of data and writing field notes that chronicle the researcher's observations, thoughts, and feelings in a specific setting. This research process is inductive science that uses empirical evidence to document "the researcher's own journey through knowledge" (Blommaert & Jie, 2010, p. 10).

In the presentation of my findings, I wanted to chronicle my firsthand experience so I could also critique cultural beliefs about racism and contribute to diversity scholarship that strives for social justice and a better life for all persons in society. This critical method is known as autoethnography (AE), which uses research and firsthand experience to connect the personal to the social and political (Ellis, 2004). Autoethnographers study social identity, which is a primary factor in diversity issues and challenges, and they use narrative to connect their personal experiences and insights to larger contexts. AE requires "deep and careful self-reflection" to study aspects of relationships between "self and society, the particular and the general, the personal and the political" (Adams, Holman Jones & Ellis, 2015, p. 2). This method thus enabled me to use reflexivity (Gilpin, 2011), awareness of my ethical responsibility as an educator, to explain the importance of reflecting on how teaching practices impact students who have marginalized social identities.

My theoretical framework for this study was framing theory, which is an effective framework for analyzing individual experience. A picture frame can be a metaphor for one's focus on a situation because the borders of the frame limit the content that is viewed and contextualize the situation (Bateson, 1956). Two individuals can see the same situation from a different perspective due to different levels of awareness, which Goffman (1959) called states of information. For example, a person who is not aware of a problem is likely to see the situation positively, whereas a person who is aware of that problem is likely to see the same situation negatively. Multiple frames can therefore exist based on differences in knowledge and individual experience (Goffman, 1974).

My experience in this study was that of a participant-observer, an active member of a group who participated in all of the group's activities so I could gain insight into the intellectual and emotional aspects of the training program experience (Lindlof & Taylor, 2011). Participant observation may be combined with other methods such as interviewing, and I conducted a face-to-face interview with both of the facilitators to gather general information about the program. The two facilitators were university employees and women of color. One woman is a professional diversity training expert, and the other woman is an ethnic studies professor. The group included 16 faculty members who voluntarily participated in the program. Most of them are White, but the group also included a few people of color. The participants were highly diverse in terms of teaching experience; they included lecturers, tenure-track assistant professors and tenured professors that teach a variety of courses and are members of 10 different academic departments in the university. After the program ended, I conducted an anonymous online survey that asked them to assess the effectiveness of this program.

Therefore, my data for this study included: (a) course materials that I received while participating in the training program; (b) notes that I wrote during each training session and meeting; (c) notes that I wrote about my observations, thoughts and feelings after each training session and meeting; (d) an interview with the two professional trainers who planned and facilitated the program; and (e) a survey of the other faculty members who had participated in the program.

Next, I will present my results in three sections. First, my narrative will provide experiential data and insight into what it

is like to participate in a comprehensive faculty diversity training program. Second, I will explain and assess the results of the training program on my individual teaching practices. Third, I will present the collective assessment of the program's effectiveness by the participants who responded to my survey.

RESULTS
Narrative Part I:
The Initial Training Period in June

The program began with three days of all-day meetings in a large conference room from 8:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. We participated in 12 training sessions that were approximately 60 to 90 minutes in length. Every day began with an ice-breaker activity, and each day the facilitators provided a breakfast buffet, a lunch buffet, and mid-morning and mid-afternoon breaks with snack buffets. The atmosphere was very relaxed and friendly during meals and breaks as we talked in small informal groups and became acquainted, but the atmosphere was very serious during the training sessions because we were learning about racism.

The first day began with self-introductions and then we participated in four training sessions that provided the context of the program and reasons why diversity training for faculty is needed: (a) Why Diversity? (the importance of diversity in higher education); (b) Language and Conceptual Frame (why teachers and students are afraid to talk about race); (c) Our Students (negative reports from students of color on our campus about their experiences here); and (d) Our Own Identities (the social identity wheel).

My worldview changed that day regarding how racism is collectively reproduced in society and how it is individually experienced by people of color. For example, we watched two videos of word association experiments. In the videos two Black children, first a little boy and then a little girl, were given two plastic female baby dolls. One doll had dark Black skin and the other doll had light Caucasian skin. Each child was asked: "Which baby is the *good* baby?" and "Which baby is the *bad* baby?" Both children chose the White doll as the good baby and the Black doll as the bad baby, which shows that they had already learned through socialization to associate white skin with good and black skin with bad. They gave the same answer, but their emotional reactions differed. The little boy smiled because he thought he had said the correct answer, but the little girl's facial expression indicated anger. After answering that question, she internalized the association and realized that society sees *her* as bad because she resembles the black doll. It was disturbing and sad because it clearly changed a child's self-image to a stigmatized social identity.

We also participated in an emotional activity that transformed my perception of the student experience for people of color. The facilitators had gathered a collection of quotes that students of color on our campus had written or said about their discriminatory experiences here. The sources for these comments were a campus climate survey, a public forum about racism on our campus, and an art exhibit in which students posted short personal narratives about their identity. These quotes were written on large posters that had been taped on three walls of the conference room. We were asked to walk around the room, read the posters, and write on each poster what we would say if the student had said the comment to us face to face. There were thirteen posters, and the comments or personal narrative on each

poster indicated that racism is a serious problem for students of color on our campus. Below are five excerpts from those stories:

> **Excerpt #1:** I don't know how to explain how frustrating it is to tell people at your school, 'I am experiencing racism every day,' and their response is, "Then leave."

> **Excerpt #2:** One White guy threatened me and called me a "fucking terrorist." Another one threw a glass bottle at my head.

> **Excerpt #3:** I could never have imagined the degree of racism that is not only present, but ENCOURAGED … I never knew that a Black woman could be walking to class, minding her business, and be spit on and called a N***** by another student. (This happened just a few days ago.)

> **Excerpt #4:** Do you know what it's like to be a minority at (university)? It's being told that race is not an issue in our community. It's being told your anger is unjustified … It's silence. It's discomfort. It's hell.

> **Excerpt #5:** I feel exhausted just from walking around, going to meetings, to class, to work. I didn't realize why until I talked to other POC here. It's because you have to put your "White friendly" mask on. You have to just take all these fucking microaggressions until you go home and lay in bed.

At the end of the first day of training, I went home, reflected on everything that I had learned, and wrote:

> I am torn between extreme anger and extreme sadness after an intensive day of diversity training at a university where most of the students are White privileged students and the few students of color are experiencing racism. It breaks my heart that my students of color may have been traumatized by racial slurs and microaggressions that stigmatized their social identity and negatively influenced their academic performance and health and well-being after they worked so hard for years to get to this prestigious university.

That was my moment of reflexivity (Gilpin, 2011) when I felt a strong sense of social responsibility. I realized that racism is my problem, not someone else's problem, because it negatively affects my students of color on my campus. They are experiencing racism on campus, but when they tell White people about the problem, they encounter defensive intolerance to racial stress ("then leave") that is characteristic of White fragility (D'Angelo, 2018). They are being told that "race is not an issue in our community," which is the myth of colorblindness (Bonilla-Silva, 2009). They are experiencing higher levels of stress due to implicit bias and microaggressions (Sue, 2010) that make it harder for them to succeed academically (Steele, 2010). Because of stereotype threat (Steele, 2010), they feel like they have to change themselves to blend in ("you have to put your 'White friendly' mask on"). Some of them are experiencing verbal abuse ("called me a fucking terrorist" and "called a N*****"), threats ("One White guy threatened me") and physical violence ("threw a glass bottle at my head"). New information that I learned that day changed my state of information (Goffman, 1959), my level of awareness of a situation, and thereby changed the frame (context) through which I saw race relations on my campus (Bateson, 1956). My worldview expanded from a limited focus on the firsthand experiences of a privileged White individual to a widened picture frame that included testimonies

from students of color who have experienced discrimination. As an educator, I committed myself to do everything I could to help solve this problem.

On the second day, we participated in four training sessions about race: (a) Power Relations (why microaggressions are harmful, the politics of so-called reverse racism, and racism as a spectrum on an implicit to explicit bias continuum); (b) Colorblindness/Whiteness (invisibility as power); (c) White Privilege (the myth of meritocracy and how U.S. laws gave economic advantages to White people); and (d) Courageous Conversations about Race (race consciousness and teaching strategies for talking about race in the classroom).

During these sessions we learned the history of Whiteness and racial oppression in the United States and how it was (and continues to be) motivated by socioeconomics; racism is a structural, institutional, systemic method of keeping White people affluent. Historically, U.S. laws such as the G.I. Bill and the Homestead Act gave economic opportunities to White people only and enabled White Americans to succeed financially. We saw a mobility graph (Singleton, 2015) that shows the challenges people of color, women, and poor people face in terms of rights (what they can and can't do), resources (limited access to housing, education, and careers), representation (seeing people who look like you in media and powerful positions), and respect from society as a whole.

My notes about that day reflected on a documentary that we watched about a young Black married couple that could not buy a new house in the suburbs because of overt systemic racism. The man was a veteran of the U.S. military, so he was entitled to that military benefit, a new house with no down payment. When he and his wife met the real estate broker who was selling the new houses, however, the broker candidly told them that the management company would not let him sell a house to them because they were Black. Reflecting on that story, I wrote: "That story was heartbreaking and really shows that racism is a system of inequality that is institutional."

The agenda for the third day included four training sessions about teaching behaviors and strategies: (a) Teaching Inclusively (10 steps for making your classroom more inclusive); (b) Barriers and Complicating Factors (teaching strategies that prevent students with marginalized identities from being "othered" in class activities); (c) Diversity and Inclusion in Higher Ed Classrooms: Implicit Bias (how confirmation bias negatively affects teaching expectations and behaviors); and (d) Inclusive Instruction Techniques (a brainstorming session for discussing new ideas for our classes in small groups). The most salient information that I learned that day was about implicit bias in the classroom. It was very upsetting to learn that teachers discriminate racially by giving more attention and encouragement to and having higher expectations for students that they think are smarter (based on race), and as I explained in my literature review, those types of teacher behavior negatively influence academic performance.

The fourth day of the initial training period was a writing day. Working from our home offices, we each created and submitted two required documents to the facilitators via our online educational platform. First, we wrote a new diversity statement for our fall syllabus and many of us also created a one-page or two-page statement about our inclusive teaching philosophy and practices. Second, we each created an "Inclusive Instruction Technique" (IIT), a new lesson plan for a course that we teach, based on or inspired

by one of the new teaching strategies that we had learned during the first three days. The online learning platform enabled everyone to open and read everyone else's documents, so we could compare our diversity statements and new teaching ideas with those that had been created by other faculty in our cohort.

Narrative Part II:
The Summer Assignments

The course materials that all participants received during the initial training period included a book and a large white binder that was filled with 10 scholarly articles about diversity and inclusion in the classroom. We were asked to read these materials before the next event, which was the workshop in late August. The book was *The Culturally Inclusive Educator: Preparing for a Multicultural World* (Samuels, 2014), and it was an excellent choice for faculty diversity training because it directly addresses diversity in higher education. Diversity training is an ongoing process of awareness and growth that is never complete, Samuels argues. You will still have implicit bias because it is so deeply ingrained, but you can use your mistakes to improve your teaching practices. Hence, one diversity workshop is not enough training for faculty, and online training modules are not a realistic solution because faculty hate taking them.

While reading the book, I reflected on my teaching behavior and took notes regarding teaching strategies that she recommends. For example, Samuels gives practical advice for responding when a student says a comment that is racist or sexist during class. First, calmly respond with a question such as "Why do you think some people think that?" (Samuels, 2014, p. 99). Next, say: "That makes me uncomfortable." Making the teacher uncomfortable is obviously unacceptable, so that frames the comment as unacceptable. Lastly, "refer to stereotypes and debunk them." Instead of ignoring microaggressions, educators can use this three-step process to challenge derogatory jokes and comments that typically go unchallenged (Samuels, 2014).

We also participated in an online writing workshop during the rest of the summer. First, we were required to give peer feedback to another member of the cohort on that participant's diversity statement and inclusive instruction technique. Second, we revised those two documents and resubmitted them. Third, the facilitators gave us constructive criticism on those two documents and asked us to revise and resubmit them again. In addition, we were required to submit a draft of our revised fall syllabus for the course that we were redesigning to be more inclusive.

Narrative Part III:
The Course Design Workshop in August

When we returned to the conference room at the end of the summer, I felt a strong sense of community with the facilitators and the other 15 participants. It was a happy reunion, and it was great to talk face-to-face instead of only posting comments online on our educational platform. We reconvened with the two facilitators in the same conference room for two days from 8:30 a.m. until 4:00 p.m. during the last week of August for a hands-on workshop that helped us prepare for our fall classes. The daily schedule was the same as the events during the first week in June, with breakfast, lunch, snacks and beverages provided.

We began the first day by reflecting on the week in June and the summer activities, and then we participated in a Diversity and Inclusion Challenges Activity in which we shared our positive and

negative feelings about applying what we had learned in the classroom. Each teacher expressed a feeling of hope or excitement and a challenge or fear of pushback/resistance that we might encounter in the classroom. We discussed the challenges and fears, first in small groups and then in a large group discussion, and the facilitators gave us practical suggestions for managing that type of conflict. We all engaged in problem-solving and learned from one another's ideas. There was an atmosphere of camaraderie; even though we were experiencing fears and facing challenges, we were doing it together, so we were not alone in our efforts.

The first day of the course design workshop also included three other workshop sessions: (a) Your First Day Discussion (a small groups activity in which each faculty member planned a short speech for the first day of class that would make all students feel welcome); (b) Is This Making a Difference? (how to assess the effectiveness of inclusive teaching practices); and (c) Diversity Learning Objectives and Your Course Learning Objectives (how to align both types of objectives as we plan resources, learning activities and assessment methods).

On the second day, we each gave a short presentation in which we practiced the new inclusive instruction technique (teaching idea) that we had created during the summer and then received constructive feedback from the group on ways to make it better. These presentations were informal and the participants were asked to take only 10 minutes, but some lasted longer. Most of the participants prepared a handout for the group, and some of the handouts required an in-class activity. The presentations gave us the opportunity to obtain useful feedback from our peers before trying our new ideas in the classroom. I learned a lot of great teaching ideas and truly appreciated the group's feedback on my teaching idea.

Narrative Part IV:
The Fall Meetings

Three one-hour meetings were held during the fall term when we were trying our new teaching ideas in the classroom. One at a time, we reported on and assessed our new teaching strategies. These meetings were productive and enjoyable because the atmosphere was like a support group; we were supporting one another's diversity and inclusion efforts in the classroom by listening and offering suggestions. Sharing the success of our new teaching ideas created a positive, motivational atmosphere and hope for the future. I also attended the social event in December, which was a relaxing and fun open house-style event that was held in a local restaurant near the university. It felt like a celebration, so it was a happy way to say goodbye.

Individual Assessment of Effects on
Teaching Practices

Beginning in the fall term, I implemented seven changes to my teaching practices to make my classrooms more inclusive:

TIDE Documents: The new diversity paragraph on my syllabus and my inclusive instruction technique both created awareness of and sensitivity to the diversity of social identities within my public speaking classrooms. During the first class while I was explaining the syllabus, I read the diversity statement aloud in a serious tone of voice, and no one said anything discriminatory throughout the fall term. My inclusive instruction technique, the addition of the social identity wheel during my audience lesson plan, also accomplished its purpose, which was to illustrate the complexity of social identities, and my students also seemed to enjoy doing it. I didn't collect the worksheet to protect their privacy, but some of them showed their worksheet to another student in an impromptu pair-and-share activity that I didn't expect. The results of both of the required teaching ideas for TIDE were therefore better than anticipated.

Introductions: I deleted two categories, academic rank and where are you from, from self-introductions on the first day of class. Those are aspects of social identity that students cannot control, and I realized that revealing that personal information publicly would marginalize first-year students (because first-year students have lower social status), students from low-income cities, and international and immigrant students (McIntosh, 1989). Now introductions proceed faster and no one looks embarrassed while introducing themselves. As a result, the introductions have a lighter atmosphere.

Diverse Videos: I made my lesson plans more representationally diverse by adding videos that profile people of color. Previously I didn't notice that most of the videos I showed profiled White males, but the TIDE program made me aware that I was perpetuating Whiteness as the default for representation in society (D'Angelo, 2018). Now my students see positive examples of diversity as they watch a variety of public speakers who have different social identities. Video clips are an effective teaching strategy for analyzing course concepts in popular culture, and showing representationally diverse videos challenges the assumption that Whiteness is the norm in popular culture (Martin & Davis, 2001).

Gender Roles: My wedding toast workshop is now more inclusive because I changed my language to reflect current social trends in marriage. As I explain the worksheet that I developed for writing a wedding toast speech, instead of saying, "the bride and groom," I say, "the bride and groom, or bride and bride, or groom and groom." A few students always smile after I say that, which I interpret as a sign of appreciation for not assuming that all couples are heterosexual. In addition, when they presented wedding toast speeches that they had written during class, one or two students gave speeches they had written for a gay or lesbian couple, and those speeches received the same enthusiastic applause as the speeches for heterosexual couples.

Current Events: I began providing opportunities for discussions about current events by relating them to course content. For example, after a mass shooting that was in the national news, I added a class discussion about the gun control debate to my lesson plan on argumentation. Using logic and reasoning, my students engaged in continuous counterargument. I wrote their arguments on the board in two columns so they could see a real-life example of argumentation in society. This enabled them to contribute to discourse in society about a social problem, see the complexity of argumentation that includes two strong arguments for opposing viewpoints, and see the diversity of values, attitudes and beliefs in society.

Course Materials: I redesigned my course materials for my public speaking class so they would be more accessible and inclusive for all of my undergraduate students. Now I prepare a course packet that is sold in the university bookstore for only $9. It is affordable for all students regardless of their socioeconomic status, and it includes fill-in-the-blank notes for all of my lectures. This enables all of my students to keep up with note-taking, especially those who have learning disabilities and/or speak

English as a second language. Last December when I conducted my usual end-of-term student survey, I asked each student, "What was your favorite part of this course?" The majority of students in one of my classes voted for the course packet. That is another example of an inclusive teaching strategy that turned out better than expected.

After my new teaching strategies were successful in the classroom, I surveyed the other participants to find out if they felt that their time and efforts to complete the training program had been worthwhile.

Group Assessment of Program Effectiveness

To assess the overall impact of the program, I conducted an anonymous online survey. Eleven of the 15 faculty responded to my survey, which included the following questions:

1. TIDE participants teach different subjects and courses. Did you learn specific teaching strategies for making the courses that you teach more inclusive? Results: 100% Yes
2. In addition to the new diversity statement on your syllabi and the required IIT, have you adopted any other teaching strategies that you learned in the TIDE program to enhance inclusion and support diversity in your classrooms? Results: 73% Yes, 27 % No
3. After participating in the TIDE program, do you feel better able to moderate class discussions about difficult topics such as racism? Results: 91% Yes, 9 % No
4. Overall, would you assess your experience as a TIDE 2018 participant as having a lasting impact on your teaching that is beneficial? Results: 91% Yes, 9% No
5. Have you recommended the TIDE program to other faculty at this university? Results: 91% Yes, 9% No
6. Would you recommend the TIDE program as a model for providing diversity training to faculty in other universities? Results: 100% Yes

Therefore, the overwhelming majority of the participants that responded to my survey also felt that the program had a lasting beneficial effect on their teaching practices (91%), learned specific teaching strategies for making their courses more inclusive (100%), and feel better able to moderate class discussions about difficult topics such as racism (91%).

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Other studies have evaluated diversity training programs for faculty (Campbell-Whatley et al., 2016; Clark, 2005; Goldstein Hode et al., 2018; Mayo & Larke, 2010; Potthoff et al., 2001; Waite & Colvin, 2018), but this study also used narrative as a window into a firsthand participant experience (RQ#1). My participation in this comprehensive faculty diversity training program was a transformative experience. Transformative learning is a process that occurs when the learner critically rethinks basic cultural assumptions and replaces them with alternative cultural assumptions that altogether form a new worldview (Jackson, 2008). Being a participant in the TIDE program was transformative because afterward I had (and still have) a different worldview of my campus, society at large, and my teaching responsibilities and practices. Previously I assumed that discrimination was not my problem or concern because I am White; now I know that it is a problem and a concern for all educators because overt and subtle incidents are common on college campuses. The program changed my

worldview by expanding my state of information, which changed the context through which I saw the situation (Bateson, 1956; Goffman, 1959).

Like the faculty diversity training program in the Rogers-Sirin and Sirin (2009) study, the TIDE program: (a) increased my awareness of the degree and depth of discrimination on my campus and in society; (b) provided evidence regarding how discrimination negatively impacts the well-being, health and academic performance of college students who have marginalized identities; and (c) made me rethink my role as an educator. I was challenged to accept social responsibility for changing how I think, talk and teach to prevent students who have marginalized identities from feeling "othered" in my classroom, and I learned specific teaching strategies that help me make progress toward accomplishing the overall objective of making my classroom more inclusive. My experience also was transformative because it was a voluntary diversity training program. Because I was willing and motivated to learn, trainee readiness increased the effectiveness of the training outcomes (Chung, 2013).

In terms of lasting positive benefits on teaching practices (RQ#2), this study has shown that a comprehensive diversity training program is more effective than a workshop that spans less than one day (Bezrukova et al., 2016; Samuels, 2014). Whereas two-hour workshops only include learning, this five-month program included learning, reflection and application. Instead of learning a small amount of general information and forgetting everything soon afterward, which is typical in the aftermath of most diversity training workshops (Dobbin & Kalev, 2016), we learned a considerable amount of comprehensive information and we were held accountable for applying what we learned. In order to receive the stipend, we had to write the required assignments, give writing peer feedback to another participant, submit the revised documents during the summer writing workshop before or on each assignment deadline and submit them in an online educational platform that all of the other participants could read. Knowing that the other faculty could read my documents motivated me to devote a serious amount of time and effort to each assignment. It also required us to apply what we learned in one of the specific courses that we taught during the next academic term. If the facilitators had not structured the program with that level of academic rigor, the benefits to my teaching practices would not have been the same.

Feedback from my students indicates that participating in the program improved my teaching practices. My instructor evaluation ratings escalated, and my end-of-term evaluations included positive comments regarding the atmosphere in my classroom. For example, one student wrote that I "make the environment feel safe, comfortable and welcoming." These results thus support studies that reported positive outcomes; students who evaluated professors that had completed a comprehensive diversity training program said that their classroom was a safe and comfortable space for all students (Mayo & Larke, 2010; Rossett & Bickham, 1994). Since the goals of diversity training programs include inclusion and transformation, I concluded that the TIDE program was an effective diversity training program. Because evaluations of diversity training should not be self-reports from a single source (Bezrukova, Jehn & Spell, 2012), I also surveyed the other faculty in my cohort and the vast majority of them evaluated it as successful. This study therefore contributes to the body of research that includes positive peer evaluations of diversity training programs

for faculty (Booker et al., 2016; Campbell-Whatley et al., 2016; Waite & Colvin, 2018).

Lastly, when the topic of diversity training arises in higher education settings, some faculty may think that they don't need diversity training because they teach in a predominantly White institution. I teach in a predominantly White institution, but I needed diversity training to expand my awareness regarding diversity and inclusion. In the TIDE program, I learned that diversity isn't just about race and ethnicity; it includes socioeconomic status, gender, sexual orientation, age, religion, mental or physical illness, and disability. Because faculty have a responsibility to promote a positive environment for all students (Torres et al., 2003), colleges and universities have an "ethical imperative" to offer diversity training to their faculty (Goldstein Hode et al., 2017, p. 347). We live in a multicultural world, and we serve a multicultural population (Burnell & Schnackenberg, 2015; Jones et al., 2013; Rogers-Sirin & Sirin, 2015). All faculty, even those at predominantly White institutions, need diversity training so they will be able to model inclusive language and behavior and will be prepared to handle sensitive discussions about diversity issues that arise in the classroom (Waite & Colvin, 2018).

REFERENCES

Adams, T. E., Holman Jones, S., & Ellis, C. (2015). *Autoethnography: Understanding qualitative research*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Antonio, A. L. (2004). The influence of friendship groups on intellectual self-confidence and educational aspirations in college. *The Journal of Higher Education, 75*(4), 446-471. doi: 10.1353/jhe.2004.0019

Astin, A. W. (1993). *What matters in college? Four critical years revisited*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Bateson, G. (1956). The message this is play. In B. Schaffner (Ed.), *Group processes: Transactions of the second conference* (pp. 145-242). New York, NY: Josiah Macy Jr. Foundation.

Bennett, L. M., McIntosh, E., & Henson, F. O. (2017). African American college students and racial microaggressions: Assumptions of criminality. *The Journal of Psychology, 5*(2), 14-20. doi: 10.15640/jpbs.v5n2a2

Bezrukova, K., Jehn, K. A., & Spell, C. S. (2012). Reviewing diversity training: Where we have been and where we should go. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 11*(2), 207-227. doi:10.5465/amle.2008.0090

Bezrukova, K., Spell, C., Perry, J., & Jehn, K. (2016). A meta-analytical integration of over 40 years of research on diversity training evaluation. *Psychological Bulletin, 142*(11), 1227-1274. doi: 10.1037/bul0000067

Blommaert, J., & Jie, D. (2010). *Ethnographic fieldwork: A beginner's guide*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Bonilla-Silva, E. (2009). Racism without "racists." In A. Ferber, C. M. Jimenenz, A. O'Reilly Herrera & D. R. Samuels (Eds.), *The matrix reader: Examining the dynamics of oppression and privilege* (pp. 176-181). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Booker, K., Merriweather, L., & Campbell-Whatley, G. (2016). The effects of diversity training on faculty and students' classroom experiences. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 10*(1), 1-7. doi: 10.20429/ijsotl.2016.100103

Boysen, G. A., & Vogel, D. L. (2009). Bias in the classroom: Types, frequencies, and responses. *Teaching of Psychology, 36*(1), 12-17. doi: 10.1080/00986280802529038

Boysen, G. A., Vogel, D. L., Cope, M. A., & Hubbard, A. (2009). Incidents of bias in college classrooms: Instructor and student perceptions. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 2*(4), 219-231. doi: 10.1037/a0017538

Boysen, G. (2012). Teacher and student perceptions of microaggressions in college classrooms. *College Teaching, 60*(3), 122-129. doi: 10.1080/87567555.2012.654831

Burnell, B. A., & Schnackenberg, H. (2015). *The ethics of cultural competence in higher education*. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.

Campbell-Whatley, G. D., Merriweather, L., Lee, J. A., & Toms, O. (2016). Evaluation of diversity and multicultural integration training in higher education. *Journal of Applied Educational and Policy Research, 2*(2), 1-14.

Caplan, P. J., & Ford, J. C. (2014). The voices of diversity: What students of diverse races/ethnicities and both sexes tell us about their college experiences and their perceptions about their institutions' progress toward diversity. *APORIA, 6*(3), 30-69. doi: 10.18192/aporia.v6i4.2828

Chang, M. J. (1999). Does racial diversity matter? The educational impact of a racially diverse undergraduate population. *Journal of College Student Development, 40*(4), 377-395.

Cho, S. (2009). Post-racialism. *Iowa Law Review, 94*(5), 1589-1649.

Chrobot-Mason, D., & Quinones, M.A. (2002). Training for a diverse workplace. In K. Kraiger (Ed.), *Creating, implementing and managing effective training and development* (pp. 117-159). San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.

Chung, Y. (2013). Trainee readiness for diversity training. *Journal of Diversity Management (Online)*. Retrieved from http://clutejournals.com/index.php/JDM

Clark, C. (2005). Diversity initiatives in higher education: Intergroup dialogue as pedagogy acrossthe curriculum. *Multicultural Education, 12*(3), 51-61.

D'Angelo, R. (2018). *White fragility: Why it's so hard for White people to talk about racism*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Dobbin, F. & Kaley, A. (July-August, 2016). Why diversity programs fail. *Harvard Business Review*. Retrieved from https://hbr.org/2016/07/why-diversity-programs-fail

Ellis, C. (2004). *The ethnographic I: A methodological novel about autoethnography*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

Ferber, A. (2007). Whiteness studies and the erasure of gender. *Sociology Compass, 1*(1), 265-282. doi: 10.1111/j.1751-9020.2007.00014.x

Ford, K.A. (2011). Race, gender, and bodily (mis)recognitions: Women of color faculty experiences with White students in the college classroom. *The Journal of Higher Education, 82*(4), 444-478. doi: 10.1353/jhe.2011.0026

Forman, T.A., & Lewis, A. E. (2015). Beyond prejudice? Young whites' racial attitudes in post–civil rights America, 1976 to 2000. *American Behavioral Scientist, 59*(11), 1394-1428. doi: 10.1177/0002764215588811

Franklin, A. J. (1999). Invisibility syndrome and racial identity development in psychotherapy and counseling African American men. *The Counseling Psychologist, 27*, 761-793. doi: 10.1177/0011000099276002

Gallagher, C. (2009). Color-blinded America or how the media and politics have made racism and racial inequality yesterday's social problem. In A. Ferber, C. M. Jimenenz, A. O'Reilly Herrera & D. R. Samuels (Eds.), *The matrix reader: Examining the dynamics of oppression and privilege* (pp. 548-551). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Gilpin, L. S. (2011). Scholarship of teaching and learning trades. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 5*(2). doi: 10.20429/ijsotl.2011.050204

Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. Garden City, NY: Anchor.

Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Goldstein Hode, M., Behm-Morawitz, E., and Hays, A. (2018). Testing the effectiveness of an online diversity course for faculty and staff. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 11*(3), 347-365. doi: 10.1037/dhe0000063

Harwood, S. A., Huntt, M. B., Mendenhall, R., & Lewis, J.A. (2012). Racial microaggressions in the residence halls: Experiences of students of color at a predominantly White university. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 5(3), 159-173. doi: 10.1037/a0028956

Hudson, N. (2016). The trauma of poverty as social identity. *Journal of Loss and Trauma, 21*(2), 111-123. doi: 10.1080/15325024.2014.965979

Jackson, M. (2008). *Transformative learning for a new worldview: Learning to think differently* (1st Ed.). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Jones, C. L. (2017). Microaggression in the college environment: Narratives of African American students at a predominantly White institution. Masters Theses. Retrieved from https://thekeep.eiu.edu/theses/2747

Jones, K. P., King, E. B., Nelson, J., Geller, D. S., & Bowes-Sperry, L. (2013). Beyond the business case: An ethical perspective of diversity training. *Human Resource Management, 52*(1), 55-74. doi: 10.1002/hrm.21517

Lee, C. N., & Hopson, M. (2019). Disrupting postracial discourse: Black millennials' response to postracial ideology and the continued impact of racial microaggressions on college campuses. *Southern Communication Journal, 84*(2), 127-139. doi: 10.1080/1041794X.2018.1517186

Lindlof, T. R. & Taylor, B. C. (2011). *Qualitative communication research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Marcus, A., Mullins, L. C., Brackett, K. P., Tang, Z., Allen, A. M., & Pruett, D.W. (2003). Perceptions of racism on campus. *College Student Journal, 37*(4), 611-626.

Martin, J. N. & Davis, O. I. (2001). Conceptual foundations for teaching about Whiteness in intercultural communication courses. *Communication Education, 50*(4), 298-313. doi: 10.1080/03634520109379257

Mayo, S., & Larke, P. J. (2010). Multicultural education transformation in higher education: Getting faculty to "buy in." *Journal of Case Studies in Education*, 1-9.

McCauley, C., Wright, M. & Harris, M. E. (2000). Diversity workshops on campus: A survey of current practice at U.S. colleges and universities. *College Student Journal, 34*(1), 100-114.

McIntosh, P. (1989, July/August). White privilege: Unpacking the invisible knapsack. *Peace and Freedom Magazine*, 10-12.

Minikel-Lacocque, J. (2013). Racism, college, and the power of words: Racial microaggressions reconsidered. *American Educational Research Journal, 50*(3), 432–465. doi: 10.3102/0002831212468048

Nadal, K. (2011). The racial and ethnic microaggressions scale (REMS): Construction, reliability, and validity. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 58*(4), 470-480. doi: 10.1037/a0025193

Noe, R. (2010). *Employee training and development* (5th Ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.

Norton, M. I. & Sommers, S. R. (2011). Whites see racism as a zero-sum game that they are now losing. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 6*(3), 215-218. doi: 10.1177/1745691611406922

Pendry, L., Driscoll, D., & Field, S. (2007). Diversity training: Putting theory into practice. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 80*(1), 27-50. doi: 10.1348/096317906X118397

Pierce, C. M. (1988). Stress in the workplace. In A. F. Conor-Edwards & J. Spurlock (Eds.), *Black families in crisis: The middle class* (pp. 27-34). New York, NY: Brunner/Mazel.

Potthoff, D., Dinsmore, J.A., & Moore, T. J. (2001). The diversity cohort: A professional development program for college faculty. *Teacher Educator, 37*(2), 145-156. doi: 10.1080/08878730109555288

Rogers-Sirin, L., & Sirin, S. R. (2009). Cultural competence as an ethical requirement: Introducing a new educational model. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 2*(1), 19-29. doi: 10.1037/a0013762

Rossett, A., & Bickham, T. (1994). Diversity training: Hope, faith and cynicism. *Training, 31*(1), 40-46.

Salvatore, J., & Shelton, J. N. (2007). Cognitive costs of exposure to racial prejudice. *Psychological Science, 18*(9), 810–815. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9280.2007.01984.x

Samuels, D. R. (2014). *The culturally inclusive educator: Preparing for a multicultural world.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Schmader, T., & Johns, M. (2003). Converging evidence that stereotype threat reduces working memory capacity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 85*(3), 440-452. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.85.3.440

Singleton, G. E. (2015). *Courageous conversations about race: A field guide for achieving equity in schools.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Solorzano, D., Ceja, M. & Yosso, T. (2000). Critical race theory, racial microaggressions, and campus racial climate: The experiences of African American college students. *Journal of Negro Education, 69*, 60-73.

Steele, C. M. (2010). *Whistling Vivaldi: How stereotypes affect us and what we can do.* New York, NY: W. W. Norton and Company.

Sue, D. W., Capodilupo, C. M. & Holder, A. M. B. (2008). Racial microaggressions in the life experience of black Americans. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 39*(3), 329-336. doi: 10.1037/0735-7028.39.3.329

Sue, D. W., Capodilupo, C. M., Torino, G. C., Bucceri, J. M., Holder, A. M., Nadal, K. L. & Esquilin, M. (2007). Racial microaggressions in everyday life: Implications for clinical practice. *American Psychologist, 62*(4), 271-286. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.62.4.271

Sue, D. W., Lin, A. I., Torino, G. C., Capodilupo, C. M., & Rivera, D. P. (2009). Racial microaggressions and difficult dialogues on race in the classroom. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology, 15*(2), 183-190. doi: 10.1037/a0014191

Sue, D. W. (2010). *Microaggressions in everyday life: Race, gender, and sexual orientation.* Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Torres, V., Howard-Hamilton, M. F., & Cooper, D. L. (2003). *Identity development of diverse populations: Implications for teaching and administration in higher education.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Waite, B. & Colvin, J. (2018). Creating and assessing faculty training on global, intercultural, and inclusive practices. *International Journal of Teacher Education and Professional Development, 1*(2), 72-86. doi: 10.4018/IJTEPD.2018070105