Message from the Chair

by Kristi Lonardo Clemens

Greeting CSJE Members!

By the time you read this, the end of our semester will be clearly in sight! I hope that your work so far this semester has been productive, fulfilling, and rejuvenating.

This semester has proven to be a busy one for the Commission. I am sure you are aware of our elections to the Directorate Body for the Class of 2008! I do want to take the opportunity now to apologize for multiple emails about this topic—there was a technical glitch at the ACPA International Office. I assure you that I do know how to use email, and hopefully it will not happen again! Our election will begin on December 18th, and you will receive additional information about the candidates closer to that time. Additionally, we will have elections for the Class of 2009 in late January. We recognize that these are close together, but we are still hopeful for a good voter turnout as well as some great candidates. Being a Directorate Body member is a great opportunity to learn more about ACPA and feel more connected—it’s Astin at work!

Speaking of elections, I would be remiss if I did not take this opportunity to comment on our national election. Regardless of your political affiliation, I think that all of us in the social justice-minded community have to acknowledge the historic decisions that....continued on page 2
This past June, ACPA’s Commission for Social Justice Educators hosted the first Institute for Social Justice Ally Development in Des Moines, Iowa. The Institute was based on the concepts in the Developing Social Justice Allies book. Authors Nancy Evans, Ellen Broido, and Robert Reason served as faculty for the Institute as well as Penny Rice joining them in place of Tracy Davis who was unable to join us in Des Moines. Participants from all over the country came to Des Moines to reflect, explore, and grow as social justice allies, and also to discuss strategies on how to foster student learning as social justice allies. The curriculum focused on overarching concepts of social justice theory, social group identity, ally identity development, and myths of social justice education, with specific sessions on being an ally working against racism, sexism, homophobia, and ableism. Participants also spent time in small groups related to their functional area work in residence life, student activities, faculty, and upper-level administrative roles to examine how to apply the concepts and strategies on their own campuses. It was a wonderful experience to connect with colleagues deeply invested in these issues and committed to developing students as well as themselves to work toward more just and equitable societies. Special thanks to Brian Arao from the Commission and Vernon Wall from ACPA who helped make the long term goal of hosting this Institute a reality.

Keith Edwards, is the former Chair of the Commission for Social Justice Educators and serves as the Director of Campus Life at Macalester College.
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Americans came to earlier this month. With the successful election of the first African-American to the office of the President, we must take the time to celebrate the accomplishment and the excitement that surrounds this moment. We must also acknowledge the many states that passed laws that prohibit same-sex marriage or adoption, most notably Proposition 8 in California.

Paulo Freire wrote, “Nor can dialogue consist without hope…. Hopelessness is a form of silence, of denying the world and fleeing from it…. As long as I fight, I am moved by hope; and if I fight with hope, then I can wait.” As we enter a new legal era of definition and exclusion, we must remember to dialogue, but do so without silencing others and without allowing ourselves to be silenced. Some of the first anecdotal and official reports I heard from California after Election Day blamed people of color, women, and religious communities for passing the proposition. While the financial contributions from some of these communities cannot be denied, we must tread carefully and avoid passing the blame around. Blame only perpetuates hopelessness; with fighting and hope, there can be change. We have seen that we are capable of great change in this country, and let us hope that we will continue down that path.

However, we can’t allow ourselves to believe that the work is done just because we have a Black president-elect. For me, it is an important reminder to us why our work is so important. Social justice educators are often the ones “fighting with hope,” either for ourselves or for communities to which we are allies. We must remember that we have an obligation and an opportunity to cultivate environments of acceptance, equity, and learning on our campuses. I urge you to continue to educate yourselves on how to reach more students and have authentic dialogue. Use this Commission as a learning lab and discussion space for your own growth and dialogue - it is an excellent opportunity to learn from colleagues who have had similar experiences and can be of great support.

I thank you all for your spirit, determination, and hard work in each of your corners of the world. Best,

Kristi

Kristi Lonardo Clemens is the Chair of the Commission for Social Justice Educators and an Assistant Director of Residential Education at New York University.
Trip down *Avenue Q* Offers Opportunities for Reflection

*by Adrianna Guram*

A viewing of the touring production of the musical *Avenue Q* anchored a daylong diversity and social justice seminar in October for first-year students at the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Reviewers of *Avenue Q* have regarded the musical as a fun and thought-provoking exploration of contemporary issues, including ones centered on race, identity, and social justice. The show has been playing on Broadway for more than five years and owes much of its inspiration to the landmark children’s program *Sesame Street* - most of the characters in the production are puppets which are operated onstage by actors.

Despite the childhood-rooted influences for *Avenue Q*, its characters are decidedly adult, generally in their 20s or 30s, discussing unequivocally mature themes. Numbers from the show include “Everyone's a Little Bit Racist,” “If You Were Gay,” and “The Internet Is for Porn.”

One of the major skills we aim to teach students through co-curricular experiences is critical thinking. So, although, some songs in the show are very explicit in their message, we wanted to engage students with the question, “How do you watch performance art, hear a message, and then really critically think about what it all means to you?”

The viewing of *Avenue Q* was just one part of the overall seminar called the Q-Jima Diversity Experience, which originated at New York University. *Q-Jima* takes its form from the Swahili word *ujima* (oooh-GEE-mah), which means “collective work and responsibility.” Brian Arao and Eric Bross from NYU at the time developed this program to help first-year students explore the concept of identity and reflect on themselves and the experiences of people with social identities different from their own. Unlike in New York, where the majority of students were aware of *Avenue Q*, which won the Tony Award for Best Musical in 2004, a number of UW-Madison students knew little about the show.

The program began at 9 a.m. and included group and individual activities that delved into aspects of social justice, including race, sexual orientation, and socioeconomic status. Everyone then attended the matinee showing of *Avenue Q*. The event concluded with a session that helped students process and make meaning of the entire experience. The program culminated in a call to action for students to think about, “What's the next step?” Some students went through the daylong experience and left able to identify steps they were going to take to explore their own identity. Others had their interests piqued and left really wanting to know what else existed at UW or in Madison that could also help them continue to learn about people different from themselves and social justice issues.

*Adrianna Guram is the Coordinator of First-Year Programs in the Center for the First-Year Experience at UW-Madison.*
In the five decades since the Brown v. Board of Education Topeka, Kansas Court decision that de-segregated the school systems, we have seen re-segregation of U.S. schools that - as Kozol (1991; also 2005) observes - yield ‘savage inequalities’ in educational outcomes. Existing practices contribute to the maintenance of these ‘savage inequalities’ in access to and persistence in college.

Privilege, according to McIntosh, “exists when one group has something of value that is denied to others simply because of the groups [social identity categories] they belong to, rather than because of anything they’ve done or failed to do” (Johnson, 2001, p. 23). The socially constructed system of privilege, i.e. white privilege, thus sets forth normative assumptions about what is quality or excellence that have implications for individuals’ participation in particular arenas. Consider, for instance, procedures for admission that frequently use SAT scores as criteria to determine whether one is eligible for membership in a given college community, even in light of debate (and evidence) of racial-bias in SAT testing (Young, 2003). Johnson is quick to add, however, an important clarification: individuals (and consequently organizational practice) are not typically engaged in intentional exclusion or discrimination; rather, the insidiousness of privilege is that one benefits without doing anything. Higher education is promoted as attainable to everyone; however, Fitzgerald (2003) observes that there are two conditions necessary in order for a student to attend college: “a student must be qualified to attend the institution to which she or he aspires and she or he must be able to afford to enroll” (p. 4). To realize this latter condition, students apply for financial aid. While all students may apply, the need for financial aid is especially great for low-income students, who are also often racial minorities. Freeman (1997), in her conversations with African American high-school students concerning access to higher education, found it was a mix of both economic and psychological concerns that served as barriers for African American high-school students in attending college, and most notably, the biggest barrier students perceived was their ability to be able to pay the short-term cost of attendance. In addition, students were concerned that the long term economic benefits of receiving a college degree would not outweigh the short-term cost of attendance (Freeman, 1997).

St. John, Paulsen, and Carter (2005), in their study of the role of the cost of college and availability of financial aid in promoting post secondary opportunities for diverse groups, found “African Americans were highly sensitive to finances in their college choices and in their persistence decisions” (p. 564). St. John et al. (2005) observe, even in light of African Americans’ greater financial need and eligibility for more aid, they were still only able to afford to attend less expensive colleges (also Perna, 2007). Long and Riley (2007) echo this point, adding that the replacement of need-based aid with merit-based aid, loans, and educational tax breaks are leaving low-income students and racial minorities with a greater likelihood to still have financial “need” even after being given all available aid. Further, Hauptman (2005) observes that high income families are qualifying for need-based aid when they attend a higher cost institution: “federal, state, and institutional need-based aid is going to students up the income ladder as persistent political pressures have pushed benefits to the middle class” (p. 1).

This seeming mismatch between institutional goals to recruit and retain a diverse student body and financial aid award practices that appear to fail low-income students and racial minorities begs the question: what happened to all of the money that was once available to bridge the gap between a student’s “need” and the cost of attending a college or university? Kramer (1991) responds with a critique of the “colorblind” system that has now emerged noting it may not necessarily help those who are continued on page 5
Financial Aid, continued from p. 4 in the most need. Gerald and Haycock (2006), in their report *Engines of Inequality: Diminishing Equity in the Nation’s Premier Public Universities*, illuminate how many of the U.S. flagship institutions appear to be enacting skewed priorities: “More and more they aren’t spending money on the low-income students for whom such aid is absolutely essential if they are to attend college, but on the high-income students who will help increase their rankings in college guides” (p. 4).

Academically successful, high achieving, low-income students ironically have the hardest time gaining access to higher education. Gerald and Haycock (2006) note that while flagship universities have increased grant funding to low-income students by 29 percent, these universities increased their funding to some of their wealthiest students by 186 percent. Family contributions for students who come from the lowest income brackets are estimated at 80 percent of their families’ annual income (Gerald & Haycock, 2006, p. 18). Something is not right when “the neediest of students are forced to work an excessive number of hours and to assume thousands of dollars in loans, just to ensure that they can stay enrolled from one semester to the next” (Gerald & Haycock, 2006, p. 18).

A personal interview with one financial aid officer expounded on the challenges described in the literature above. Jefferson, an assistant director of financial aid at a four-year public university, noted that many low-income students and racial minorities are also first-generation college students. The FAFSA form, which must be filed by March 1st in order to qualify for aid, is a dense process, with “tricky” terminology (personal communication with Johnson, November 8, 2007). Further, she adds, the earlier that one files the FAFSA, the more money one can qualify for. For first-generation, low-income students they are less likely to have mentoring to help them prepare and know what other options exist if their award package is low (i.e. investigate other funding sources such as scholarships). An additional barrier that Jefferson observed is the “digital divide” (personal communication, November 8, 2007). Even in today’s technological age, not everyone has access to a computer; yet, effective in the 2008-2009 academic year, no more paper FAFSA forms will be issued to financial aid offices. Students without access to a computer must call to request a paper copy.

In light of these barriers and disparities in financial aid practice, higher education administrators need to re-evaluate their approach to narrowing the gap between racial minorities and low-income students and their wealthy white peers. Gerald and Haycock (2006) offer several recommendations to administrators to create a (more) level playing field for racial minorities and low-income students. Some of the recommendations include being more aware of the pertinent statistics such as, how well the institution serves the breadth of its state residents, the graduation rate of entering freshman, gaps in graduation rates, and the amount of grants awarded to students with high financial need proportional to the rest of the student body. Others include, focusing on increasing the success of students already admitted, aggressively recruiting more
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talented low-income students and students of color, reallocating institutional aid dollars, reaching out and reclaiming students who left in good standing, but without a degree, and committing to preparing more high-quality teachers for high-poverty and high-minority schools (Gerald & Haycock, 2006).

Evidence suggests that recent financial aid initiatives have widened the gap in college attendance between blacks and whites and between those from low- and high-income families. For instance, in her study of the Hope Scholarship, Dynarski (2000) notes that should it have its intended effect on middle- and upper-income attendance it will also widen already large racial and income gaps in college attendance in the US. Low-income students and racial minorities attend community colleges in disproportionate numbers to their wealthy, white peers, and correspondingly white students from high-income brackets are far more likely to attend Ivy-league universities (Goldrick-Rab, 2006). A failure to systematically address these disparities risks reproducing barriers to higher education access for low-income and African Americans students and an academic classism in higher education.


Amber Johnson is a graduate student in the Higher Education Administration & Student Personnel at Kent State University. Dr. Susan V. Iverson is an Assistant Professor of Higher Education Administration & Student Personnel at Kent State University.
Exploring Identity, Difference, and Privilege
by Jane Duffy

At a small liberal arts college in the Northeast, student affairs professionals at our college were contemplating how we could spark more conversations about identity, difference, and what it means to be white among our predominantly white students. Our students, perhaps yours too, are well aware of international and global issues of oppression and could speak for hours about women’s rights in developing countries, the crisis in Darfur, or the pros and cons of liberating Tibet. An issue student affairs professionals on our campus face is how to encourage our students to think about issues of social justice on a local level, to deter them from intellectualizing things that happen in the world and think about how actions affect lives on a daily basis.

To promote this idea of thinking about social justice on a micro level, we created an event-filled week titled “Rethinking difference outside the classroom.” Thanks to collaboration from various departments and student groups on campus, we offered more than a dozen different sessions. Some of these programs were social in nature and did cost money to bring in an outside dancer or drummer. However, the majority of these programs cost nothing and only required advertising through word of mouth and flyers. For example, a faculty member from the Psychology Department shared some of her research in an interactive session titled, “Race, class and gender: The psychology of prejudice.” She showed us research about testing our own unconscious biases available at https://implicit.harvard.edu/implicit/demo or at http://backhand.uchicago.edu/Center/ShooterEffect.

The folks from campus security offered to host a session they named “Community and identity: A conversation with campus security” in which they shared how their own cultures play a role in their lives and invited students to do the same. Students in attendance stated that they would have never spoken to the security officers about these topics without such an opportunity. A group of administrators on campus led a discussion titled “Who the %&$# are you,” advertised as an event to raise the level of sophistication about the concept of identity on campus. Some male students of color in attendance shared experiences about the use of anger in their lives, which led to a powerful discussion about adult problem-solving strategies.

Residence Life staff offered workshops about transgender and white identities. The transgender program allowed students the opportunity to discuss as many definitions as possible that fall under the “transgender umbrella” and what pronoun to use with a friend who is transitioning. During the white identity session, students brainstormed what it means to be white, and what items make up white culture. In small groups, students took part in a sharing / listening activity about race and identity, where no questions or comments could be made when someone was talking. One student, a junior history major, shared that she had never spoken about being white, or being in an interracial relationship before.

As with any conversation about difference and identity, those who led the sessions encouraged students to continue conversations on campus among their friends and classmates. While the number of students in attendance did not break any records, it is important to remember that the quality of the conversations is what really mattered. It can be disheartening for student affairs professionals to have low attendance at any event, but interacting with a handful of students in a way that they have never been reached before has the potential to benefit any college campus.

Many of these same students will fight for fair wages of workers here on campus and then throw their cigarettes on the ground, not pick up overflowing trash on their floor, or vandalize their residence hall ... how do we encourage our students to think about issues of social justice on a local level and deter them from intellectualizing things that happen in the world...

Jane Duffy is an Area Coordinator in the Department of Residence Life at Bard College.
Blogosphere Offers New Starting Points for Conversations about Race
by ChiChi Onyemaechi

I graduated from the University of Michigan in April, empowered and energized by the last year of social justice work that I had been involved in as a student coordinator and workshop facilitator in the Program for Intergroup Relations (IGR). As my plane landed in my home state of Maryland following my graduation, it dawned on me that I wasn’t in “Kansas” anymore. Like the character Dorothy from the Wizard of Oz, what I left behind was a safe haven. Although different from Dorothy, mine was in a large university setting of progressive thought, open conversation, and an extensive, yet intimate, cohort of individuals who shared my ideas and passion for social equality.

But today, like Dorothy, I have had to confront the illusion presented by the Emerald City – in my case, this is recognizing that “the real world” that I looked forward to entering is filled with jobs, loan repayment, and inevitably, social injustice. Granted, my alma mater was no utopia; I often encountered racism, for instance, both academically and socially. But fortunately, I was able to take refuge on a plush couch in the IGR office and speak openly about my frustrations with racism (or sexism or homophobia, etc.) on campus and develop a solution with the help of other students and faculty members. I was rarely concerned with whether those with whom I spoke considered me to be too serious, pretentious, or facetious in my remarks or questions; I was comfortable, which made it easier to facilitate conversations on these difficult topics with other students outside of IGR. I now was struggling to reconcile the tools and knowledge I garnered about social justice and activism in IGR (and invariably in school) with the bigotry and political correctness that I encounter in my present life.

I grappled with this for some time until I came across Racialicious, an interactive blog website that analyzes the interplay between race and pop culture. Wow, I thought, this is beneficial not only because it presents race in an interesting way but it also offers a comment section that allows people to post opinions in common language about social (in)justice. Finally, I thought, I have a place where I can feel at home, albeit online, and learn to talk about race in a more practical way with other people.

Recently, I was struck by a post about “Bechdel’s Rule”, in which a writer claimed that she would not see a film unless it passed the following criteria: a) involved two women as characters, b) the women spoke to one another and c) they did not talk about men (i.e. they did not submit to a stereotype). The caveat however, was that the Bechdel Rule was adapted and applied to people of color and their roles in films. After reading the post, I immediately called my close friend and shared what I read. We spent the next hour brainstorming our favorite films to analyze and discover if they fit the Rule. Unfortunately, most of them did not; many failed at the last point,

continued on page 9
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as the characters fulfilled stereotypes. My friend – a gay, black male who only has a high school diploma – admitted that he had never really thought about race in this way and that he would really think more deeply about what we discussed during that night. I felt elated that night because I realized that talking about complex issues like race could be as simple as discussing movies.

This is only one example of how I have overcome the obstacle of discussing social justice with people who have not been exposed to it. Inherently, I am privileged in that I am able to recognize discrimination or oppressive practices. With this power I also feel it is my responsibility to share it with other people in ways in which they can understand. In this vein, Racialicious has really helped me to develop my voice because I have an immense pool of pop cultural sources to tap into for examples.

I do not think I am unique in this regard but it is evident to me that simplicity is often the key when battling topics of social injustice. Whether it is the latest Lil Wayne song and his sexist lyrics or the recent passage of Prop. 8 in California, there are many ways in which injustice is present and many ways in which they can be dismantled through continual discussion. I am still not entirely confident about talking about these difficult topics, but every conversation I have is still another step toward victory in the fight against social justice.

ChiChi Onyemaechi is a research assistant at the Veterans Affairs Medical Center in Washington, DC. and plans to attend medical school in Fall 2009.
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Teaching and Learning Together: Modeling Social Justice on Campus

by Eriberto P. Lozada Jr.

At the recent Tools for Social Justice conference in Kansas City, I discovered I was a tool. Yes, I learned a lot from my fellow attendees and faculty from the Social Justice Training Institute about using my “self as instrument” in my work as a social justice educator. But I also learned that, as a professor at a small private liberal art college, I was also a tool in the colloquial sense of the word (as in the “tool of the system”). As an anthropology professor, my primary focus is to teach students the theoretical frameworks and research methodologies used in the social sciences (and maybe expose them to a bit of Chinese society and culture); as a teacher, I hope that students learn about social justice through anthropological perspectives that deconstruct and make problematic commonly held ideas about race, gender, and other cultural concepts. My challenge, then, is to teach in such a way the students can take lessons learned in the classroom out into the world to transform their own communities in “the real world.” In developing community-based learning classes, where students work with community organizations on specific projects, I thought I was pretty good at making social justice a part of my pedagogy. But as I have learned through working with college professionals on my campus, and especially at the Kansas City conference, in using the traditional methods of assessment (hourly exams, take-home essays, research papers, and other types of writing), I still have been strengthening the academic structures that privilege particular kinds of discourse – yes, I am still a tool.

At the Kansas City conference, I participated in various reflective, active, and engaging exercises that helped me recognize my own position and internalized behavior patterns in different dominant and subordinate groups – the crucial first step in engaging in social justice education. An exercise where we labeled ourselves with playing cards and interacted with each other based on this ranking (where we also did not know the value of our own playing card) made me realize how little effort I regularly make to “read” others’ non-verbal or subtle signals of dominance and subordination. Intellectually, I know from my own teaching and research in race and ethnicity that people of color in the United States are by necessity fluent in the cultural signals of the dominant culture (as well as their own), but because of my own membership in various dominant groups, even though I am a person of color, I do not have this skill in recognizing these cultural signals – I had a 4 of hearts (low value card), and did not realize that people were slighting me in this exercise! These kinds of engaging exercises can help the heart understand what the mind may already know, and need to be part of my pedagogy if I hope to leave lasting impressions on my students.

As the conference went on, I began to wonder why we faculty do not work more collaboratively with professional staff in our classroom teaching, why we do not more fully integrate such exercises more into our syllabi. It was clear from the strength of the theoretical frameworks and the depth of thought evident in the various tools for social justice education that the different speakers used in their presentations that many people have invested a great deal of talent and experience into how to teach undergraduate students about social justice. Why aren’t more of my colleagues embracing such approaches? Clearly there are “turf issues” involved – campus politics where the powers-that-be are invested in clear demarcations between the domains of faculty and professional staff. However, for better or worse, I have enough faith in the good
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teaching intentions of my faculty colleagues, that other more experienced professors before me would have readily embraced the fruits of other disciplines – in the social sciences, we are always borrowing theories and methodologies from another discipline and applying them to our own. But as I heard more presentations, I realized that one of the biggest stumbling blocks inhibiting increased faculty and professional staff collaboration in the teaching of undergraduates are the theoretical disjunctures between disciplines. The presenters largely had a background in education, while most of the faculty on the campus of my private, liberal arts college are grounded in various disciplines in the humanities, social sciences, and sciences such as political science, literature, or biology. My own graduate training was in social anthropology (as well as religion from divinity school and East Asian studies for my masters; my undergraduate degree was in chemistry and physics). Presenters grounded in education theories used concepts that sounded familiar – social justice, hegemony, resistance – but in actuality were different from the way that I use them.

For example, the idea of social justice in Vernon Wall’s excellent closing presentation on the “Ten Myths of Social Justice” starts off with the first myth that “social justice is a ‘vague’ concept with no real scholarly basis.” Wall did an excellent job defining and summarizing the scholarship and research behind social justice, and as soon as I got back to campus, I borrowed what everyone pointed to as the best resource on the subject: Maurianne Adams, Lee Anne Bell, and Pat Griffin’s book *Teaching for Diversity and Social Justice* (2nd edition, 2007). This text is indeed an excellent resource, but I realized that professionals in this field are using a different concept of social justice. Before reading the introductory chapter on the theoretical foundations for social justice education, I expected some variant of Thomas Hobbes’ *social contract*, John Rawl’s *equal liberty principle* and *principle of equal opportunity*, or David Miller’s *solidaristic community, instrumental association, and citizenship* – the political philosophy that I had read a long time ago. Instead, what I read were social justice *education* theories (such as Kreisberg’s *power with* versus *power over* approach) that were eye-openers for me. Similarly, when Kathy Obear and Jamie Washington talked about *resistance*, this was not the resistance from Yale University political scientist James Scott’s seminal book *Weapons of the Weak* that I read in graduate school, but a discussion of the actual resistance engendered by the often dislocating messages in social justice education.

Such theoretical differences, however, should not hinder faculty and professional staff from teaching and learning together in our educational enterprise – in fact, these differences, like the diversity that we all value, provide more resources that can deepen our academic disciplinary understanding and improve our teaching. Faculty and professional staff must collaborate more explicitly in our shared role as *teachers* – not just in meeting rooms for committee work, but in the classrooms, residence halls, and other lived areas of our campus.

Faculty and professional staff must collaborate more explicitly in our shared role as *teachers* – not just in meeting rooms for committee work, but in the classrooms, residence halls, and other lived areas of our campus.

Eriberto P. Lozada Jr. is an Associate Professor of Anthropology and the Director of Asian Studies at Davidson College