Building Curricular Diversity through a "Social Movement":

How Faculty Networks Support Institutional Change

MARY A. ARMSTRONG
Lafayette College

HANNAH STEWART-GAMBINO
Lafayette College

Introduction

ACROSS US HIGHER EDUCATION, the value of diversity has become understood as vital for preparing students for a progressively interconnected world.[1] Indeed, two decades ago the American Association of Colleges and Universities published *American pluralism and the college curriculum: Higher education in a diverse democracy*, identifying diversity efforts, particularly in the curriculum, as an essential aspect of the mission of American higher education. Today, fostering diversity in education is not only held to be a "just practice;" it is now considered a best practice.[2] On many campuses, however, the successful infusion of diversity across the curriculum remains both a long-standing goal and a persistent challenge. In this essay, we address the complex set of constraints that shape college and university faculty agency in making choices about the inclusion of diversity content in their courses. Using one campus's experience as an example, we offer a frame for addressing the constraints that affect faculty decisions regarding diversity in the curriculum - which include varying disciplinary cultures, campus-specific hierarchical structures, and individuals' memberships in identity groups.

Consistent with reconceptionalist curricular theory, this essay specifically focuses on the curriculum as dynamically constructed, particularly in terms of faculty decision-making about including issues of diversity in their courses. We consider "the curriculum" as a historically situated *process* that does not merely provide content for educational experience but rather exists as an unstable site for contestations over knowledge and power (Pinar, 2011, pp. 2-3). Hence, we recognize the work of curricular change as intersecting with complex structural and ideological factors that educators must recognize and with which they must engage. Consistent with

Michael Apple's (1990) notion of the "hidden curriculum" – that is, the ways in which seemingly neutral curricular content reflects and perpetuates asymmetries of power on multiple levels (p. 14) – our essay illuminates the forces behind the curricular "diversity failures" that occur on many campuses while offering a framework for confronting traditional curricula's "roots in the soil of social control" (p. 47). Our project – infusing issues of difference and diversity throughout a higher education campus curriculum – rests on an understanding of a curriculum as a potentially powerful force for liberatory social change if constructed to resist what Pinar has termed the "deferral and displacement of racism and misogyny," as well as other forms of bias (p. 9).[3] We offer our experience with the aim of enlisting others like us, faculty and administrators whose teaching and scholarship are drawn from multiple fields, to join the critical debates and conversations in higher education around and within reconceptualist curriculum theory.

Specifically, this essay uses the example of a Teagle Foundation-funded initiative at Lafayette College (2011-2013), a private liberal arts college in eastern Pennsylvania, which employed a faculty networking model inspired by both theories of institutional change and social movement theory to structure the infusion of diversity across the curriculum. Using this case study, our aims are to 1) contribute to the broader reconceptualist frame by employing interdisciplinary theories of organizational change and social movements to address the highly political campus contexts in which individual faculty make curricular choices, 2) share a campus model for building cross-disciplinary faculty engagement for infusing diversity-related content across the curriculum, and 3) disseminate strategies for building the internal campus conditions most likely to enlist faculty and administrators in sustainable engagement with the project of curricular and institutional transformation. Our intended audience here is higher education campus leadership (both faculty and administrative), as well as high education faculty in general, a group that typically enjoys greater latitude than their K-12 counterparts regarding both departmental curricular offerings and the content of their own courses.

Curricular Diversity Initiatives in the Higher Education Context

For the purposes of this essay, we employ the term "diversity" relative to higher education curricula and intend it to indicate an engagement with a full spectrum of differences across social hierarchies, relative to both course content and classroom climate. Within this spectrum, our understanding of "diversity" requires a grasp of the historically disadvantaged subject positions shaped by long-standing, structural inequalities (people of color, the working class, women) as well as the systemic privileging of those "groups who benefit most from existing inequalities" (Howard et al 5). As most campus administrators and many faculty know, the goal of bringing such complex diversity content into the student academic experience across the *whole* curriculum can be difficult to achieve and sustain.

In our combined experience of teaching on multiple campuses and engaging in national conversations about diversity and US higher education, we have observed that most campuses that commit to using the curriculum to teach students about diversity typically attempt this work through one of two models. Some include a diversity requirement as part of their general education program, creating content standards for specific courses. There are advantages to this approach, including the opportunity for an institution to develop shared standards for diversity topics and content, as well as to mobilize the most knowledgeable faculty in order to quickly implement a sub-curriculum of high-quality courses. The goal of this model is to speedily deliver a targeted, consistent student experience of diversity *within* the curriculum. However, this

narrow model relies on a limited number of faculty "experts" and, perhaps most importantly, leaves the traditional, and hidden, curriculum intact.

Institutions can also employ a broader infusion approach that is aimed at ensuring that diversity issues are widely embedded *across* the curriculum, and it is on this particular model that we focus throughout this essay. The goal of this model is for each student to explore issues of difference across the disciplines and throughout the entirety of his/her curricular trajectory. The infusion model is more gradual but also more appealing for several reasons, including the obvious advantage of insuring that diversity content is fundamentally (and consistently) a part of every student's educational experience throughout her entire college career.

But although the comprehensive nature of the infusion-across-the-curriculum model is desirable, it can be particularly challenging to fully implement, particularly at institutions whose faculties remain comprised largely of tenured and tenure-track members who enjoy relative freedom in shaping their course offerings and content. A considerable part of that challenge stems from the often unrecognized fact that curricular efforts at infusing diversity actually take place in the context of three powerful institutional factors, specifically: 1) that different areas of intellectual inquiry have different "cultures" around diversity content and can vary substantially in their emphasis on and sophistication in examining difference, 2) that the fields in which examinations of differences are usually most explicitly central – the humanities, some social sciences, interdisciplinary programs such as gender, area, or cultural studies – can be disadvantaged in terms of campus-wide power hierarchies and 3) that stereotypes about identity and difference can affect the expectations of both campus leadership and faculty concerning who can/should master and convey diversity content.

Recognizing these factors enables us to rethink "diversity across the curriculum" as always partially unfolding within the following contexts:

- *Disciplinary Cultures* –which affect both the faculty who have/are expected to have "diversity expertise" (e.g. English, Psychology, Ethnic Studies), as well as those faculty who do not have/are expected not to have such expertise (STEM fields),
- *Institutional Hierarchies* –in which those faculty members who are expert in diversity are also likely to occupy locations nearer the structural margins of power (the humanities, and fields such as gender or cultural studies)
- *Identity Group Membership* –which reflects structures of privilege and power relative to who is expected to have "diversity expertise" (e.g., faculty of color, LGBT faculty, etc.) versus those who are not implicitly associated with diversity (majority faculty).

Taken together, these categories illustrate that faculty develop curriculum not only within *the* culture of any institution, but within the *multiple* interlocking cultures, hierarchies, and power structures of any given institution. This perspective enables us to re-imagine a curriculum as, in fact, a highly textured, asymmetrical phenomenon shaped by structural differences in disciplinary norms, institutional power structures, and social identities that exist, interact, and help explain the uneven and/or weak results produced on any given campus.

Recognizing that every curriculum is constructed from multiple sites of power that are organized in specific institutional contexts complicates what is typically the default approach to promoting curricular diversity, namely, relying on extrinsic incentives to individual faculty (stipends or release time) to entice them to include diversity in their courses.[4] Yet faculty do not act as isolated or autonomous individuals when making decisions about the content of their courses; faculty are enabled and/or constrained by the content norms within their specific disciplines, the ways in which their departmental cultures require/discourage the addition of

diversity-related content, their disciplines' place within the power structures of the institution, and the expectations that others may have relative to their identities. Individual faculty decisions about the appropriateness of diverse course content are, of course, part of the story—but faculty make such choices within specific institutional power structures and social contexts that reward and/or constrain individual faculty decisions about diversity in the curriculum.[5]

Hence, in our experience, one of the reasons that infusing diversity across the entire curriculum has been a notoriously difficult objective to achieve is because institutional leaders have traditionally viewed the task as a matter of adjusting individual faculty behaviors; therefore, efforts to infuse diversity in the curriculum are organized through individual—as opposed to structural—channels. The energy, good will and expertise of some faculty can be easily squandered, while impediments facing other faculty may go unseen and unaddressed. For example, institutions often task faculty in "diversity friendly" disciplines or areas to instruct and inspire their colleagues on diversity in the curriculum. Typically, this happens through faculty development workshops where leading such initiatives—often politically precarious work—typically counts as "service" that is no more valued, or even less valued, than other campus assignments. Such roles may also activate a "minority tax" on underrepresented faculty, a phenomenon in which non-majority faculty are disproportionately "expected to be experts on their own culture [and] to engage in substantial culturally related service activities" (Boyd, Cintron, and Snow, 2010, p. 5). Assuming that institution-wide change can be achieved through enticing individual instructors to change their courses one by one runs all the classic risks of volunteer efforts – feelings of exhaustion, frustration, and even exploitation among leaders, uneven change confined to the "believers," and institutional narratives of progress that gloss over problem areas where no change has taken place.

Simultaneously, faculty whose disciplines do not typically intersect with diverse content—such as the natural sciences, engineering or mathematics—remain burdened by very real obstacles that are often embedded in their disciplinary norms. For example, in less "diversity-content oriented" disciplinary cultures, there may be opposition to the project of infusing diversity content—and sometimes to the larger institutional project of "promoting diversity" in general. Ideological opposition to diversity as an institutional priority (while potentially found in any discipline) may be more likely among individuals or disciplinary sub-cultures in fields where the culture of diversity has not taken root. This creates additional impediments to faculty who may be interested in infusing diversity in their own courses, and faculty in disciplinary cultures where diversity-related content is not widely seen as suitable may face a potentially damaging loss of professional credibility if they engage with it as a serious matter of interest. Active hostility towards diversity as a curricular project or the institution's passive inability to acknowledge the particular challenges presented by disciplinary norms may persuade such faculty that curricular diversity is not possible (or safe to attempt). And where disciplinary restraints and the potential losses of faculty power that accompanies diversity work remain unacknowledged, many faculty may never be able to successfully find their place in the project of infusing diversity into the curriculum.

Neglecting the structural elements that shape institutional, disciplinary, and individual power dynamics obscures key motivators and obstacles that help us understand where, when and how diversity can (not) develop across the curriculum. But how to foster curricular diversity in a way that productively recognizes the differing power structures embedded in both the disciplinary/departmental and institutional levels of any institution? And how can this be done by *empowering faculty agency*—that is, without either taking advantage of the (often minority)

faculty from less powerful disciplines *or* failing to create a realistic space for faculty whose disciplines do not typically address issues of difference and social power? And, finally, despite the disparities in disciplinary perspective, institutional location and personal identity that faculty experience, is it possible to collectively engage faculty in curricular change efforts that transform institutions from within?

Curricular and Institutional Change through the Construction of a Social Movement

Although there is ample evidence of the important role curricular diversity plays in preparing twenty-first century students, there is very little research that addresses 1) how such curricular changes might be linked to achieving durable institutional change and 2) how efforts towards such meaningful changes might be sustainably structured. It is in the context of these challenges that theories of institutional change enable us to better understand how interventions in the curriculum may function both as the means to infuse diverse content into the classroom and as points of entry into institutional transformation efforts.

In their work on institutional change, political economists and institutional change theorists Wolfgang Streeck and Kathleen Thelen (2005) posit that established institutions are too often dismissed as fundamentally resistant to change, or only likely to change as the result of actions or events that are both external and drastic. In contrast, they ask "How can transformative change result from incremental change, in the absence of exogenous shocks?" i.e., as a function *of* institutions (p. 18)? While their work focuses on institutions in advanced capitalist economies, their approach is useful for thinking about any institution, including higher education (and curriculums), which are also often perceived as fixed, entirely dependent upon rigid and asymmetrical power relations, and deeply invested in their own continuity.

Steeck and Thelen argue that internal processes of institutional behavior may in fact allow for far more "play" than is typically recognized and that modes of normative institutional activities can produce powerful and transformative results without toppling the larger institutional structure. They contend that new institutional behaviors can be entirely transformative—even when they are internally generated and gradual, and operate within institutional structures. Streeck and Thelen identify several different modes for such transformative change, including the dynamic of "layering," a process whereby an institution actively permits innovative efforts towards a goal and new structures emerge internally as a result. Overall, their work supports the claim that infusing diversity into the curriculum may do more than revolutionize the intellectual and cultural perspectives of students relative to social justice and power. Such efforts may also be a means of fostering long-lasting and substantive change within both faculty culture and the larger institution itself.

How might layering – or, the addition of new perspectives and actors into an existing institutional arrangement – occur in the context of infusing diversity through a curriculum? The first step is to reject the assumption that faculty's curricular choices are straightforward expressions of their personal knowledge and/or values and embrace a more explicitly structural approach. Rather than viewing the curriculum as an expression of campus consensus that can easily accommodate the infusion of new elements through the sum of individual faculty choices, acknowledging that individual instructors must negotiate disciplinary, campus and identity structures opens the possibility of more intentional strategies for institutional change. We suggest that social movement theory offers particularly valuable "mechanisms" for curricular and institutional change that campus leaders, both faculty and administrative, can employ to empower faculty to drive internal transformations.[6]

Social movement theories seek to explain what distinguishes sustained collective action (regardless of the ideological content) from episodic and unsustainable expressions of individual or group discontent. Common across all of the debates in the social movement literature is the assumption that a social *movement* requires intentional mobilization of individual actors (who do not necessarily recognize themselves as sharing group identities) into sustained action toward a shared objective. Two particular strains of the social movement literature - resource mobilization and network theories of social movements - are especially useful for enabling the infusion of issues of diversity and inclusion across a campus curriculum. Resource mobilization theory argues that social movements require access to, and strategic deployment of, specific resources toward the achievement of particular ends (McCarthy and Zald, 1977, 2002; Edwards and McCarthy, 2004). Any savvy faculty or administrative leader understands the power of mobilizing resources to build leadership, common purpose, and collective identity – including material resources (money, space, training, access to communication), human resources (appointment of skilled leaders and allocation of faculty time), symbolic resources (recognition of faculty merit, faculty awards and recognition), and cultural resources (emphasis of specific values in the mission and campus life).

More recent network theories focus on the role of social networks in creating sustainable collective action over time. Successful social movements must mobilize independent actors— such as faculty from different campus disciplinary departments or programs—who are embedded in "local" contexts that shape their professional identities, values, and orientations. According to this view, successful social movements create opportunities for individuals with incongruent affiliations—such as faculty from different disciplines and/or power positions—to build networks that cut across these institutional affiliations (Diani and McAdams, 2002). Deliberately constructed faculty networks that link departmental and hierarchical structures can also address the need to create a new collective identity (Castells, 2004). In turn, new collective identity links "the usual diversity suspects" (who may occupy the margins of campus power arrangements) in common cause with potential allies whose more privileged positions often inhibit their participation in institutional change.

Social movement theory also highlights how the intentional construction of social networks can mitigate, even transform, cultural understandings of the status quo (Jaspers, 1997). For example, new faculty networks around the value of diversity enable the kinds of "layering" of new models for action that are added to a community's sense of "how we do things," leading to alternative cultural understandings of disciplinary expertise, acceptable pedagogical practices, and even objects of legitimate scholarship. In turn, collective action through successful informal network mobilization results in cultural shifts that reinforce future efforts toward institutional change, enabling the "conversion" of institutional priorities and goals over time.

The 2011-2013 Lafayette College Teagle Grant

In 2011, the Teagle Foundation awarded Bucknell University, Dickinson College and Lafayette College – private institutions in the Northeast – a cooperative grant directed specifically at collecting and using data to develop effective student-related programs across the institution. Lafayette College focused specifically on promoting student skills and learning relative to diversity. The project was divided into two parts: the first part engaged students directly through the College's Office of Intercultural Development (Student Affairs Division) in order to develop a Multicultural Competency Training program. The second part of the grant was focused on infusing diversity in the curriculum by deliberately taking structural issues of power

and difference into account via a "social movement" strategy for faculty development. The aim of the faculty portion of the grant was internally-generated curricular and institutional change. Six key premises undergirded the "Teagle Faculty Group":

- First, that infusing diversity across different disciplines and styles of instruction would require a strategy of **fundamental organizational change**
- Second, that such change would require faculty networks created by **building a sense of shared identity and purpose that cut across the formal, institutional structures of power** (e.g., across faculty ranks, across departments).
- Third, that such a network had to be constructed by the participants and **based on knowledge, skills, values, and an identity arrived at <u>collectively</u>**
- Fourth, that **resources**, both material and abstract, had to be made available for the group to **develop its identity over time and sustain its efforts**
- Fifth, that **intentional partnership between the developing faculty network and institutional leadership** was required to successfully develop and implement goals
- Sixth, that the group would **consciously strive to become a durable network of actors that could engage with other diversity-oriented groups/change initiatives over time**

At the core of these premises was the idea that *collective action,* for which faculty took *authorship and ownership* and around which they built a *durable identity,* could successfully address the persistent structural issues that often block the successful infusion of diversity. Our focus stayed on the necessity of mobilizing key resources to build a "movement" rather than an accumulation of individual volunteers. And moving across organizational lines allowed faculty and administrators to develop an explicit partnership around identifying goals and strategically deploying available grant dollars and other symbolic resources.

With these principles in mind, the Teagle Faculty Group stressed the accumulation of "diversity skills," the open exploration of what those skills could and should be, and how/why those skills might be different for different faculty. We avoided the traditional hierarchical transmission and training ("expert/novice") model in favor of an exploration and growth ("peer/peer") model. This organizational structure was planned to be cumulative in terms of both knowledge and people: hence the grant was designed to "stack" and integrate groups of faculty over time in order to build a purposeful social network of supporters. By simultaneously engaging in exercises that would increase knowledge about diversity across the curriculum, the numbers of involved faculty and strength of group skills and identity increased concurrently over time, a process that helped distribute, as evenly as possible, the responsibility for both learning about diversity in the curriculum and the work of assisting other faculty with diversity projects. This would, in turn, avoid the strain on diverse and diversity-knowledgeable faculty that usually accompanies these efforts.

With the aim of involving at least 20% of the total full-time faculty over the life of the grant, the Teagle process began with a core group of 10 faculty who self-identified as engaged in substantive diversity-related research and/or pedagogy and who were willing to both develop or revise a course in their own disciplines and to make a 2 year commitment to the project. From the beginning, this group self-identified as "campus change agents" – as opposed to "experts" – who wanted to create a nucleus of diversity advocates through honing their skills and building an explicit network of support for diversity in the curriculum. The first event was a two-day workshop led by an outside speaker skilled in teasing out the ties between individuals' personal identities and issues pertaining to diversity in the curriculum and in institutions. Through shared readings, exercises and discussions, core faculty engaged in activities that were designed to build

a new faculty identity as members of a group dedicated to diversity across the curriculum and to acting as institutional change agents. The opening workshop was aimed at building both a *shared knowledge base* and a *community of peers* that reached across structural divisions of rank, division, specific knowledge areas, and identity groups. Although we began with faculty who were willing to self-identify as possible "change agents," we also aimed at a model where mentoring and being mentored were flexible roles. For many first faculty participants, some of whom had known one another for years, the workshop provided several powerful moments of shared interpersonal discovery that strengthened the group's ability to begin the more targeted work of revising current courses or creating new ones.

The core faculty began the peer workshopping efforts that would come to characterize the main activities of the Teagle Faculty Group. Workshopping proposed or revised courses and practicing skills related to infusing diversity into different disciplinary structures did more than advance diversity in individual courses. It created a dynamic in which "diversity skills" were openly understood as variable across disciplinary frameworks. In course development workshops, faculty were required to both articulate and understand the distinct disciplinary norms and institutional dis/advantages that effected faculty options and choices around creating a course with diverse content at the center. In this context, it was possible to bring disciplinary norms and power structures into our conversations, and to consider, as a group, how the particular epistemological demands of any given area of study differently shaped and effected faculty choices about diverse content. These mutually-engaging and supportive discussions (which were scheduled independently and took place without "grant leadership" present) further reinforced this new faculty identity.

From its inception, the core faculty of the Teagle Faculty Group candidly discussed the social movement model as a promising structure for curricular infusion efforts and larger institutional change. Adopting the social movement model meant that there was a conscious decision to work towards creating a group that both helped infuse diversity into the curriculum and also took on the larger task of supporting positive institutional change. To that end, the group brainstormed about ways to connect to other institutional change-oriented groups and initiatives. The "big picture" approach ensured that the group continued to foster a collective identity as an institutional-level actor.

The Teagle Faculty Group began with several important characteristics firmly established: the core faculty developed a vision for themselves as a group, began to understand themselves self as change agents within the institution, and created an internal dynamic in which members worked together and thought about both the institution and diversity in the curriculum in new ways. As the grant progressed, cohorts of new faculty were added in small groups. All Lafayette faculty were invited to participate and, as new faculty joined in, concentrated efforts were made to connect to and invite faculty from the "low turnout" disciplines—specifically Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM) fields.

This initial unevenness of faculty participation was not unforeseen. It is well-documented that infusing diverse content and engaging with inclusive excellence is particularly challenging in some STEM areas (Gunasekera and Friedrich 2009). It was therefore expected that the divisions of the institution where diversity is more normatively embedded in course content would respond to calls for participants in higher numbers than the STEM fields. Consistent with the conscious formation of a faculty network of diversity advocates, several members of the core group explicitly reached out to leaders and suspected allies in the STEM disciplines to address this and encourage them to join or refer others in their fields. It is worth noting that faculty

participation was predictable according to differences in disciplines and institutional position, a finding that aptly supports our claim that failure to address disciplinary differences ensures that uneven faculty participation will continue to plague "diversity across the curriculum" efforts.

With new faculty participants being added on in batches every semester, grant activities took on the following shape: all members met together at the beginning of each semester for a large workshop that highlighted the purpose of the Teagle grant, the group's shared identity and collective purpose, and focused discussions on common readings and issues pertaining to both developing curricular diversity and to promoting institutional diversity more generally. Participating faculty then broke out into assigned small networking clusters that met informally over the course of the semester. Each cluster workshopped members' projects. An original core faculty member was embedded into each cluster, which was otherwise comprised of ongoing members and new arrivals. Cluster membership assigned and intentionally shuffled faculty across discipline, rank, pedagogical experience, and level of diversity expertise.

Teagle grant dollars were used to encourage informal networking, with an administrative staff member assigned to process the many small receipts for food and materials or reserve meeting spaces, as desired. Several of the faculty clusters met more than originally envisioned by the grant – sometimes in each other's homes – and the deepening of cluster "cultures" among the involved faculty was reported by many participants, of all ranks, as the most rewarding part of the Teagle experience. Small group meetings quickly solidified the sense of individual identity within the larger, collective purpose of the diversity "movement." At the end of every semester, the Teagle Faculty Group reconvened, with each faculty cluster reporting on their progress and sharing what they learned. At the end of each year, the stacked cohorts were invited to a social event to celebrate lessons learned and progress made. Over time, as the Teagle Faculty Group strengthened in identity, purpose and size, clusters were re-assigned for maximum exposure to both new ideas and new colleagues. As more and more full group meetings took place, members of this "social movement" began to engage in institutional-level actions, receiving and offering "reports" from members who served on other diversity-related committees and initiatives (such as Study Abroad, Enrollment Planning, and so on), and began referring to themselves as "Teaglers" – resulting in far more institutional impact than the sum of approximately forty faculty participants and the courses that they had originally identified for revision or creation. Finally, throughout the work of the grant, faculty worked in alignment with administrators who provided space and autonomy for faculty innovation. The initiative engaged in three levels of administrative partnership: 1) the appointment of a faculty leader who served as a peer leader and recruitment/organizational hub, 2) the Dean of the College who served as the administrative contact, distributed resources and provided secretarial support through her office and 3) the Provost & Dean of the Faculty, whose leadership initiated the diversity focus of the grant, made regular appearances at group activities, thus reaffirming the institution's support of faculty engaged in curricular diversity efforts.

Identifying Impacts and Core Lessons

A total of 37 faculty participated in the funded phase of the Lafayette College Teagle initiative (2011-2013). Each faculty member was required to propose a new or substantially revised course and each received a nominal stipend. Within two years, 25 Teagle courses (67%) had been proposed and/or offered, and plans were in place for many of the remaining courses. However, a truer measure of the success of the social movement strategy would be evidence of new faculty networks leading to the kinds of layering suggested by Streck and Thelan. Such

evidence, while not easily quantified, should lead to the expectation of palpable institutional culture change over time.

The broad impact of the Teagle Faculty Group is perhaps best demonstrated simply by its voluntary continuation past the structural and financial scaffolding provided by the original grant. When the Teagle Foundation grant concluded in June of 2013, the Teagle Faculty Group opted to continue as a working group without stipends. An open-ended questionnaire administered by the faculty group leader at the conclusion of the grant period demonstrates several key findings that indicate success: 1) the most valued aspect of the grant was the new networks that emerged from peer-to-peer contact across departments and ranks, along with the collaborative spirit that characterized group activities; 2) many participating faculty expressed relief from feeling isolated in their pedagogical work and hoped to continue to build a more comprehensive understanding of issues regarding diversity across the College; and 3) the majority of participants expressed a desire to continue to strengthen the new "identity" forged by group membership. Indeed, two years later new faculty (across rank and academic division) continue to join the group, and participants continue doing significant amounts of work—small working group meetings, larger group gatherings, course revisions, and so on. In fact, the expanding group has chosen to maintain an established terminology, referring to themselves even today as "Teaglers." Anecdotally, faculty regularly report that new friendships and professional relationships have developed through the years of small and large group interactions. Finally, although the expansion of participation has not been even across the academic disciplines, the peer-to-peer work of developing new skills together rather than privileging certain "expert" colleagues has largely replaced the (sometimes implicit) view that diversity work is only the work of the "diversity faculty" with an increased sense of inclusivity and shared campus purpose.

Because part of the social movement strategy was to link the Teagle work to the formal college structures, it is possible to trace the ways in which the Teagle faculty work has created new institutional pathways of influence and connection. For example, during the 2013-2014 (post-grant) academic year, a Teagle faculty group worked with the College's Center for the Integration of Teaching, Learning and Scholarship (CITLS) to share lessons learned with the broader campus faculty population. Offering panels that shared Teagle Faculty insights, events such as "Diversifying Your Syllabus" and "Tips for Inclusive Teaching," generated broader campus conversations about diversity in teaching while raising greater overall awareness of the Teagle group. Perhaps more importantly, the post-grant Teagle Faculty Group was institutionally recognized and supported by the Provost's Office; the group is now served by a faculty leader who both heads up the Provost-appointed Teagle Planning Group and sits on the CITLS Advisory Board along with the former Dean of the College (whose office initially administered the faculty-focused component of the original Teagle grant).

Beyond the campus, the innovative work of the Teagle Group Faculty group was recognized by the *Chronicle of Higher Education* in its October 28, 2013 special issue "Diversity in Academe" (Gose, 2013). This public acknowledgment of the group's ground-breaking approach to solving a classically difficult problem gave the group significant national exposure. This resulted in numerous queries and expressions of interest from other institutions. As a consequence of subsequent consultations with Lafayette College, several institutions of higher education have now developed versions of the Teagle Faculty Group initiative. These include (at various institutions) adopting a Teagle-like program as a key part of accreditation efforts, folding a Teagle-like peer-to-peer mentoring model into academic senate training, and adapting the Teagle structure for a similar cross-institutional "infusion of diversity into the curriculum" effort.

Even if our work has had significant impact, we know that constellations of institutional power are particular for every institution, meaning that interventions may look different on every campus and conditions for building a social movement to foster curricular diversity can vary greatly. However, it is possible to identify some generally-applicable core principles and practices derived from our experience. While not exhaustive, these elements should enable creative thinking about ways to infuse diversity into the curriculum with more breadth and depth, while also strengthening faculty culture and improving faculty cohesiveness around these issues. Successful efforts will very likely:

- *Recognize the high value of a faculty peer-to-peer mentoring model* for learning about diversity-related issues, especially in terms of course development
- *Uniformly train an original core faculty cohort as a group*
- *Cumulatively "stack" trained cohorts of faculty over time*
- *Combine the pedagogy-, knowledge- and community-building power of balancing active small faculty subgroups with ongoing full group meetings*
- *Refine criteria and adjust the project in process* in order to suit structural issues, e.g., adding projects focusing on "classroom inclusivity" to those that "infuse diversity"
- *Recognize divisional differences and adjust expectations appropriately*, e.g., recognize differences between humanities and engineering syllabi and pedagogies, for example
- *Explicitly use and refer to the "social movement" networking model*
- *Use shared learning experiences to build identity and expertise* (readings, workshops, and other shared activities)
- *Use full group meetings to learn about/link to other institutional entities connected to diversity* and as a cross-institutional "reporting" space
- *Connect faculty to a cooperative administrative structure* that also "stacks" across levels (faculty leader, Dean, Provost) to sustain energy, faculty buy-in, and productivity
- *Think early and carefully about long-term sustainability* especially relative to institutional location, group leadership, and so on.

Conclusion

This essay contributes to curriculum theory in two ways. First, we bridge the reconceptualist school's illumination of the ways in which the curriculum both grapples with and reflects ideologies, power and potential for social change with an explicit framework for motivating and sustaining individual instructors working to confront and transform the "hidden curriculum." The multidisciplinary approach of the reconceptualist School invites those of us in other disciplines to add new theoretical models for explaining and fostering institutional change to the shared goal of liberatory education. In turn, our model has been strengthened by the theoretical richness of curriculum theory, which allows us to more precisely situate our own campus experience within a larger understanding of the social construction of US education.

Second, our case study involves a particular segment of US higher education, in which individual instructors often enjoy great autonomy in constructing the content and the pedagogical approaches of their courses, and highlights the role of individual instructor agency in the larger framework of socially-constructed curricula. Although we do not claim that our case study represents the whole of US higher education, we have explored one distinctive aspect of US higher education, underscoring the larger need for a theoretical frame that encompasses both the potential of and the constraints on higher education faculty curricular choices.

In this context, part of our goal for this essay was to engage colleagues within new frameworks for thinking about diversity, curricular change and institutional transformation and to do so in ways that were theoretically informed and promising for possible future variations. But we acknowledge, too, that there are both limits to our model and promising possibilities for further research. It seems likely, for example, that variables distinguishing any given institution of higher education (public v. private, geographical location, endowment, history, enrollment, etc.) will powerfully impact how our "faculty network" approach for curricular change can be understood and operationalized. Additional research might therefore address how faculty social movements around the curriculum intersect with and are shaped by other "vertical" institutional factors (e.g., internal administrative offices and forms of governance, such as a Board of Trustees). Further work on "horizontal" issues concerning how differences among disciplinary cultures and conventions affect the formation of faculty social movements across the entire curriculum would be promising as well.

We have argued that strategies for meaningful curricular change should build on an intentional model for faculty empowerment and that a social movement frame offers a useful model for mobilizing faculty support and participation. Our experience with the Lafayette College Teagle Faculty group suggests that a social movement approach is an effective means of tackling the persistent problem of infusing diversity into the higher education curriculum, a promising mechanism for improving faculty culture more broadly, and a possible pathway towards more meaningful conversations about the curriculum and positive institutional change.

Acknowledgements

[1] In 2013, 37 higher education organizations issued a statement that illustrates how commitment to diversity is both pervasive and steadfast. Published as a full page announcement in the June 30, 2013 *New York Times*, "Diversity in Higher Education Remains an Essential National Priority" states: "Our economic future, democracy, and global standing will suffer if the next generation is not ready to engage and work with people whose backgrounds, experiences, and perspectives are different from their own" (ACC&U et al). Similarly, other higher education organizations confirm the centrality of diversity - from the American Council on Education ("The success of higher education and the strength of our democracy depend on it") to the Association of American Universities ("We therefore reaffirm our commitment to diversity as a value that is central to the very concept of education in our institutions") (ACE 2012; AAU 1995).

[2] American Association of Colleges and Universities (AACU) 1995. Over the last two decades, a broad array of scholars has explored strategies for creating curricular diversity as well as documenting its positive effects (Garber 1994; Morey and Kitano 1997; Branche et al 2007; Nelson Laird 2014).

[3] In the simple sense of infusing diversity-related course content, "the curriculum" can be understood as the sum of credit-bearing courses taught by regular and/or contingent faculty. However, our work overall

takes a Pinarian approach to the curriculum, recognizing it as complexly embedded in and across multiple structures of power.

[4] The definition of "faculty" encompasses a broad range of contractual relationships. For our purposes, this essay assumes that in traditional higher education most faculty typically build their own courses and syllabi, achieve tenure and contract renewals based on their individual merits, and ultimately hold authority and responsibility pertaining to the content they teach. Academic freedom, too, demands that faculty choices be made—as they should—without undue intrusion, interference, or censorship. These factors may be particularly relevant in not-for-profit and liberal arts and university settings.

[5] Faculty members can be viewed as participants in what Paulo Freire calls "limit situations" that constrain change. Indeed, Freire could be describing the faculty when he states, "if individuals are caught up in and are unable to separate themselves from these limit-situations, their theme in reference to these situations is *fatalism*, and the task implied by the theme is *lack of a task*. Thus, although the limit-situations are objective realities which call forth needs in individuals, one must investigate with these individuals their level of awareness" of the structural constraints in play (emphasis in original) (Freire, p. 94).

[6] Our incorporation of social movement literature here (alongside political economy research and the literatures on organizational change and institutional diversity) is consistent with the reconceptualists' embrace of multidisciplinary theoretical contributions to curricular theorizing. As Thomas and Schubert (1996) explain, "the discourse of institutionalized, school oriented curriculum development, which was the main focus of curriculum thinking from 1918 until 1969, is no longer the primary language form of scholarly writing about the curriculum. Rather the work of curriculum thinking has shifted to understanding curriculum by adopting and developing scholarship from other discourse communities. Thus, there is no one discourse text that dominates...There are instead multiple 'texts' or coherent and emergent bodies of literature: historical, political, racial, gender, phenomenological, postmodern, autobiographical/biographical, aesthetic, theological, institutional, and international..." (Thomas and Schubert, p. 269)

References

The American Association of Colleges and Universities et al. (2013, June 30). Diversity in higher education remains an essential national priority. *New York Times*, p. A17.

The American Association of Colleges and Universities. (1995). *American pluralism and the college curriculum: Higher education in a diverse democracy*. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges and Universities.

American Council on Education. (2012). *On the importance of diversity in higher education*: ACE *board of directors resolution on diversity*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

The American Association of Universities. (1995). *AAU statement on the importance of diversity in university admissions*. Washington, DC: American Association of Universities.

Apple, Michael. (1990). *Ideology and the Curriculum*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge.

Branche, J., Mullennix, J., & Cohn, E. R. (Eds.). (2007). *Diversity across the curriculum: A guide for faculty in higher education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Boyd, T., Cintrón, R. & Snow, M.A. (2010). The experience of being a junior minority female faculty member. *Forum on Public Policy Online* 2010 (2010). Retrieved from: http://forumonpublicpolicy.com/spring2010.vol2010/spring2010archive/boyd.pdf

Castells, M. (2004). *The Power of Identity* (2nd Ed.). London, England: Blackwell.

Diani, M. & McAdam, D. (Eds.) (2002). S*ocial movement analysis: the network perspective*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Edwards, B., & McCarthy, J.D. (2004). Resources and social movement mobilization. In D. A. Snow, S. A. Soule, & H. Kriese, (Eds.), *The Blackwell companion to social movements* (pp. 116-152). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Freire, P. (1996). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. 2nd edition. London: Penguin Books Ltd.

Garber, L. (Ed.). (1994). *Tilting the Tower*. New York: Routledge.

Gose, Ben. (2013). "Adding Diversity to the Curricula, Starting in the Classroom" *Chronicle OF Higher Education: Diversity in Academe.* 28 October. http://www.lafayette.edu/about/files/2013/10/ATT00058.pdf   Accessed: January 6, 2015

Gunasekera, N., & Friedrich, K. (2009). Creating inclusive science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) courses. In R. A. Gurung, & L. R. Prieto Sterling (Eds.), *Getting culture: Incorporating diversity across the curriculum*. Sterling, Virginia: Stylus.

Howard, A., & Polimeno, A., Wheeler, B. (2014). *Negotiating Privilege and Identity in Educational Contexts*. New York: Routledge.

Jaspers, J.M. (1997). *The art of moral protest: Culture, biography, and creativity in social movements*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

McCarthy, J. D. & Zald, M. N. (1977). Resource mobilization and social movements: A partial theory. *American Journal of Sociology*, *82*, 1212-1241.

McCarthy, J. D. & Zald, M. N. (2002). The enduring vitality of the resource mobilization theory of social movements. In J. H. Turner (Ed.), *Handbook of sociological theory* (pp. 533-565). New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum.

Morey, A. & Kitano, M. (Eds.). (1997). *Multicultural course transformation in higher education: A broader truth.* Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Nelson Liard, T. F. (2014). "Reconsidering the Inclusion of Diversity in the Curriculum" *Diversity and Democracy*, 27(4): 12-14.

Pinar, William. (2011). *What is Curriculum Theory?* 2nd ed. New York: Routledge.

Thomas, T. P. and Schubert, W. H. (1997). Recent Curriculum Theory: Proposals for Understanding, Critical Praxis, Inquiry, and Expansion of the Conversation. *Educational Theory*, 47, 261–285

Streeck, W. & Thelen, K. 2005. Introduction: Institutional change in advanced political economies. In W. Streeck & K. Thelen (Eds.), *Beyond continuity: Institutional change in advanced political economies* (pp. 1-39). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.