



**POWER,
PRIVILEGE, *and the*
POLITICS OF DIFFERENCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION**

FALL 2020 SYLLABUS

Charles H.F. Davis III, Ph.D., Course Instructor

COURSE DESCRIPTION

Power, Privilege, and the Politics of Difference in Higher Education examines how systems and relationships of power shape research, policy, and practice in higher education and its social contexts. The course uses historical and sociopolitical perspectives from a variety of fields and disciplines to interrogate how institutionalized systems of power and structures of domination, primarily within the United States, work together to drive inequities across social differences of ability, class, gender, race/ethnicity, religion, and sexuality.

FOCUS OF THE COURSE

Contemporary educational environments arguably present us with greater challenges related to power, diversity, and equity than in any other time in U.S. history. Others might say that the challenges facing our educational system today are essentially the same tensions with which it has unsuccessfully struggled for the last century. Therefore, the primary purpose of this course is to provide students an opportunity to explore those tensions through the range of dimensions in which problems of "diversity" manifest among students, faculty and staff in today's postsecondary educational environments. We think of the interaction of diversity and learning as not only involving the differences that students bring to learning environments, but also the ways we as educators respond to those differences in the context of policies, systems, histories, structures and legislation.

Students enrolled in the course will examine educational access and equity in the contexts of culture, ethnicity, race, sexual orientation, religion/spirituality, ability, and gender – viewing these contexts through inter-relationships among divisions of labor, class structures, power relationships, group marginalization, cultural images, residential patterns, health, family life, employment, education, and values. In addition to the challenges related to diversity, students will also explore aspects of diversity as potential assets in creating rich and productive learning environments. Through framing case studies, students will apply the knowledge they gain from these explorations to the framing, analysis, and generation of solutions to contemporary educational problems of practice.

PROBLEMS OF PRACTICE

In addition to research and theory, think about the goals of this course as addressing three specific problems of practice. These problems of practice center around individuals' and institutions' core values as they relate to diversity, equity, and inclusion as well as the difference between that to which we aspire and what *actually* happens in educational environments.

Problem of Practice #1

The first problem of practice relates to the disparate outcomes experienced by different groups as they engage our educational institutions. Some refer to these differences in outcomes as an achievement (or student success) gap, but the problem extends beyond achievement. While equity issues certainly manifest in educational outcomes, they also exist in interpersonal interactions, campus experiences, and access to socio-academic resources. Most educators see these disparities as a pedagogical problem while many others also consider them moral and ethical concerns and issues of social justice. Therefore, this problem of practice moves

beyond a lack of clarity in what educators and institutions value and toward a more complete understanding of how what gets rewarded (i.e., meritocracy), resourced and implemented either fails to reflect espoused institutional values (e.g., equity, diversity, and inclusion), and/or has consequences that are contrary to those values.

Problem of Practice #2

Our reactions to (and interactions with) the increasing diversity of our educational environments, among college students and in the postsecondary workforce, itself, create a second problem of practice addressed in this course. Specifically, we (educators and the rest of us, typically) often lack an awareness of our perceptual viewpoint, and therefore of alternative views. This “tunnel vision” can cause us to limit the way we frame – and therefore solve – a challenge like those presented in the first problem of practice. Through the experiences, assignments, and resources in this course, we hope to help each other see what was previously invisible, to reveal and challenge whatever operating assumptions we may have underlying challenges of college access and equity. We may not always agree on either what the problem is or what should be done, but a goal of the course is to ensure we do not think about these challenges and potential solutions in the same ways as we did in the beginning of the semester.

Problem of Practice #3

The third and final problem of practice this course addresses is our common difficulty in having meaningful conversations across sociopolitical difference. In this course, “difference” is an umbrella frame within which variation is not merely horizontal, but vertical and hierarchical and represents relationships of power at individual and systemic units of analysis. Why a focus on power? As educators, in order to facilitate and engage in conversations across difference it is important to recognize how power shapes dialogue. To be sure, power has deeply shaped who has historically and continues to have access to formal learning, especially higher and postsecondary education. Furthermore, consider the following:

1. The most recent census data indicate that an increasing diversity overwhelmingly characterizes urban schools, two-year colleges, four-year institutions, and communities. Despite these compositional shifts, discrimination and disenfranchisement persist.
2. Although access to higher education has widened, student success, educational attainment, and post-college life outcomes continue to show disparities across diverse groups.
3. Research evidence suggests that learning processes in educational environments can be more effective if they account for and include the cultural funds of knowledge, scholarly contributions, languages, and other related socio-historical and socio-cultural factors of the diverse populations they now serve.

LEARNING OUTCOMES

A successful course will be demonstrated by students’ abilities to do the following:

- Identify the historical foundations of systemic oppression in the United States and higher education.

- Explain how relationships of power contribute to disparate postsecondary educational opportunities and experiences across difference.
- Explain key social constructs and identities (e.g., ability, class, gender, race/ethnicity, and sexual orientation) and how they relate to broader systems of oppression.
- Conduct critical analyses of power of contemporary higher education issues and postsecondary contexts.
- Compare and contrast current theoretical and practical approaches to “diversity, equity, and inclusion” in higher education.
- Propose innovative strategies and policy changes that could help transform higher education institutions toward more equitable outcomes for students, staff, and faculty.

COURSE NOTES

While this course will be entirely online, both asynchronous (individually separate learning time) and synchronous (collective learning time) instruction will be utilized. Using a flipped or time-shifted course model, aspects of course lecture may be removed from designated class time to allow students the flexibility to learn upcoming content (especially lectures) at any time during the week prior to a course meeting. While the power and success of this approach will be determined by our up-front investment of our time, it will also allow much more effective use of class time to focus on answering questions, discussing readings, and undertaking small group activities. Additionally, this approach will limit the duration of on-screen engagement during synchronous instruction.

Finally, all video-based lectures will be posted using links on Canvas. In addition, any presentation slides, in-class lectures, and discussions will be posted *following* each class session for future reference.

GENERAL COURSE REQUIREMENTS

FRAMING DISCUSSIONS

To help frame our discussions inclusively, this course builds on the [Association of American Colleges & Universities \(AAC&U\) Making Excellence Inclusive](#) guiding principles for access, student success, and high-quality learning and equity work from the Center of Urban Education at the University of Southern California. Specifically, the following definitions are offered:

Diversity, Inclusion, and Equity: Core Principles

- **Diversity:** Individual differences (e.g., personality, learning styles, and life experiences) and group/ social differences (e.g., race/ethnicity, class, gender, sexual orientation, country of origin, and ability as well as cultural, political, religious, or other affiliations).
- **Equity:** The achievement of parity across difference with regard to *outcomes* (i.e., success measures). Equity is the result from deliberate and sustainable interventions that explicitly center historically

disenfranchised and underserved populations and (re)direct resources necessary to support their success (see also [Equity and Student Success](#)).

- **Inclusion:** The active, intentional, and ongoing engagement with diversity—in the curriculum, in the co-curriculum, and in communities (intellectual, social, cultural, geographical) with which individuals might connect—in ways that increase awareness, content knowledge, cognitive sophistication, and empathic understanding of the complex ways individuals interact within systems and institutions.
- **Equity-mindedness:** The perspective or mode of thinking exhibited by practitioners who call attention to patterns of inequity in student outcomes. These practitioners are willing to take personal and institutional responsibility for the success of their students, and critically reassess their own practices. It also requires that practitioners are race-conscious and aware of the social and historical context of exclusionary practices in American Higher Education. ([Center for Urban Education, University of Southern California](#)).

FOUR AGREEMENTS FOR COURAGEOUS CONVERSATION

By participating in this graduate-level seminar class, we collectively agree to abide by the following:

1. **Stay engaged.** Staying engaged means “remaining morally, emotionally, intellectually, and socially involved in the dialogue.”
2. **Experience discomfort.** This norm acknowledges that discomfort is inevitable and asks that discussants make a commitment to bring issues into the open. It is not talking about these issues that create divisiveness. The divisiveness already exists in the society, in our institutions, and in our schools and colleges. It is through dialogue, even when uncomfortable, the healing and change can begin.
3. **Speak your truth.** This means being open about our thoughts and feelings and not just saying what you think others want to hear.
4. **Expect and accept non-closure.** This agreement asks discussants to “hang out in uncertainty” and not rush to quick solutions, especially in relation to shared understanding, which requires a future commitment to an ongoing dialogue.

SOURCE: Singleton, G.E., & Linton, C. (2006). *Courageous conversations about race: A field guide for achieving equity in schools* (pp. 58-65). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Marginalized Voices and Classroom Communication

In addition, as a community of learners, we agree to promote an environment conducive to learning. In doing so, we should equitably respect differences of culture, nationality, language, values, opinion, and style. However, respecting differences also requires we account for historical and ongoing relationships of power that typically marginalize the voices of minoritized communities. This means we should be conscious of the amount of space we occupy during class discussions, especially when we are located in positions of power and privilege that have historically drowned out the perspectives of marginalized and oppressed people. Lastly, in effort to promote clear communication, we should strive to:

1. Be specific rather than broad, general, or vague, with our truth claims;
2. Provide examples and evidence to support our arguments; and
3. Ask “good faith” questions in moments needing clarification.

ATTENDANCE AND PARTICIPATION

Attendance: As a seminar style course, our collective learning depends greatly on everyone attending our scheduled class sessions. However, this is a particularly challenging and unpredictable time for all of us. Therefore, absences may be unavoidable or even necessary to manage our mental and emotional health during the various difficulties of the pandemic and uprisings for racial, economic, and environmental justice.

That said, if and when do absences occur, please try your best to let the instructor or TA know, whether in advance or soon after the missed class. If multiple, consecutive absences occur, the instructor or TA may reach out to offer additional support and co-create a plan to stay on-track for completing course.

In some cases (e.g., non-emergency absences), students may be asked to complete a reflective assignment engaging what he/she/they/ze would have contributed to the class had he/she/they/ze been able to attend and what he/she/they/ze learned from having watched the recording within a 7-day window following the absence.

Recognition of Religious and Spiritual Observances: All students are encouraged to participate in the holidays and observances consistent with their religion and/or spiritual practice. In those instances where such participation conflicts with scheduled course time, deadlines, etc., please simply notify the instructor of possible absences or needs to adjust assignment due dates to accommodate and support your plans for religious and/or spiritual observance.

Coursework and Readings: Students enrolled in this course are expected to read, listen, and watch all content provided in the syllabus. Additionally, students are expected to complete all other exercises and projects required for each lesson *before* each class meeting where the lesson will be discussed..

Class Participation: Pair-share and small group discussions will occur during nearly every class session and students are expected to actively participate in them. Active participation may include, but not be limited to asking critical questions, drawing on and making connections between the assigned readings and higher education policy and practice, and contributing to the overall discussion through thoughtful interlocution with their peers.

Stressful Content (Trigger Warning): We will occasionally discuss trends and problems on college and university campuses that may engender discomfort (and possibly distress) for students who have previously experienced related forms of educational violence and/or trauma. In the event that you may need individual support or modification to participation during a particular unit, please contact the instructor or TA via email or using the private chat function offered by Zoom. Confidential assistance may also be sought out through the University’s resources, namely the [Counseling and Psychological Services](#) office via phone at (734) 764-8312 or email at caps-uofm@umich.edu.

SUPPORT AND ACCOMMODATIONS

Students in need of learning support or specific accommodations should contact the course instructor at their earliest convenience. In response, an intentional effort to modify any and all aspects of this course will be made to facilitate the full participation and progress of students with a diverse set of learning needs. Additionally, the instructor will work with the Office of Services for Students with Disabilities (SSD) to help us determine appropriate academic supports to ensure student needs are met. Students may also contact SSD at (734) 763-3000 or via email at ssd.umich.edu at their own discretion to register accommodations using the Verified Individualized Services and Accommodations (VISA) form. Any information you provide is private and confidential and will be treated as such.

ASSIGNMENTS AND ACTIVITIES

WEEKLY REFLECTION JOURNAL/VIDEO DIARY ENTRIES

Between Week 3 and Week 12, bi-weekly reflection journal/video diary entries offer students an opportunity to consistently make sense of course content and its relationship to their lived experiences as well as the implications for their career(s) in higher education. Journal entries should be no longer than 150 words (or video recordings of no longer than 2:00 minutes) and submitted through the assignments tab on Canvas labeled "Reflection Journal – Week #". A total of 5 journal entries will be required, which can be either or both written journal and video diary entries, totaling a value of 10% of one's final grade. These entries are not intended to be perfunctory, but rather provide a strong basis for your *Autocritography* by tracking your analytical growth and development as a scholar and/or practitioner over time in the course. Once you submit your journal/diary entries, be sure to add them to your [ePortfolio on Canvas](#) so you can view them later and incorporate your ongoing reflection into your autocritographical analysis.

COLLABORATIVE CASE STUDIES

Throughout the semester, collaborative groups will analyze a recent (occurring within the at least six months) or current issue regarding power, privilege, and the politics of difference in higher education and its social contexts. Building on course readings, class discussions, and additional outside sources, case studies offer an opportunity to analyze the multiple and contested factors that influence postsecondary learning in the U.S. Specifically, each case study should address a relevant topic that relates to a unit discussed in the week in which it is being due. For example, the first case study presented by a group during Week 4 will focus on an issue of race and ethnicity. The remaining case studies should address issues related to topics discussed in subsequent weeks. This assignment will include both a written and presentation component.

Case Presentation and Written Case Analysis

In this course, successful presentations and written analyses should include the following sections:

1. Introduction

- a. Identify and provide a succinct description of a key higher education problem or issue.
- b. Formulate and include a statement broadly summarizing the argumentative thesis of your analysis.

2. Background

- a. Describe the context (systemic, structural, organizational, and/or interpersonal information), relevant facts (e.g., historical or legal precedent) and/or data points, and other important information of the case.

3. Evaluation

- a. Using relevant concepts, theories, and/or empirical evidence from the course readings and discussion, make an assessment of the problem (or the aspect on which you are focusing).
- b. Compare and contrast the relative effectiveness of any existing solutions.

4. Solutions

- a. Provide one specific, measurable, and attainable solution to the problem.
- b. Explain why this is the preferred solution.
- c. Support the solution with evidence (e.g., data, theory, course readings, credible outside sources).

5. Recommendations

- a. Determine and discuss specific strategies for accomplishing the proposed solution.
- b. Discuss the role(s) of specific stakeholders (i.e., students, families, faculty, staff, and senior administrators) in implementing the solution.
- c. If applicable, recommend further action to resolve potential shortcomings or unintended consequences of implementation.

The group presentation will be delivered in-class via Zoom the week it is due and should be roughly 30 minutes with an opportunity for discussion and questions from the class. Consider ways to make the presentation interactive by integrating pre-work (any brief texts to read, listen, or watch), in-class polls, ideation for solutions, etc. Written case studies should be no longer than 1,000 words.

To identify problems for consideration in your case analyses, consider sourcing material from trusted education news sites to include, but not limited to:

1. EdWeek
2. Education News
3. Education News at U.S. News and World Report
4. Diverse Issues in Higher Education
5. Inside Higher Education
6. The Chronicle of Higher Education

AUTOCRITOGRAPHY

As a final assessment, students will write a comprehensive, critical autoethnography based weekly reflections, observations, and analyses developed throughout the semester. Although summative in nature, this is an iterative assignment with several deadlines toward the latter portion of the course. Specifically, the following three deliverables are expected to support your development as a writer:

| Task | Description | Due | Points |
|-------------------|--|---------|--------|
| Outline | Based on the assignment brief below, develop an outline your final paper. The outline should help provide a sense of structure and flow for your identity brief, event description, theoretical/conceptual analyses, practical implications. An outline for your concluding reflection is not necessary. | Week 7 | 5 |
| Peer-Review Draft | A draft of your final paper will undertake a peer-review process with another member of the class. This process is an effort to familiarize you with an important aspect of the scholarly writing, which is engaging others with early drafts of your work to gain useful insight that helps improve a manuscript. | Week 10 | 10 |
| Final Paper | See below. | Week 15 | 25 |

Overview

This assignment is intended to facilitate the critical examination of the ways one may “experience, exist, and explain their identities – who they are, what they stand for, and why – and to recognize their . . . social relations” (Camangian, 2010). Autoethnography itself is a way of reading *between* the lines of [our] own lived experiences (Alexander, 1999) and of those who share similar experiences, in order to gain insight to oneself and others who might be similarly or differently affected by the broader sociological world. This assignment is based on several key texts: “Starting with Self: Teaching Auto-ethnography to Foster Critically Caring Literacies” (Camangian, 2010), “Culturally Relevant Pedagogy: Ingredients for Critical Teacher Reflection” (Howard, 2003), “Art of the Contact Zone” (Pratt, 1991), and “In Search of Progressive Black Masculinities” (McGuire, et al. 2014). Although these texts are not required reading, they have been provided on Canvas as references for further direction and should be used as references.

Purpose

The purpose of *this* autocritography is to critically synthesize the relationship between self, community, and the social contexts of higher and postsecondary education as an insider-outsider. In essence, the exercise is to construct a descriptive narrative that shares something one has learned about themselves (auto) – in a critically self-reflexive and self-conscious (crit) way – from within a sociocultural context (ethno) of postsecondary life, and conducted as an exploratory study (graphy) of one’s self as a member of and in relation to a larger sociopolitical group(s) to which they belong. Such an exercise is important to both the research and practice of higher education because it helps reveal an educator’s positionality within systems of power that affect ways of

knowing, seeing, and being. Our positionality deeply shapes how we as educators engage the various campus and community stakeholders connected to our work. For that reason, understanding and reckoning with our truths of identity, power, and privilege – and the broader truths they may reveal – can improve the efficacy of our work, the primary result of which should improve the lives of people. To be sure, students will be assessed not on the “rightness” of the autoethnography, but rather their demonstrated effort to descriptively excavate their personal and professional biography, situate it within a historical, sociocultural, and/or political context, and critically analyze their illustration using the theoretical and conceptual foundations discussed in this course.

Process

Like any methodological exercise, conducting an autocritography is as much about process as it is about product. In fact, ethnographic work of any kind is always about both; process and product inform one another constantly through a symbiotic relationship. With regard to process, the following steps will help guide your work:

1. **Reflect and generate.** Consider the ways you identify and how you have come to identify with certain aspects of your relationship to self and to others within your various communities. What aspects of yourself are most salient? Why are those aspects more salient than others? In what contexts are you more or less aware of various aspects of your identity? Which aspects of your identity are most intriguing to you intellectually and emotionally? Answers to these and other questions will help you gain focus on the *what* you will write about.
2. **Conduct research.** Consider reading any of the above-mentioned texts (or others) to help you construct your autoethnography. Then, excavate your own *communities of memory* by talking to friends, family, former teachers/professors, etc. to learn how others have perceived you up to this point. If available, you might even consult old journals or blogs you have written that help capture important experiences in your life. Ideally, these perspectives can help provide clarity to your identity development and the contexts in which you became who you are today.

In addition, seek out sources that help connect the unique and particular aspects of your experiences with broader sociological trends. This may include data or statistics that confirm or refute your own accounting of how you identify (and how others identify you), but also could include parallel cases and narratives of those with whom you share a similar social identity or position in society. You might also look at existing research with regard to how it theorizes the effect environments and social conditions have on the lived experiences of those benefiting and/or oppressed by larger systems of power.

3. **Analyze, synthesize, & organize.** Review all of the information you have gathered from your generative thinking and research. Determine how your identity, social context, and experiences converge to shape what you ultimately choose to write in your paper. Make connections between that determination and your sources to develop a preliminary framework (or guide) for building your paper. Then, organize your thoughts in a way that help provide direction for your future writing by creating a detailed outline.

4. **Write.** After developing an outline, begin to construct a draft of your paper and write freely. Consider the language you may use that help communicate important details about yourself to the reader, whom may be an insider or an outsider. Make choices that honor your own linguistic style and cultural communication pattern while also translating a clear understanding to your reader
5. **Revise & re-write.** It's been said that "there is no such thing as good writing, only good rewriting," which is certainly true to scholarly and academic writing exercises. Given the many layers of complexity to this paper, a commitment revision and rewriting will be important to developing a good auto-ethnography, especially one that is critically reflective and reflexive. At least two revisions of your work should take place: 1) prior to your submission for peer-review, and 2) after peer-review before final submission.

Product

Pratt (1991) considers the autoethnography as "a text in which people undertake to describe themselves in ways that engage with representations others have made of them ... autoethnographic texts are representations that the so defined others construct in response to or in dialogue with those texts" (p. 35). That is to say, autoethnographies are not merely autobiographies or forms of self-representation. Instead, they are more collaborative and relational by putting one's biography in critical conversation with its history, community, sociocultural context(s), and those relationships within and beyond the worldview of the author. In this way, autoethnographies are written both to reveal to oneself and to others a set of broader understandings derived from the particular, subjective truths of one's lived experience. Further, *autocritography* is a more deliberate academic exercise that "foregrounds aspects of the genre typically dissolved into author's always strategic self-portraits" and is "an account of individual, social, and institutional conditions that help to produce a scholar and, hence, his or her professional concerns" (Akward, 1999, p. 7).

This means that within the essay you will offer an illustrative account that reflects the sociological conditions that have produced you as an individual and professional. In addition, your essay should critically engage the implications of those conditions and experiences for your trajectory as a scholar, practitioner, and/or policymaker. Specifically, your essay will include five parts:

1. **Statement of self-identity.** First, to frame your reflection, a clear declaration of identity and the context(s) within which that identity was developed. Consider this an abridged articulation of your biography that allows the reader insight into *who* and *whose* you are in ways that reveal underlying factors to your personal development and socialization. Consider the following questions:
 - 1.1. Who am I (to myself)? To whom (larger social community) or to what (institutions, systems, or structures) do I belong? How does the broader social world perceive and respond to who I am?
 - 1.2. What contextual factors (family dynamic, neighborhood or geography, schooling experiences, etc.), broadly speaking, shaped my being and becoming?
2. **Illustrative event description.** Next, richly describe a defining experience (or set of related experiences) directly related to issues power, privilege, and the politics of difference in illustrative detail. This should be framed through the lens of participating (or being complicit) in the

marginalization of others and/or experiencing marginalization yourself. Consider the following questions:

- 2.1. Who, what, when, and where? (What happened? When and where did it happen? Who was involved? What was your role? What were the roles of others?)
3. **Critical Analysis.** Then, critically analyze that experience(s) using the evidence presented in course readings, the extant scholarly literature, publicly available data, class discussions, etc. You may consider building your analysis from the theoretical, conceptual, or analytical frames discussed in the course, although frames from other courses related to power and privilege are also welcomed. Consider the following questions:
 - 3.1. What contributing factors or sociological conditions led to the situation playing itself out the way that it did?
 - 3.2. Why, in your evidence-based or theoretical/conceptual analysis, was this situation either unique or commonplace?
 - 3.3. Using the literature to facilitate and support your analysis, how was power operating in the scenario you described? How is that power related to broader systems of oppression and structures of domination?
4. **Implications.** Now, based on your analysis, offer a set of implications for your future research, policy, and/or practice as well as those in similar social categories of difference. Be careful not to generalize, but do attempt to draw conceptual and theoretical conclusions from your analysis. Consider the following questions:
 - 4.1. What did you learn as a result of analyzing the experience(s) you described? In particular, what is instructive for your role(s) as a researcher, practitioner, or policymaker?
 - 4.2. How will what you learned shape the ways you may undertake your professional practice in the future?
 - 4.3. What lessons can you offer from your own experiences and analysis for others in similar and related professional positions?
5. **Reflection.** Finally, as a concluding section of the paper, reflect on the *process* of undertaking the autoethnographic project. That is, consider the following:
 - 5.1. What difficulties did you have when planning and writing this paper? Why?
 - 5.2. Describe your experience with peer review. Was it helpful? Did you get and give good feedback? Was this comparable to your previous experiences with peer review? Explain.
 - 5.3. Cite a beautiful, well-crafted sentence from your essay (written by you). Explain why this sentence is important and compelling.
 - 5.4. Do you believe that your essay accomplished its purpose?

- 5.5. If you had more time (or energy), how would you expand/change/enhance this essay?
- 5.6. What did you learn about yourself as a writer through writing the essays and this reflection?
- 5.7. Any other thoughts/comments/questions regarding this essay that you want to share?

The final paper is due Week 15 of the semester via Canvas by **Friday, December 11th at 11:59pm**. The final paper should be 5-7 double-spaced pages, (not including a title page, abstract, and references). Use regular 12-point font, APA style (according to the 7th Edition) with 1-inch margins top, bottom, left and right. Please follow this format carefully.

GRADING AND ASSESSMENT OF SCHOLARLY WORK

This course takes a primarily qualitative assessment-based approach to determine areas of success as well as improvement related to our desired learning outcomes. This means, as the course instructor, I am most interested in your own learning objectives and goals for being enrolled and engaging your work with questions and critical feedback than I am in evaluating your assignments and contributions by assigning them a fairly arbitrary numerical value. In addition, a core component of this course is self-reflection, self-evaluation, and peer review of your work to expand the possibilities of what constitutes being a scholar and producing knowledge rather than following predetermined expectations framed by contested categories of merit, excellence, and success. That said, I also recognize this approach may be new – and perhaps even anxiety inducing – to many enrolled, and offer some guidance through a point system associated with each assignment. This system is intended to help students track their own progress in demonstrating various skills typically associated with graduate work, but that are not necessarily taught in this course (e.g., academic/scholarly writing). I am happy to discuss any individual concerns about this approach and developing an alternative pathways for discussing your progress during the semester.

ASSESSMENT POINTS BY ASSIGNMENT

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Class Attendance & Participation | 20pts (2pts per class session) |
| Reflection Journals/Video Diaries | 10pts (2pts ea.) |
| Case Studies | 30pts (Presentation, 10pts; Written Case Analysis, 20pts) |
| Autocritography | 40pts (Outline, 5pts; Peer-Review, 10pts; Final Paper, 25pts) |

GRADING SCALE

| | | | |
|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| A 94-100 | B+ 87-89 | C+ 77-79 | D+ 67-69 |
| A- 90-93 | B 84-86 | C 74-76 | D 64-66 |
| | B- 80-83 | C- 70-73 | D- 60-63 |

ASSIGNMENT SUBMISSION POLICY

All assignments should be submitted via Canvas, not email, no later than the Friday (by 11:59pm) the week they are due (unless otherwise individually or collectively negotiated with the instructor). For example, a journal entry due for Week 3, the assignment should be uploaded by Friday, September 18th at 11:59pm.

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

Operating under the highest standards of academic integrity is implied and assumed. Academic integrity includes issues of content and process. Treating the course and class participants with respect, honoring class expectations and assignments, and seeking to derive maximum learning from the experience reflect some of the *process* aspects of academic integrity. In addition, claiming ownership only of your own unique work and ideas, providing appropriate attribution of others' material and quotes, clearly indicating all paraphrasing, and providing account and attribution to the original source of any idea, concept, theory, etc. are key components to the *content* of academic integrity.

Remember, citation is as much a social and political action as an academic norm and should be respected given the often theft of scholarship and the intellectual contributions of marginalized and minoritized scholars. Therefore, let us aspire to the spirit and highest representation of academic integrity. For additional university specific details, please read the University's General Catalogue, especially the sections that detail your rights as a student and the section that discusses the University's expectations of you as a student (see <http://www.rackham.umich.edu/StudentInfo/Publications>).

READINGS, TEXTS, AND COURSE SCHEDULE

Readings are available via Canvas under the ‘Files’ tab and in folders designated for each week of the course. Additionally, the texts under the “WATCH” heading are available in the ‘Media Gallery’ tab on Canvas (or can be accessed through your browser by clicking the links below). Texts listed under the “LISTEN” heading should be accessed by clicking the link and opening them in your web browser.

| WEEK | UNIT | READINGS | DUE |
|--------|--|---|-----|
| Week 1 | <i>Power, Privilege, and the Politics of Difference Part I</i> | <p>READ</p> <p>Blumenfeld W. J., & Raymond, D. (2000). Prejudice and discrimination. In M. Adams, W. J. Blumenfeld, R. Castaneda, H. Hackman, M., Peters, and X. Zuniga (Eds.) Readings for diversity and social justice (pp. 21-30). New York: Routledge.</p> <p>Domhoff, W. (2005). Basics of studying power. Retrieved from http://whorulesamerica.net/methods/studying_power.html.</p> <p>Powercube. (2011). Gramsci and hegemony. Retrieved from http://www.powercube.net/other-forms-of-power/gramsci-and-hegemony/.</p> <p>LISTEN</p> <p>Huerta, A. (2018). A field guide to bad faith arguments. Retrieved from https://medium.com/s/story/a-field-guide-to-bad-faith-arguments-7-terrible-arguments-in-your-mentions-ee4f194afbc9.</p> <p>WATCH</p> <p>Liu, E. (2014). How to understand power. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=c_Eutci7ack.</p> | |

| WEEK | UNIT | READINGS | DUE |
|--------|--|--|--|
| Week 2 | <i>Power, Privilege, and the Politics of Difference Part II</i> | <p>READ</p> <p>Johnson, A. G., (2005). Privilege, oppression, and difference. Privilege, power, and difference (2nd ed.) (pp. 12-40). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.</p> <p>Johnson, A. G., (2005). Making privilege happen. Privilege, power, and difference (2nd ed.) (pp. 54-67). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.</p> <p>Prescod-Weinstein, C. (2018). A brief history of "Identity Politics." Retrieved from https://medium.com/@chanda/a-brief-history-of-identity-politics-d1cb37b39311.</p> <p>Young, I. M. (1988). The five faces of oppression. The Philosophical Forum, 19(4), 270-290.</p> <p>WATCH</p> <p>Sweeney, N. (2017). Social stratification. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SlkKCMt-Fs.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED (OPTIONAL)</p> <p>Black, L. L., & Stone, D. (2005). Expanding definitions of privilege: The concept of social privilege. Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 33, 243-255.</p> | |
| Week 3 | <i>Analytical, Epistemological, and Theoretical Framing Part I</i> | <p>READ</p> <p>Johnson, A. G., (2013). Aren't systems just people? Retrieved from http://www.agjohnson.us/glad/arent-systems-just-people/.</p> <p>Staats, C. (2016). Understanding implicit bias: What educators should know. American Educator, 29-33.</p> <p>Bell, L. A. (2013). Theoretical foundations. In M. Adams, W. J. Blumenfeld, R. Castaneda, H. Hackman, M. Peters, M., & X. Zunig (Eds.) Readings for diversity and social justice (3rd ed.) (pp. 21-26). New York: Routledge.</p> <p>Hardiman, R., Jackson, B. W., & Griffin, P. (2013). Conceptual foundations. In M. Adams, W. J. Blumenfeld, R. Castaneda, H. Hackman, M. Peters, M., & X. Zunig (Eds.) Readings for diversity and social justice (3rd ed.) (pp. 26-35). New York: Routledge.</p> <p>WATCH</p> <p>hooks, b. Interlocking systems of domination. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sUpY8PZlqV8.</p> | <p>Group 1 Case Study Presentation</p> <p>Weekly Journal Entry</p> |

| WEEK | UNIT | READINGS | DUE |
|----------------------|--|---|--|
| <p>Week 4</p> | <p>Analytical, Epistemological, and Theoretical Framing Part II</p> | <p>READ</p> <p>Cabrera, N. C. (2018). Where is the racial theory in critical race theory?:A constructive criticism of the crits. <i>Review of Higher Education</i>, 42(1), 209-233.</p> <p>Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A Black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory, and antiracist politics. <i>University of Chicago Legal Forum</i>, 89(8),139-167.</p> <p>Ladson-Billings, G. (2013). Critical race theory: What it is not. In M. Lynn and D.D. Dixon (Eds.) <i>Handbook of critical race theory in education</i> (pp. 34–47). New York: Routledge.</p> <p>Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2012). Decolonization is not a metaphor. <i>Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society</i>, 1(1), 1-40.</p> <p>WATCH</p> <p>Crenshaw, K. (2016). What is intersectionality? Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ViDtnfQ9FHc.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED (OPTIONAL)</p> <p>Collins, P. H. (2015). Intersectionality's definitional dilemma. <i>Annual Review of Sociology</i>, 41, 1-20.</p> | <p>Group 2 Case Study Presentation</p> <p>Weekly Journal Entry</p> |
| <p>Week 5</p> | <p>Racial-Colonial and Racial-Capitalist Foundations of U.S. Higher Education</p> | <p>READ</p> <p>Carp, A. (2018, February 7). Slavery and the American university. Retrieved from https://www.nybooks.com/daily/2018/02/07/slavery-and-the-american-university/.</p> <p>Mustafa, J. B. (2017). Mapping violence and naming life: A history of anti-Black oppression in the higher education system. <i>International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education</i>, 30(8), 711-727.</p> <p>Stein, S. (2018). Confronting the racial-colonial foundations of US higher education. <i>Journal for the Study of Postsecondary and Tertiary Education</i>, 3, 77-98.</p> <p>Tuck, E. & Gaztambide- Fernandez, R. A. (2013). Curriculum, replacement, and settler futurity. <i>Journal of Curriculum Theorizing</i>, 29(1), 72-89.</p> <p>LISTEN</p> <p>Sexton, S., & Valle, F. (2018). Capitalism goes to college: A people's history of higher education (0:00-26:22). Retrieved from https://wearemany.org/a/2018/07/capitalism-goes-to-college.</p> | <p>Group 3 Case Study Presentation</p> <p>Weekly Journal Entry</p> |

| WEEK | UNIT | READINGS | DUE |
|----------------------|--|---|--|
| <p>Week 6</p> | <p>Race & Ethnicity</p> | <p>READ</p> <p>Cornell, S., & Hartman, D. (2007). The puzzles of ethnicity and race. <i>Ethnicity and race: Making identities in a changing world</i> (2nd ed.) (pp. 1–15). Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.</p> <p>Cornell, S., & Hartman, D. (2007). Mapping the terrain: Definitions. <i>Ethnicity and race: Making identities in a changing world</i> (2nd ed.) (pp. 15–40). Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.</p> <p>Smedley, A., & Smedley, B. D. (2005). Race as biology is fiction, racism as a social problem is real. <i>American Psychologist</i>, 60(1), 16-26.</p> <p>WATCH</p> <p>Gilmore, R. W. (2020). Geographies of racial capitalism. Retrieved from https://youtu.be/2CS627aKrJl.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED (OPTIONAL)</p> <p>Lopez, G.P., (2003). The (racially neutral) politics of education: A critical race theory perspective. <i>Educational Administration Quarterly</i>, 39, 68-94.</p> | <p>Group 4 Case Study Presentation</p> <p>Weekly Journal Entry</p> |
| <p>Week 7</p> | <p>Racism and Campus Racial Climate</p> | <p>Bonilla-Silva, E. (2001). What is racism? <i>White supremacy and racism in the post-civil rights era</i> (pp. 21-59). Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.</p> <p>Bonilla-Silva, E. (2015). The structure of racism in color-blind, “post-racial” America. <i>American Behavioral Scientist</i>, 59(11), 1358–1376.</p> <p>Hurtado, S. (2001). The campus racial climate: Contexts of conflict. <i>The Journal of Higher Education</i>, 62(5), 539-569.</p> <p>Stewart, D.-L. (2013). Racially minoritized students at U.S. four-year institutions. <i>Journal of Negro Education</i>, 82(2), 184-197.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED (OPTIONAL)</p> <p>Harper, S. R. (2012). Race without racism: How higher education researchers minimize racist institutional norms. <i>The Review of Higher Education</i>, 36(1), 9-29.</p> | <p>Group 5 Case Study Presentation</p> <p>Weekly Journal Entry</p> |

| WEEK | UNIT | READINGS | DUE |
|--------|---|---|--|
| Week 8 | Whiteness and White Supremacy | <p>Cabrera, N. L. (2014). Exposing whiteness in higher education: White male college students minimizing racism, claiming victimization, and recreating white supremacy. <i>Race, Ethnicity, and Education</i>, 17(1), 30-55.</p> <p>Cabrera, N. L., Franklin, J. D., & Watson, J. S. (2017). Whiteness in higher education: Core concepts and overview. <i>Whiteness in higher education: The invisible missing link in diversity and racial analyses</i> (pp. 16-27). Association for the Study of Higher Education monograph series. San Francisco, CA: Jossey- Bass.</p> <p>Leonardo, Z. (2009). Ontology of whiteness. <i>Race, whiteness, and education</i> (pp. 90-105). New York: Routledge.</p> <p>Leonardo, Z. (2009). Myth of White ignorance. <i>Race, whiteness, and education</i> (pp. 109-125). New York: Routledge.</p> | <p>Group 6 Case Study Presentation</p> <p>Weekly Journal Entry</p> |
| Week 9 | Constructing and Structuring Gender and Sexuality Part I | <p>READ</p> <p>Kimmel., M. S. (2004). Masculinity as homophobia: Fear, shame, and silence in the construction of gender identity. In P. F. Murphy <i>Feminism and Masculinities</i> (pp. 182-199). Oxford: University of Oxford Press.</p> <p>Lorber, J. (1994). 'Night to his day': The social construction of gender. <i>Paradoxes of Gender</i> (pp. 13-36). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.</p> <p>Mehta, C. M., & Dementieva, Y. (2017). The contextual specificity of gender: Femininity and masculinity in college students' same- and other-gender peer contexts. <i>Sex Roles</i>, 76, 604-614.</p> <p>Risman, B. J. (2004). Gender as a social structure: Theory wrestling with activism. <i>Gender & Society</i>, 18(4), 429-450.</p> <p>WATCH</p> <p>Mackay, F. (2019). The difference between gender and sex. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WUVi-XgcQdE.</p> <p>YGender & Minus 18 (2019). Trans 101: The basics. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-3ZzpTxjgRw.</p> | <p>Group 7 Case Study Presentation</p> <p>Weekly Journal Entry</p> |

| WEEK | UNIT | READINGS | DUE |
|---------|--|---|--|
| Week 10 | <p align="center">Constructing and Structuring Gender and Sexuality Part II</p> | <p>READ</p> <p>Garvey, J. C., Mobley, Jr., S. D., Summerville, K. S., & Moore, G. T. (2018): Queer and trans* students of color: Navigating identity disclosure and college contexts. <i>The Journal of Higher Education</i>, DOI: 10.1080/00221546.2018.1449081.</p> <p>Meyer, E. (2007). "But I'm not gay": What straight teachers need to know about queer theory. In M. Rodriguez & W. Pinar (Eds.), <i>Queering straight teachers: discourse and identity in education</i> (pp. 15-32). New York: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.</p> <p>Nicolazzo, Z. (2016). 'It's a hard line to walk': Black non-binary trans* collegians' perspectives on passing, realness, and trans*-normativity, <i>International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education</i>, 29(9). 1173-1188.</p> <p>Somerville, S. B. (2000). Scientific racism and the invention of the homosexual body. In S. B. Somerville <i>Queering the color line: Race and the invention of homosexuality in American culture</i> (pp. 15 - 39). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.</p> <p>WATCH</p> <p>Stewart, D.-L. (2019). Black trans* lives matter. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bs67v5klQI4.</p> | <p align="center">Group 8 Case Study Presentation</p> <p align="center">Weekly Journal Entry</p> |
| Week 11 | <p align="center">Capitalism, Class, & Socioeconomic Status</p> | <p>Alon, J. (2009). The evolution of class inequality in higher education: Competition, exclusion, and adaptation. <i>American Sociological Review</i>, 74(5),731-755.</p> <p>Johnson, A.G. (2005). Capitalism, class, and the matrix of domination. <i>Privilege, power, and difference</i> (pp. 41-53). New York: McGraw-Hill.</p> <p>Kelley, R. D. G. (2017, January 12). What did Cedric Robinson mean by racial capitalism? Retrieved from http://bostonreview.net/race/robin-d-g-kelley-what-did-cedric-robinson-mean-racial-capitalism.</p> <p>Langston, D. (1988). Tired of playing Monopoly?. In J. W. Cochran, D. Langston, and C. Woodward (Eds.) <i>Changing our power: An introduction to women's studies</i> (pp. 397-402). Dubuque, IA: Kendall-Hunt.</p> | <p align="center">Group 9 Case Study Presentation</p> <p align="center">Weekly Journal Entry</p> |

| WEEK | UNIT | READINGS | DUE |
|---------|--|--|---|
| Week 12 | <p style="text-align: center;">Christian Dominance, Islamophobia, and Anti-Semitism</p> | <p>Ahmadi, S. (2011). The erosion of civil rights: Exploring the effects of the Patriot Act on Muslims in American higher education. <i>Rutgers Race & the Law Review</i>, 12, 1-55.</p> <p>Larson, M. H., & Shady, S. L. (2012). Confronting the complexities of Christian privilege through interfaith dialogue. <i>Journal of College and Character</i>, 13(2). doi:10.1515/jcc-2012-1824.</p> <p>McGuire, K. M., Casanova, S., & Davis III, C. H. F. (2016). Exploring the multiple marginality of a non-native born Black Muslim on a predominantly white campus. <i>Journal of Negro Education</i>, 85(3), 316-330.</p> <p>Saxe, L., Sasson, T., Wright, G., & Hecht, S. (2015). <i>Antisemitism and the college campus: Perceptions and realities</i>. Waltham, MA: Maurice and Mary Cohen Center for Modern Jewish Studies at Brandeis University.</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">Group 10 Case Study Presentation</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Weekly Journal Entry</p> |
| Week 13 | NO CLASS | | |
| Week 14 | <p style="text-align: center;">Differences in Ability, Disability, and Academic Ableism</p> | <p>READ</p> <p>Dolmage, J. T. (2017). Disability on campus, on film. <i>Academic ableism: Disability and higher education</i> (pp. 153-183). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.</p> <p>Higbee, J. L., Katz, R. E., & Shultz, J. L. (2010). Disability in higher education: Redefining mainstream. <i>Journal of Diversity Management</i>, 5(2), 7-10.</p> <p>Madriaga, M., Hanson, K., Kay, H., & Walker, A. (2011). Marking-out normalcy and disability in higher education. <i>British Journal of Sociology of Education</i>, 32(6), 901-920.</p> <p>Mutanga, O., & Walker, M. (2015) Towards a disability-inclusive higher education policy through the capabilities approach. <i>Journal of Human Development and Capabilities</i>, 16(4), 501-517.</p> <p>Pye, K. (2016, August 24). Eddie Ndopu, Oxford's first disabled African student, might not be able to attend. Retrieved from https://cherwell.org/2016/08/24/eddie-ndopu-oxfords-first-disabled-african-student-might-not-be-able-to-attend/.</p> <p>WATCH</p> <p>Social Justice Project (2013). Ableism. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=P7_cMziG1Fc&feature=emb_title.</p> | |

| WEEK | UNIT | READINGS | DUE |
|---------|---|---|-----|
| Week 15 | <p>Advocacy, Activism, and Advancing Equity Higher Education Policy and Practice</p> | <p>READ</p> <p>Bell, D. A. (1980). Brown v. Board of Education and the interest convergence dilemma. <i>Harvard Law Review</i>, 93, 518-533.</p> <p>Goldstein, S. B., & Davis, D. S. (2010). Heterosexual allies: A descriptive profile. <i>Equity & Excellence in Education</i>, 43(4), 478-494.</p> <p>Meyerson, D., & Tompkins, M. (2007). Tempered radicals as institutional change agents. <i>Harvard Journal of Law & Gender</i>, 30(2), 303-22.</p> <p>Patton, L. D., & Haynes, C. (2020). Dear White people: Reimagining whiteness in the struggle for racial equity. <i>Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning</i>, 52(2), 41-45.</p> <p>Washington, J. (2012). Social justice education in higher education: A conversation with Rev. Dr. Jaime Washington. <i>Journal of Critical Thought and Praxis</i>, 1(1), 41-48.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED (OPTIONAL)</p> <p>Gillborn, D. (2013). The policy of inequity: Using CRT to unmask white supremacy in education policy. In M. Lynn and D.D. Dixon (Eds.) <i>Handbook of critical race theory in education</i> (pp. 129–140). New York: Routledge.</p> <p>Jones, T., & Nichols, A. (2020, January 15). <i>Hard truths: Why only race-Conscious policies can fix racism in higher education</i>. Washington, D.C.: The Education Trust. https://edtrust.org/resource/hard-truths/.</p> | |