A) Diversity Mapping Project Undertaken:

In Fall 2016 through Summer 2017, Halualani & Associates conducted a diversity mapping of the University of Alabama (hereafter UA) through which we examined all completed diversity efforts and activities that occurred from January 1, 2011 through December 2016 as well as its diversity-related undergraduate and graduate courses across the university curriculum. Developed by Dr. R. Tamiko Halualani, this diversity mapping represents an evidence-based methodology that analyzes an institution’s record of action in relation to diversity and inclusion. In this mapping analysis, a “diversity effort” was defined as “any activity or program that promotes the active appreciation of all campus members in terms of their backgrounds, identities and experiences, as constituted by gender, socioeconomic class, political perspective, age, race, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, disability, regional origin, nationality, occupation and language, among others, as well as any activity or program that brings together any of these aspects.” We defined a “diversity course” as one that “focuses on issues and topics related to various cultural groups, backgrounds, identities and experiences, and/or promotes the larger importance of diversity, difference or cultural sharing for the public.”

B) Key Findings:

1. Diversity Efforts

Through the diversity mapping analysis, we conclude that UA has produced a substantial and consistent record of diversity activity and efforts in the last five years, which constitutes a foundational base from which to take more strategic action on diversity and inclusion. We note that such diversity action, while initially required by the Knight Settlement Agreement, has proliferated into multiple, institutionalized diversity and inclusion programs and initiatives over the years. Specifically, we found the following:

- **UA has produced an ample record of diversity activity in the last five years.** More specifically, UA has produced 1,695 active diversity efforts. This amount is equivalent to the amount that we typically see for campuses with 30,000 - 48,000 students. Thus, UA has completed a record of diversity activity that falls in line with a campus of its student size (37,665 as of Fall 2016). But, quantity is not the only important measure with regard to diversity efforts. Instead, the **quality** of these diversity efforts must be gauged in terms of the extent to which diversity plays a primary role in these efforts. 95% (1615) of UA’s diversity efforts were primarily focused on and centrally designed to achieve an aspect of diversity
(i.e., diversification of students, faculty, staff; inclusion and belonging of specific diverse groups, and exposure to diverse perspectives and identities). Meaning, that when UA sets out to engage in diversity, equity, and inclusion work, it does so with a concentrated focus. A significant portion of these efforts represent quality diversity programs and initiatives that have become permanent and institutionalized.

- However, while there is indeed diversity activity taking place at this university, and UA’s record of efforts are broadly aligned with the five goals (as listed below) of its Strategic Diversity Plan 2008 (as mandated by the Knight Settlement Agreement), such activity will need to undergo the next iteration of its diversity strategy. By this, we mean that the University of Alabama needs to establish a more current and tailored strategic vision of what it aims to accomplish with regard to diversity, equity, and inclusion within a specific time period (two to five years, five to ten years) while also maintaining its core commitments to and promises regarding diversity as outlined in the 2008 Strategic Diversity Plan. We have several conclusions (as designated below) regarding the strategic direction of UA as indicated by the examined record of diversity efforts.

- Indeed, we acknowledge that the designated (to the right) five goals from the Strategic Diversity Plan 2008 have provided an important foundation and base from which the last seven to eight years of diversity efforts (five years of which we examined) have proliferated. However, we note that these goals do not constitute a larger contemporary diversity strategic vision to lead UA into the future. Moreover, the Strategic Diversity Plan 2008 goals need to be revisited in terms of their utility, potency, and framing of diversity.

- For instance, Goal One (“Communicate the University of Alabama’s commitment to diversity as part of its educational mission”) is important to declare UA’s commitment to diversity (and stands as a First Order Effort in our Diversity Change Order layer). However, merely showcasing one’s commitment via this goal, may not be enough if demonstrative and impactful, sustained action does not follow such declarations. We noted that some efforts which
represented statements of diversity commitment in specific divisions and units did not always progress into significant diversity activity.

• **Goal Two** ("Goal Two: Create and sustain an inviting, respectful, and inclusive campus environment that enhances awareness and appreciation of cultural and individual diversity, promotes community and tolerance, and prepares students for the global society in which they will live and work") should be revisited in terms of the scope of efforts and its linkage to UA's curricula so that diversity co-curricular, student and professional development activities, and curricular components (course content, pedagogical approaches) are integrated and aligned. We also encourage UA to examine its notion of “tolerance” and determine its theoretical and pedagogical utility for creating an “inviting, inclusive, and respectful community” as the notion of “tolerance” is often negatively framed as yet another form of exclusion and separation. Acceptance, awareness, and understanding of others’ views, perspectives, experiences, identities, and backgrounds (in approach and discourse) may be the more fruitful path for inclusion for the University of Alabama.

• **Goal Three** ("Increase diversity within the University’s faculty and senior level administration to ensure that students are exposed to and learn from individuals from a variety of backgrounds and experiences, and consequently graduate with a better ability to understand, appreciate, and contribute to a global society") and **Goal Four** ("Increase diversity within the University’s student body to enrich the learning environment, foster more informed and open perspectives, promote community, and better prepare our students to live and work in an ever-expanding global environment") will always stand as core diversity goal areas for UA especially given the historical contexts of the university and the region’s historical legacy related to racial oppression, segregation, and the denial of rights to LGBTQIA persons.

• **Goal Five** ("Annually review goals and assess effectiveness of actions steps and initiatives in enhancing diversity within our educational mission") does not represent the most optimal, stand-alone diversity plan goal. Instead, it is a necessary requirement and practice of accountability for all diversity strategic plans and strategic plans in general.
• In terms of the Strategic Diversity Plan 2008 goals, the majority (69%, 1168) of UA's diversity efforts represented Goal Two (“Create and sustain an inviting, respectful, and inclusive campus environment that enhances awareness and appreciation of cultural and individual diversity, promotes community and tolerance, and prepares students for the global society in which they will live and work”) activities, followed by Goal Five (“Annually review goals and assess effectiveness of actions steps and initiatives in enhancing diversity within our educational mission”) (21%, 354). 4% (64) of the diversity efforts aligned with Goal One (“Communicate the University of Alabama's commitment to diversity as part of its educational mission”) while 3% (45) represented Goal Three (“Increase diversity within the University’s faculty and senior level administration to ensure that students are exposed to and learn from individuals from a variety of backgrounds and experiences, and consequently graduate with a better ability to understand, appreciate, and contribute to a global society”) and another 3% (58) were not directly related to any of the goal areas.

• While there is a university-wide strategic plan, “The UA Strategic Plan: Advancing the Flagship” that features strategic goals (namely Goals #1 and #3) that touch on diversity, these will not be enough to steer UA towards a meaningful diversity-centered future. As emphasized on the previous pages, a new university-wide diversity strategic plan (for three to five years) with a central framework (for all units to inflect in their own way) is needed to make sure that there is a shared vision and intentionality, affirmed commitment, and underscored direction.

• With a record of diversity activity and the need for the next-level diversity, equity, and inclusion strategic plan, UA needs to build up its diversity infrastructure. UA's newly hired Vice President and Associate Provost for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (Dr. G. Christine Taylor) represents an excellent first move in building a diversity infrastructure at the University of Alabama. This role's scope of duties and functions as the university-wide diversity leader is well-defined and in line with our recommended next steps. However, this role should also report to the President (as opposed to just the Executive Vice President and Provost) and be a permanent member of the President's Cabinet in order to be a central locus on diversity and inclusion at the highest level of the university. Under Dr. Taylor, a diversity infrastructure should be built up in terms of a larger division, key staff members (one for diversity education, another for diversity analytics), and needed resources.

• UA's diversity efforts demonstrate that UA approaches diversity and inclusion through a larger “team” or campus wide approach. Meaning, all ten (10) of the main campus divisions (Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, Community Affairs, Financial Affairs, Office of the Provost, Office of the President, Athletic Department, Museums, Advancement, and Research & Economic Development) have contributed to the diversity activity within the last five years, with Academic
Affairs (44%, 753), Student Affairs (31%, 533), and Community Affairs (15%, 247) as leading the efforts.

- **UA's diversity efforts also reveal that there is solid collaboration among divisions and units around those efforts.** Specifically, 19% (316) of UA's diversity-related efforts represented collaborations among divisions/units. There were 1111 collaborators and an average of 2 collaborators for every diversity effort. Such information reflects positively on the teamwork potential at UA around diversity and inclusion efforts.

- **Over half of UA's diversity efforts are institutionalized and make up its diversity organizational infrastructure.** For example, 52% (884) of diversity efforts have been permanent, recurring, and therefore, institutionalized over the last five years. 92% (1552) of UA's diversity efforts are directly initiated by its main divisions and its next level units. This indicates that there is a level of institutionalization and resource investment on diversity and inclusion at the core power levels of the university. Moreover, we also found that the majority (90%, 1528) of the diversity efforts are activated by sub-division and program level units while 10% (167) are initiated by the main divisions. Such a finding is not uncommon in higher education. However, it is ideal if the main divisions’ efforts represent strategic frameworks or goals that the next-level units can take up and enact. We did not see this as being the case to the fullest extent at UA.

- **However, as a counterpoint to the above finding, 48% (811) of UA's efforts are not institutionalized and represented one-shot or fleeting activities that waned after one semester or one to two years.** This again underscores the need for a new strategic direction when it comes to diversity, equity, and inclusion work at UA. So while over 1600 diversity efforts have occurred at UA in the last five years, the question remains: What is UA moving towards? What does UA want to achieve by way of diversity and inclusive excellence? Who does it want to serve and in what ways? What kinds of efforts does UA want to focus on? Universities cannot do everything with limited fiscal resources and external pressures (tuition driven dependency, community and workforce needs). Thus, UA needs to make decisions about the kinds of diversity efforts it wants to prioritize in the next few years and ideally, have those efforts align with a strategic framework.

- **In the last five years, UA's diversity efforts have mostly been diversity-related events and programming.** In terms of type of diversity effort, we found that UA had mostly events (48%, 809) followed by student organizations (8%, 144), campus resources (8%, 141), and student recruitment activities (8%, 131). The remaining 28% of diversity efforts are spread out across 20 different themes. Such a finding reveals that there has not been a strategic logic or vision in the last five years in relation to the university's diversity activities. While the 2008 Strategic Diversity Plan featured broad-based diversity and inclusion goals and these goals began to fill a much-needed historical void, these elements will not be enough to establish a diversity-centered organizational structure for the future. Instead, UA should design its own next-level diversity strategic plan (with a centralized framework) so that all of its divisions and units can move forward in an intentional strategic direction.
• **Paralleling the above finding, a significant portion of UA's diversity efforts are not framed for the long-term time frame and thus, may not make a lasting impact.** More specifically, while 43% (733) of UA's diversity efforts are slated to last for several years as institutionalized programs, 53% (895) are framed for the immediate or short-term time frame as either one-time events or initiatives. However, it is duly noted that UA has impressively established a consistent and substantial record of diversity activity since 2008. We reaffirm the need for UA to put a newer diversity strategic framework in place in order to guide the design and implementation of efforts for multiple years (or in line with the time frame of the diversity strategic plan). Indeed, the 2008 Strategic Diversity Plan clearly demonstrates that the mandate for such a plan has helped to sediment and embed diversity efforts and programs into the organizational structure and fabric of the University of Alabama. A more current diversity strategic framework that takes up where the 2008 plan leaves off (or one that builds on top of it) will extend this path even more so.

• **In terms of its strategic sequence in relation to diversity and inclusion (or Halualani & Associates’ Change Order sequence), UA is clearly located in a second order stage, or the stage through which the institution has demonstrated its commitment to diversity and inclusion by embarking on and completing diversity actions, efforts, programs, and activities.** 97% (1645) of the diversity efforts are second order efforts while 3% (50) stand as first order efforts (or those that declare the institution’s commitment to diversity). Because we found evidence of recurrence and institutionalization of these efforts, we locate UA in a firm second order stage position. In order to make it to a third order stage (through which a strategic framework anchors and organizes the diversity activities and there is impact determination of such efforts), UA needs to actually craft a more current or updated diversity strategic framework through which to steer itself in the desired direction with regard to diversity, equity, and inclusion. In addition, UA should create more robust mechanisms to assess or identify the impact of its diversity efforts. By doing so, it will be able to determine if it is moving in the desired strategic direction and or to be more intentional and purposeful about its diversity efforts. Though Goal Five (“Annually review goals and assess effectiveness of actions steps and initiatives in enhancing diversity within our educational mission”) in the 2008 Strategic Diversity Plan has required
UA to provide annual reports of its diversity-related activities, there are no evaluative frameworks in place to review these reports and determine the diversity progress and achievements made. Thus, there is a record of diversity activity but not a clear sense of the extent to which these efforts are “moving the dial” for UA in building a strong, inclusive, and diversity-centered community.

- **UA’s diversity efforts are predominantly specific group-focused as opposed to a mainstream/generalized target audience.** For example, 70% (1190) of the diversity efforts hone in on and target specific diverse groups while only 30% (505) engage an amorphous diverse audience. The efforts that target specific diverse groups focus on the following: historically underrepresented campus members (36%, 611), female campus members (10%, 166), international campus members (8%, 140), African American campus members (7%, 116), campus members with disabilities (4%, 60), LGBTQIA campus members (2%, 29), active duty/veteran/military campus members (2%, 29), Hispanic/Latino campus members (1%, 21), first-generation students/campus members (1%, 10), and Native American campus members (1%, 9). This finding indicates that a more targeted (and thus culturally responsive) approach to diversity and inclusion may be at work at UA.

- However, we note that these specific group-focused efforts are predominantly diversity-related events, student organizations, campus resources, diverse student recruitment efforts, and financial aid/scholarships. Of these, three specific group-focused effort types — student organizations, campus resources, and financial aid/scholarships — represent powerful types of targeted interventions for college completion and retention-graduation. These types of efforts may also increase the overall graduation rate (68.7% for a six-year rate) and the specific graduation rates (first-time, full-time freshman cohort six-year) for diverse groups at UA (with 59% for Hispanic/Latino students; 56% for African American students). We urge UA to continue to implement and refine customized interventions for specific diverse groups to factor into retention and graduation rates for diverse students.

- Interventions that significantly factor in college completion and retention-graduation for students include campus resources (or programs and services that help students navigate their academic and social pathways at the university), academic support services, and social support and transition services) and retention-graduation initiatives/programs (Hurtado, Halualani, Ambo, Ramirez, & Alvarado, 2017). We found that UA has created and implemented these types of efforts mostly for the following student segments: historically underrepresented students (or African Americans, Hispanic/Latinos, Native Americans, Southeast Asians, Pacific

---

1 Hurtado, S., Halualani, R.T., Ambo, T., Ramirez, J, & A. Alvarado. (2017). “Organizing for Equity & Success,” a panel presentation at AACU’s 2017 conference regarding an institutional case study and retention “effort mapping,” a novel form of inquiry, in which these researchers provided a comprehensive portrait on how one exemplar institution works to ensure the degree probability of low-income, first generation, and underrepresented minority students.
Islanders, Alaska Natives), veteran/military students, international students, students with disabilities, female students, and African American students in particular. Such activity should be commended in that there are specific needs and experiences of a university environment that require customized attention.

- **We also highlight several positive findings about college completion and retention-graduation efforts for diverse students at UA.**

  - We note that there is the fullest range of diversity efforts in terms of student clubs/organizations, campus resources, financial aid/scholarships, academic program support, and retention-graduation initiatives for historically underrepresented students (as a larger group) and African American students.

  - Likewise, the specific student retention-graduation initiatives especially focused on helping historically underrepresented students (as a larger group) and African American students. Student clubs/organizations and campus resources represent efforts that target and include the widest range of diverse groups on campus (in terms of race/ethnicity, nationality, gender, sexual orientation, age/generation, and disabilities).

  - There is a greater proportion of identity-based student clubs/organizations and campus resources for African American students, Asian American students, Hispanic/Latino students, female students, international students, and students with disabilities than targeted academic program support for those student segments.

  - A closer examination of how diverse students experience UA through a campus climate survey may help in identifying the most optimal combination of student clubs/organizations and campus resources to help increase student belonging for diverse and first generation students.

- **UA’s diversity efforts frame “diversity” in terms of important, highly relevant, and complex constructions of culture.** For instance, UA’s diversity efforts mostly define diversity in terms of Race/Ethnicity (23%, 1547), Intersectionalities (22%, 1476), Gender (21%, 1432), Socioeconomic Status (10%, 683), Broad Culture/Diversity (8%, 565), International/Global Formations (3%, 229), and Sexual Orientation (3%, 221). Taken together, these framings of diversity represent important points of learning about diversity and difference at the university. More, however, can be done with regard to Disabilities, Active Duty/Veterans, Religion, Region, Political Ideology, and Age/Generation as these are important diversity positionalities. In terms of the time series analysis, there has been a steady stream of diversity efforts that focus on Religion, International/Global Cultures, and Race/Ethnicity in the last five years. There has been a noticeable increase in diversity efforts that engage Gender and Broad Culture/Diversity over the last three to four years.
• **In terms of the larger approach to diversity**, UA’s diversity efforts engage diversity in terms of fostering an active appreciation of cultural groups and perspectives as well as creating entry points for historically underrepresented groups. For example, 68% (1152) of UA’s diversity-related efforts represent active diversity, or efforts that develop, build, support, and promote diversity in general and of specific cultural groups through programs, trainings/workshops, events, and student clubs/organizations. 22% (368) of the diversity efforts work towards creating conditions and structures (especially in the areas of recruitment, hiring, retention) to help include historically underrepresented and marginalized groups (in terms of gender, religion, sexual orientation, and race/ethnicity) in higher education. These inclusion-focused efforts mostly focus on Religion, Intersectionalities, Broad Culture/Diversity, and Gender. 173 (10%) of diversity efforts highlight social justice or those that identify power differences and inequalities and works to dismantle such disproportionate power relations. Within these efforts, Sexual Orientation, Gender, and Race/Ethnicity are engaged the most through a social justice approach. We commend UA for these efforts and look forward to more across all of these approach types.

• **In terms of how diversity is “talked about” and articulated**, UA’s diversity efforts employ language that mostly highlights pluralism and historical underrepresentation. 79% (1335) of its diversity efforts used language and terms when referring to diversity in terms of the acceptance and appreciation of various cultural groups and their unique identities in its overall campus community. 11% (191) of UA’s diversity efforts employed language related to historical underrepresentation and the importance of ensuring that specific racial/ethnic and gender (namely women) groups are provided the fullest access to a quality education. As a significant finding, there were 169 (10%) efforts that used the language of a “critical approach” or a perspective that examines culture and identity as intricately linked to power, structures, and societal inequalities; this is a significant number of efforts that feature critical power-based language or discursive framing that we have ever found within a campus’ diversity efforts.

• **UA’s diversity-related events and programming primarily exposes campus members to diversity issues and perspective-taking.** These diversity-related events mostly feature DELTA Level 1 - Knowledge Awareness (61%, 493) followed by DELTA Level 5 - Evaluation-Critique of Power Differences (21%, 169) and DELTA Level 3 - Interaction (10%, 84). Thus, diversity efforts are mostly exposing campus members to diversity perspectives and issues and having campus members participate in perspective-taking (DELTA Level 1 - Knowledge Awareness and DELTA Level 3 - Interaction).

  • However, it should be noted that 21% (170) of UA’s diversity-related events focus on engaging campus members into topics and discussions about diversity in terms of power relations, social structures, and contexts of inequalities. The events that specifically engaged DELTA Level 5 - Evaluation-Critique of Power Differences focused on Race/Ethnicity (74%, 124), and Gender (14%, 23). (Sexual Orientation, International/Global
Cultures, Broad Culture/Diversity, Nationality, Religion, and Socioeconomic Status were also engaged in this DELTA layer but to a lesser extent.

- 8% (68) of these events recur each year. As such, the diversity-related events that recur, provide more exposure to Political Ideology, Broad Culture/Diversity, Active Duty/Veterans, Sexual Orientation, Disabilities, and Race/Ethnicity. We urge UA to continue to create events and programs that engage the higher DELTA levels more (for e.g., Level 5 - Evaluation-Critique of Power Differences, Level 6 - Social Agency & Action, Level 7 - Innovative Problem Solving) and to gauge the extent to which campus members are experiencing such engagement. We also recommend linking these events to UA courses and specifically course assignments and units in terms of shared student learning objectives about diversity/diverse perspectives and demonstrated performance on these student learning objectives through participation in a UA diversity event (this can all be done through a diversity strategic plan). A passport program that links diversity-related events to courses, is also recommended.

- Our diversity mapping provides a closer look at diverse faculty and staff recruitment and retention efforts in terms of the presence, frequency, and quality of such efforts. UA has engaged diverse faculty recruitment over the last five years but needs to do more with regard to this area and also in terms of faculty retention. In addition, more effort needs to be made for diverse staff recruitment and retention.

- For example, we note that UA’s efforts have delved into the following areas for diversifying its faculty (and in this particular order in terms of effort frequency): advertising/outreach approaches, grow your own (recruiting former graduate students, and search committee training. However, more creative (“outside the box”) strategies will need to be designed to recruit diverse faculty for the future and make needed headway in this area.

- Few efforts have specifically focused on recruiting and retaining diverse UA staff members and thus, targeted efforts should be designed for this group (and in terms of workforce development and advancement).
In terms of a time series analysis of the diversity efforts, there has been considerable diversity activity and movement by UA over the last five years but mostly within the last three years, by specific divisions, in terms of events and efforts that highlighted Race/Ethnicity and Broad Culture/Diversity. Specifically, we note the following:

- Between 2013 and 2015, there was an increase in the number of diversity efforts at UA. (There was actually a decrease in the number of diversity efforts at UA from 2012 to 2013.)

- Student Affairs and Community Affairs have increased the number of diversity efforts from their divisions in the last three to four years. Academic Affairs has also increased the number of their diversity efforts but at a more steady pace.

- Diversity-related events have continued to increase and remain steady in the last three to four years while diversity-related campus resources (academic support programs, identity-based centers, support services programs for diverse students) have remained steady in the last three to four years. Diversity-related student clubs/organizations have held steady in number over the last five years. (From 2011 through early 2013, there was a decrease in the number of diversity efforts.)

- Efforts that highlighted Broad Culture/Diversity and Gender experienced the most positive change over the last three to four years (i.e., increasing in number over time). Efforts that engaged Race/Ethnicity and International/Global Cultures decreased in number (and in spurts) throughout the last five years.

- UA’s diversity efforts have mostly framed “diversity” as a topic/issue or in terms of a specific diverse group/community, and tapped into the affective-emotional dimension for diversity engagement.

  - Specifically, the campus’ diversity efforts have predominantly framed diversity as a topic/issue (48%, 809) to learn about or as the needs and experiences of specific diverse groups/communities (34%, 580). The remaining efforts positioned diversity as a skill to be gained (8%, 143), concern for the larger context/setting (7%, 118), as a concept/philosophy/approach (2%, 26), and as a demographic or data segment (1%, 19).

  - Campuses should also explore the extent to which it engages the minds (the cognitive dimension), hearts (the affective-emotional dimension), and habits (behaviors) (the behavioral dimension and the social-interactional dimension) of its campus members with regard to diversity. In this vein, UA’s diversity efforts mostly tap into the affective-emotional dimension (30%, 1026) of diversity engagement for targeted populations, which gets at the feelings, internal reflections, and self-introspections of individuals with regard to a diversity focus. Such a layer is an often-
neglected focus at colleges and universities, and thus, UA should feel
heartened by this finding. The other engaged dimensions for campus
members were the cognitive dimension (gaining new knowledges and
information about diversity issues) (26%, 869), social-interactional
dimension (how to connect with culturally different peers, how to create
social support networks with identity groups and diverse groups, how to be
a part of a shared community) (24%, 797), and the behavioral dimension
(how to be more inclusive, interculturally competent, and how to engage in
allyship and social praxis) (21%, 698). There is movement and activity on
the part of UA for all of these dimensions, and a more strategic approach
may help to increase the work done on the social-interactional and
behavioral dimensions.

• Just under half of UA's diversity efforts contribute to improving campus climate
or building up the structures of belonging for diverse students. 48% (808) of
the diversity efforts represent attempts to create mechanisms, programs, and
structures to increase diverse student belonging.

  • Of these campus climate-focused efforts, 50% (405) emphasized the
creation of opportunities for success, leadership, and thriving for diverse
students. 28% (224) of the campus climate-focused efforts honed in on
creating interactional support networks for students while 22% (174) of
the efforts focused on addressing the adjustment and acclimation needs of
diverse students.

  • 81% (654) of these campus climate-focused efforts are at the individual
level while 19% (154) target the institutional level (4 of these efforts were
framed as both levels). In terms of the individual level of campus climate,
the efforts focused on the psychological aspects (78%, 507) of the student
experience (or the ways in which students feel as if they belong in college
and in their higher educational environment and see themselves as valued
and capable students/scholars) and the behavioral aspects (22%, 147) of
the student experience (or the ways in which students are equipped with
skills and practices to help them develop as scholars). The campus-climate
efforts that targeted the institutional level, represented activities to build up
UA’s organizational infrastructure with student-belonging programs and
initiatives.

  • UA’s attempts to strengthen campus climate for its members and increase
diverse student belonging will need to be aligned with the results of a
conducted university-wide campus climate survey (every two years)
through which all campus members can report on how they are
experiencing UA and their peers in their respective roles (students, staff,
faculty, administrators).

• The University of Alabama’s diversity efforts reflect its institutional capacity to
engage diversity mostly in terms of campus learning, education, dialogue, and
awareness of diversity, equity, and inclusion topics.
When analyzing diversity efforts enacted by a higher educational institution, it is important to examine the **diversity capacity** of that institution. By “diversity capacity,” we mean the institution’s ability to fulfill and carry out its mission and values, and goals with regard to diversity, equity, and inclusion work for all of its campus members. Such an institutional diversity capacity could include specific resources (fiscal, non-fiscal) allocated for diversity purposes, skill sets of its members that relate to diversity, equity, and inclusion, and processes established to help achieve diversity goals.

In this area, we found that UA’s efforts reflect a robust and productive **educational resource type of capacity** when it comes to diversity, equity, and inclusion. By this, we mean that 58% (977) of UA’s diversity efforts (that related to capacity areas) focused on educating its campus members on key topics, needs, and contexts that are related to diversity. Much of this was done through events, trainings, community partnerships, and discussion/dialogue groups. Our analysis also identified that 34% (575) of the diversity efforts (that related to capacity areas) reflected an **organizational/structural resource type of capacity** or programs and initiatives that are built into UA’s current organizational structure to drive and address diversity needs. Lastly, we also found that 8% (142) of diversity efforts that related to capacity areas, constituted a **social capital resource type of capacity**, or activities that created social networking opportunities and “intercultural relations” channels among culturally diverse campus members and for specific historically underrepresented groups.

Such a finding indicates solid diversity and inclusion work on the part of UA. However, with more of an updated strategic vision, focus, and plan for achieving specific diversity goals in the future (and addressing long-held diversity challenges from the past to the present), UA’s institutional diversity capacity should grow and reflect a rich and varied range of resources and capacity types.

Overall, the diversity mapping reveals that UA has engaged in diversity activity but with little to no strategic direction; thus, there is movement without full momentum on diversity goals. (The graphics to the right and on the next page, reveal lower scores/percentages in Diversity Momentum, Diversity Strategy, Diversity Infrastructure, Diversity Capacity, and Diversity Curricular Exposure and closer to midpoint scores for Diversity Achievement.)

While UA has engaged in diversity activity, it has been movement with broad-based diversity...
strategy (as established nine years ago) and thus without full momentum towards a current diversity vision. Its efforts, though, have built up some capacity at UA especially in the area of educational resource capacity.

• With the recent hiring of a Vice President and Associate Provost for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion, there is the beginning foundation of diversity infrastructure as connected to all divisions and units, which will be vital for diversity strategy.

• There has been some gains/progress made in areas of diverse faculty, staff, and student recruitment as well as the establishment of diversity programs and initiatives. There, however, is much more to be done in the area of recruitment as well.

2. Diversity-Related Curricula

• We examined the University of Alabama’s undergraduate and graduate curricula. We identified many intellectually and perspectivally rich academic course offerings created by talented faculty members at UA. There are areas of high-quality diversity exposure in the current undergraduate and graduate curricula. However, there are a number of decision points about the role of diversity throughout its curricula that need to be broached (and are pointed out throughout this summary).

UA’s Undergraduate Diversity-Related Courses

• The University of Alabama features a solid offering of vibrant diversity-related undergraduate courses.

  • Over one-third of UA’s undergraduate curriculum (36%, 1083 courses) is diversity-related (out of a total of 2917 undergraduate courses). However, 64% (695 courses) of UA’s undergraduate curriculum is partially focused on diversity or a course that has diversity as a secondary or supplementary emphasis; this indicates that the majority of UA’s undergraduate curriculum does not engage diversity as a primary focus of a course.

  • 30% (327 courses) of all diversity-related undergraduate courses are primary which means that the diversity content constitutes the dominant focus of the course.

  • As a positive finding, 6% (61 courses) of UA’s undergraduate curriculum is integrated with diversity which means that diversity aspects are connected to every course unit/module and class discussion.
• With 388 undergraduate courses spanning a primary and or integrated focus on diversity (or 36% of the entire UA undergraduate curriculum), a portion of UA's diversity related courses at the undergraduate level has the potential to maximize diversity learning engagement for its undergraduate students. However, there is much more work to do (as indicated in next several pages).

• The primary diversity-related undergraduate courses mostly frame diversity in terms of International/Global Cultures, Race/Ethnicity and Religion. Partial diversity-related undergraduate courses engaged International/Global Cultures, Race/Ethnicity Language, and Broad Culture/Diversity.

• It should also be noted that diversity-related courses most often appear in disciplinary areas that speak to such course content in their subject matter; our firm looks for how such courses may exist throughout a university's curriculum so that all majors are exposed to diversity content, issues, perspectives, contexts, and pedagogies. As a positive finding, our analysis found that every academic college and major unit at UA featured diversity-related courses (in varying percentages and numbers). We find this to be a positive finding in that diversity is being somewhat embedded (although not uniformly or equally) across UA's diversity curriculum. More evidence of this can be seen in the finding that the diversity-related undergraduate courses are mostly disciplinary-based content courses (80%, 868) followed by language instruction courses (13%, 140), global/international-focused courses (3%, 33), and Ethnic Studies content courses (3%, 31), among others.

• UA's diversity-related undergraduate courses emphasize a more culture-general (etic) approach. 61% (658) of UA's diversity-related courses are culture-general while 39% (425) are culture-specific. However, a greater percentage (34%, 222) of the culture-general courses engage Race/Ethnicity more than that (12%, 45) of the culture-specific courses. This indicates that courses that look at larger processes, dynamics, and topics related to culture in a more general or overarching way are engaging multiple framings of diversity like Race/Ethnicity International/Global Cultures, Gender, and Religion. Interestingly enough, the culture-specific courses engage International/Global Cultures (41%, 147) and Language (38%, 139) the most. A healthy blend of both culture-general (etic) and culture-specific (emic) curricular treatments is ideal for diversity engagement. With this, there also needs to more attention paid to the singular (culture-specific) treatments of specific diverse cultures and identity areas in the undergraduate curriculum.

• The diversity-related undergraduate courses at UA emphasize international/global framings of diversity more than domestic ones. In terms of the spread of culture, UA's diversity-related courses highlighted international/global cultural formations (41%, 441) as opposed to domestic cultures (24%, 263). 35% (379) of the diversity-related courses spoke to both international/global and domestic cultures (local, regional, national U.S. issues of difference on race/ethnicity, socioeconomic class, gender, sexual orientation, age, generation, disabilities).
• **UA’s diversity-related undergraduate courses uniquely speak to both the contemporary and historical aspects of culture for a rounded out perspective of cultural contexts.** In terms of the temporality of culture, 43% (469) of UA's diversity-related courses focused on the contemporary aspects (present-day topics, experiences, content) as opposed to just the historical aspects (past topics, experiences, content). 36% (395) of diversity-related courses engaged both the historical and contemporary aspects. It should be noted that the historical aspects of culture were mostly engaged in courses that looked at both temporalities (the historical past and the current present).

• **As another positive leverage point, UA diversity-related undergraduate courses that frame diversity in terms of international/Global Cultures, do so as both contemporary and historical contexts.** This is especially significant given that many campuses approach the international/global dimensions of diversity predominantly in terms of contemporary issues and urgencies. Moreover, courses that engage Race/Ethnicity also did so in terms of both historical and contemporary contexts; more needs to be done, however, in historically framing Race/Ethnicity in a historical context (and as a singular treatment in this regard). We found that there was more variety in the specific aspects of diversity that were framed via a contemporary contextualization (International/Global Cultures, Broad Culture/Diversity, Religion, Language, Race/Ethnicity, and Gender) throughout the UA diversity-related undergraduate curriculum than in the historical contextualization.

• **The curricular treatments of culture varies in the undergraduate diversity-related offerings.** The majority of UA's diversity-related courses highlight two or more cultures (60%, 655) followed by singular culture/identity focus (39%, 425). The diversity-related courses that underscore two or more cultures, mostly focused on International/Global Cultures (39%, 255), Race/Ethnicity (34%, 222), and Broad Culture/Diversity (18%, 118). The diversity-related courses that foregrounded a singular cultural identity/focus, engaged International/Global Cultures (40%, 147) and Language (38%, 139) the most.

• **There is an uneven percentage of diversity-related courses in the different class levels, thereby potentially providing diversity exposure at certain stages of the educational pathway.** Most of the diversity-related undergraduate courses at UA are featured at the 300 and 400 levels. For example, the diversity-related undergraduate courses are mostly located in the 400 level courses (35%, 377) and the 300 level courses (33%, 355) which highlights the need for UA to strategize and life stage how diversity is engaged in the course bookends or among the 100 and 200 levels. Diversity exposure seems to increase with each course level: with 14% (158) at the 100 level, 18% (196) at the 200 level, 33% (355) at the 300 level, and 35% (377) at the 400 level. All course levels in terms of the diversity-related courses engage the International/Global Cultures aspect of diversity the most with Language and Race/Ethnicity as the next framings. The 300 and 400 level diversity-related courses highlight International/Global Cultures the most, thereby indicating that UA students gain more exposure to International/Global Cultures (over other aspects of culture such as Race/Ethnicity, Gender, Intersectionalities, Sexual Orientation, Disabilities, and several others) as they complete their degrees and depart UA.
• **There are varied and complex constructions of diversity and culture embedded throughout UA’s diversity-related undergraduate courses.** The diversity-related undergraduate courses mostly framed “diversity” predominantly in terms of Gender (21%, 924), International/Global Cultures (17%, 744), Nationality (14%, 616), Race/Ethnicity (13%, 579), Intersectionalities (11%, 492), Language (11%, 491), Broad Culture/Diversity (3%, 136), and Socioeconomic Status (4%, 194). (Note that similar to the diversity efforts, our team codes up to 4 different framings of diversity for each diversity-related course.)

• **UA’s diversity-related undergraduate courses mostly feature advanced levels of diversity engagement as in deep cultural analysis, evaluation and critique of power differences, and social agency and action.** There exists room, though, for more engagement in terms of evaluation and critique of power differences, social agency and action, and innovative problem-solving.

• In terms of H & A’s Diversity Engagement Learning Taxonomy Assessment (DELTA), the majority of the diversity-related undergraduate courses target the DELTA Level 4 (Advanced Analysis - through which cultural analysis, cultural comparisons, cultural reflexivity, perspective-taking take place) (72%, 779).

• We found that DELTA Level 5 (Evaluation-Critique of Power Differences - through which culture and diversity are connected to power differences, structured inequalities, and disproportionate power relations, systematic and social oppressions, and privilege, are unpacked) is fully embraced in 14% (158) of UA’s diversity-related courses. [6% (70) of the diversity-related undergraduate courses topped out at DELTA Level 6 (Social Agency & Action — through which student identify and reimagine what a more inclusive, just, and equitable society and world would be like and the ways to create such a world and also engage disproportionate power relations of culture).]

• The remaining diversity-related undergraduate courses topped out at DELTA Level 2 (Skills - through which intercultural competence, diversity and inclusion skills are featured) (13%, 143) and DELTA Level 3 (Interaction - through which intergroup discussions and intercultural interaction are spotlighted) (3).
• Thus, while culture and diversity may be broached in courses, these aspects are not always connected to issues of power, historical context, and or structured inequalities in a significant proportion of the undergraduate curriculum.

• When DELTA Level 5 - Evaluation-Critique of Power Differences is occurring, it is mostly in the in the 200 and 400 level courses as opposed to the 100 and 300 levels. However, the most engaged framing of diversity on the higher DELTA Levels like Level 5 - Evaluation-Critique of Power Differences is on Race/Ethnicity and Gender. This indicates that when UA hones in on Race/Ethnicity and Gender in your diversity-related undergraduate courses, those courses reach the higher DELTA engagement levels. As a contrast, the majority of the courses that focus on International/Global dimensions of diversity are mostly located at the mid-range DELTA level (Level 4 - Advanced Analysis, 53% of that level) and not always in terms of power relations.

• Given these findings, we encourage a thoughtful conversation among UA faculty members about how diversity is discussed, theorized, approached, and interrogated across all course levels at UA. What are the specific learning goals and processes that you want UA students to experience in the first year on your campus and throughout each subsequent year and when they leave UA and transition on to their next stage of life? Are these goals and processes different if students transition from high schools or from community colleges? An important decision point stands here at this juncture.

**UA’s Core Curriculum/General Education Requirement Courses**

• General education requirements present opportunities for focused diversity content that may otherwise not be a part of students’ curricular experience. For this reason, Halualani & Associates looked specifically at UA’s Core Curriculum/GE courses to determine the quantity and quality of diversity related courses in each area and at each course level, the ways that diversity is approached, and how deeply diversity is engaged. From this data, we can determine the quality of student exposure to required diversity content. The key question here is: What kind of curricular exposure is provided by UA to diversity dimensions in the Core Curriculum/GE Requirements curriculum and by Core Curriculum/GE Area?

• Approximately half of UA’s Core Curriculum/GE curriculum represents diversity-related courses with mostly a partial focus on diversity. Our team examined the entire Core Curriculum/General Education curriculum. We found that 50% (363) of the Core Curriculum/GE curriculum (a total of 725 certified courses) was diversity-related. 69% (251) was partially focused on diversity while 27% (99) was primarily focused on diversity. There were 13 (4%) courses that we identified as integrated with diversity.
• Diversity-related courses exist throughout all of the Core Curriculum/GE SLO/Outcome areas.
  
  • We found that ten of the eleven Core Curriculum/GE outcome areas featured diversity-related courses. Most notably, 52% (190) of the total Core Curriculum/GE courses existed in the Writing GE Area, 20% (73) in the Humanities (HU) area, and Foreign Language (FL) (14%, 52) as the leading Core Curriculum/GE areas.

• Diversity curricular exposure proffered by the diversity-related courses in the Writing Core Curriculum/GE Area (the most diversity-populated GE area) is solid when it comes to the blended focus on international-global and domestic cultures as well as a combined focus on historical and contemporary aspects of culture. However, the diversity exposure is uneven based on class level and the specific course based on the large number of courses (190) to choose from in this area. This means that relying on Writing Core Curriculum/GE Area to fulfill UA students’ diversity engagement may not be enough in terms of providing varied constructions of culture and ones that link to issues of power and structures of inequality throughout all class levels, and course options. Meaning, more will need to be done curricularly to ensure that every UA student gains a high-quality diversity curricular exposure no matter which Writing Core Curriculum/GE Area course option is selected. This could mean reconstructing that Writing Core Curriculum/GE Area and revising its criteria for certification and or re-thinking the Core Writing Core Curriculum/GE Area completely (perhaps identifying two Core Curriculum/GE areas for diversity exposure: one on international/global aspects and the other on domestic aspects).

  • We found the following regarding the diversity-related courses in the Writing Core Curriculum/GE Area:

    • the majority (60%, 114) of the courses are partially focused on diversity;

    • these partially-focused courses cover International/Global Cultures, Race/Ethnicity, and Broad Culture/Diversity the most;

    • the courses are mostly at the 400 level (4th year) (55%, 104) followed by the 300 level (29%, 55);

    • the 200 and 400 level courses provide the most courses that connect culture and diversity to issues of power in terms of the DELTA Level 5 (Evaluation-Critique of Power Differences - through which culture and diversity are connected to power differences, structured inequalities, and disproportionate power relations, systematic and social oppressions, and privilege, are unpacked);

    • the 300 level courses in this Core Curriculum/GE area have the most variety in terms of the framings of diversity (Race/Ethnicity Religion, International/Global Cultures, Gender, Broad Culture/Diversity, Religion, Disabilities, Language);
• the majority (65%, 62) of the courses in this Core Curriculum/GE area emphasize two or more cultures, and these courses highlight International/Global Cultures, Race/Ethnicity Broad Culture/Diversity, and Religion;

• the majority (42%, 79) of the courses in this Core Curriculum/GE area emphasize both international/global and domestic aspects of culture; the remaining courses are split in terms of engaging domestic aspects (29%, 56) and international aspects (29%, 55) of culture;

• the majority (47%, 90) of the courses in this Core Curriculum/GE area highlight both the historical and contemporary aspects of culture while 27% (52) engage the contemporary aspects of culture only and 25% (48) emphasize the historical aspects of culture;

• the courses in this Core Curriculum/GE Area that frame the contemporary aspects of culture, do so with the most diverse range of constructions of culture (International/Global Cultures, Broad Culture/Diversity, Religion, Race/Ethnicity, and Language);

• the courses in this Core Curriculum/GE Area that frame the historical aspects of culture, do so in terms of International/Global Cultures and Race/Ethnicity;

• the majority of the courses in this Core Curriculum/GE Area feature culture-general (72%, 136) approaches and provides a greater proportion of coverage around Race/Ethnicity than the culture-specific courses in this GE Area. The culture-specific courses in this area engage International/Global Cultures the most.

• **There are different framings of diversity in different Core Curriculum/GE SLO/Outcome areas.**

  • The Writing, Humanities (HU), and Fine Arts (FA) Core Curriculum/GE Areas offer the most varied framings of diversity.

  • The Writing Core Curriculum/GE Area proffers more framings based on International/Global Cultures, Race/Ethnicity, Broad Culture/Diversity, Gender, and Language.

  • The Humanities (HU) Core Curriculum/GE Area provides more framings based on International/Global Cultures, Religion, Language, Broad Culture/Diversity, and Race/Ethnicity.

  • The coded diversity-related courses in the Writing and Humanities (HU) Core Curriculum/GE Areas provide the most coverage of Race/Ethnicity out of all of the other Core Curriculum/GE Areas. The Humanities (HU) Core Curriculum/GE Area provided the most coverage of Religion while the
Writing, Humanities (HU), History (HI), Literature (L), and Fine Arts (FA) Core Curriculum/GE Areas highlighted International/Global Cultures the most. The Foreign Language (FL), Humanities (HU), and Freshman Composition (FC) Core Curriculum/GE Areas provided the most coverage of Language.

- There needs to be more coverage of intersectionalities, age, generation, active duty/veterans, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, and political ideology across the Core Curriculum/GE outcome areas.

- We also note that overall, the diversity-related courses we identified throughout the Core Curriculum/GE curriculum are characterized by the following:
  - the diversity-related Core Curriculum/GE courses tend to focus partially on diversity (69%, 251) and exist more at the 100 and 400 class levels (the bookends);
  - provide more coverage of International/Global cultures across all class levels;
  - represent mostly disciplinary-based content courses (75%, 274);
  - highlight two or more cultures (60%, 219) more than a singular culture/identity focus (39%, 143);
  - emphasize more of the international/global aspects (43%, 156) of culture as opposed to the domestic aspects of culture (22%, 80), with 35% (127) stressing both international/global and domestic dimensions;
  - primarily engage the contemporary (39%, 143) temporality of cultures and a blend of both historical and contemporary framings of culture (29%, 142);
  - stress more culture-general frameworks (61%, 220) as opposed to culture-specific frameworks (39%, 143);
  - define diversity/culture mostly in terms of Gender (21%, 298), International/Global Cultures (20%, 284), Nationality (16%, 227), Language (13%, 185), Race/Ethnicity (11%, 154), and Intersectionalities (11%, 153) as the leading framings;
  - only 14% (53) of the courses engage culture and diversity in terms of issues of power in terms of the DELTA Level 5 (Evaluation-Critique of Power Differences - through which culture and diversity are connected to power differences, structured inequalities, and disproportionate power relations, systematic and social oppressions, and privilege, are unpacked).
• The above findings with regard to Core Curriculum/GE Area diversity-related courses, highlight several conversation and decision points for UA as listed below:

• Because there is NOT an equal blend of a coverage focus on “International/Global” and U.S. “Domestic” diversity contexts, several questions arise: Is it the goal of Core Curriculum/GE (General Education) Requirements at UA to cover that dynamic between the “Global/International” and U.S. “Domestic” diversity contexts? And if so, how is this dynamic approached and covered? Or why aren’t there more approved Core Curriculum/GE Area courses that focus on U.S. domestic issues so that historically specific issues of racialization, power differences, societal inequalities, and U.S. framings/containment of oppressions can take the spotlight? And why don’t extant Core Curriculum/GE Area courses highlight dynamics of power in relation to global forces and dynamics? These questions need to be explored by UA faculty to strengthen the entire Core Curriculum/GE Requirements program.

• The aforementioned findings with regard to the Core Curriculum/GE Area diversity-related courses, depart from the intended curricular architecture and design of General Education diversity-related courses as honing in on specific diverse groups in the U.S. (such as racial/ethnic groups, women, gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender communities, non-Western religious groups) that may need more singular treatment for knowledge awareness, advanced analysis, and evaluation-critique of power differences in terms of a specific group’s historical and sociopolitical contexts.

• A key question is the extent to which all of the different marginalized groups in the U.S. are being covered in Core Curriculum/GE diversity-related courses and in terms of a culture-specific view. There also needs to be discussion about the quality of coverage in the more generalized courses that highlight the evolution of diversity in this country in terms of historical events, group experiences, interface with U.S. institutions and inequalities, and contemporary responses to this history.

**UA’s Diversity-Related Graduate Courses**

• UA’s graduate curricula features a solid collection of diversity-related courses that engage various constructions of culture and a diversity professions-based framework.

• With regard to UA’s graduate curriculum (with a total of 2171 courses), 39% (851) of the graduate curriculum is diversity-related and these courses are predominantly partially-focused (52%, 441) on diversity (or using it as a secondary focus of a course).

• We also note that 38% (324) of UA’s diversity-related courses are primarily focused on diversity, and 10% (86) of the diversity-related courses are integrated with regard to diversity. By diversity integration, we refer to the careful embedding of diversity content and perspectives into disciplinary
subject matter across a field of study. For example, the disciplines of Education, Social Work, Nursing, Health Sciences, and Law have worked towards diversity integration for the last two decades. Our analysis identified a similar pattern with graduate disciplinary programs at UA that integrated their subject matter with diversity contexts and needs of highlighted professions for the advancement of their graduate scholars. We encourage UA to encourage graduate programs and departments to consider ways in which diversity can be meaningfully interspersed (and not through some general, non-descriptive way) throughout its core subject matter. When UA graduate courses focus on “practice” and “professions,” diversity appeared to move closer to integrative curricular practices. It should be noted that while we see the potential here, many courses did not fully embed their material with diversity in a way that would satisfy the “integrated” litmus test.

- The primary diversity-related graduate courses mostly engaged Broad Culture/Diversity (28%, 77), Language (26%, 72), International/Global Cultures (24%, 64), and Race/Ethnicity (22%, 59) while the partial diversity-related graduate courses mostly highlighted Race/Ethnicity (65%, 281). The integrated diversity-related graduate courses mostly highlighted Race/Ethnicity (52%, 42) and International/Global Formations (48%, 39).

- **UA’s diversity-related graduate courses are predominantly disciplinary content courses and thus represent core disciplinary fields of study.**
  - The vast majority (80%, 678) of the diversity-related graduate courses were disciplinary content courses.
  - The 500 level and 600 level diversity-related graduate courses engaged the widest range of constructions of culture: Race/Ethnicity, Broad Culture/Diversity, International/Global Cultures, Disabilities, and Gender the most.

- **Similar to the diversity-related undergraduate curriculum, UA’s graduate diversity curriculum is constituted by curricular offerings from all of the academic colleges/schools/major units.**

- **UA’s diversity-related graduate courses mostly engaged a “two or more cultures” cultural approach.** 64% (543) of the diversity-related graduate courses engaged two or more cultures while 36% (305) highlighted a singular culture/identity focus. The courses that engaged two or more cultures, mostly examined Race/Ethnicity, Broad Culture/Diversity, and International/Global Cultures. The singular culture/identity focused-courses mostly highlighted Race/Ethnicity and International/Global Cultures.

- **UA’s diversity-related courses mostly highlighted the international aspects of culture.** Similar to UA’s undergraduate curriculum which emphasized the international/global aspects of culture, the majority (42%, 354) of diversity-related graduate courses focused on the international/global aspects of culture while 32% (276) emphasized both the domestic and international/global aspects of culture.
26% (221) of the diversity-related graduate courses engaged the domestic aspects of culture.

- **The diversity-related graduate courses stressed contemporary aspects of culture over historical aspects.** UA's diversity-related graduate courses seem to emphasize the contemporary aspects of culture (69%, 591) as opposed to the historical aspects (9%, 80). 21% (180) of the diversity-related graduate courses focus on both the contemporary and historical aspects of culture. The historical-focused diversity-related courses mostly highlighted International/Global Cultures and Language while the courses that engaged both the contemporary and historical aspects, engaged Race/Ethnicity, Language, and Gender the most. The contemporary-focused diversity-related courses emphasized Race/Ethnicity, International/Global Cultures, Broad Culture/Diversity, and Language the most. We note that there is room for more courses that historicize Race/Ethnicity Intersectionalities, Gender, Sexual Orientation, Socioeconomic Status, and Disabilities.

- **UA's diversity-related graduate courses feature a more culture-general (etic) framework.** 82% (700) of the diversity-related graduate courses are culture-general while 18% (151) are culture-specific. The culture-general diversity-related courses engage Race/Ethnicity more than the culture-specific courses. This indicates that while Race/Ethnicity is incorporated into overview diversity-related courses, there may need to be more dedicated curricular treatments of and or showcases of Race/Ethnicity in relation to specific graduate fields of study. The culture-specific diversity-related graduate courses engage Language and International/Global Formations the most.

- **As an impressive finding, UA's diversity-related graduate courses featured a wide range of multiple and interlocking constructions of culture and diversity.** More specifically, the diversity-related graduate courses proffered framings of diversity mostly in terms of the following leading categories: Gender (20%, 676), Race/Ethnicity (19%, 663), Intersectionalities (19%, 644), International/Global Cultures (12%, 402), Socioeconomic Status (11%, 383), Nationality (6%, 206), Language (5%, 185), and Broad Culture/Diversity (5%, 154), among others. (Note that similar to the diversity efforts, our team codes up to 4 different framings of diversity for each diversity-related course.) We especially commend the framing of Intersectionalities across many diversity-related graduate courses as it is becoming increasingly relevant to today's diversity landscape and is highly relevant to students.

- **Similar to the undergraduate diversity-related curricular offerings, UA's diversity-related graduate courses feature higher levels of diversity engagement but there is room for further engagement in terms of evaluation-critique of power differences, social agency and action, and innovative problem-solving.** In terms of H & A’s Diversity Engagement Learning Taxonomy Assessment (DELTA), 91% (774) of the diversity-related graduate courses target the DELTA Level 4 (Advanced Analysis - through which deep cultural analysis, cultural comparisons, cultural reflexivity, and perspective-taking, take place). The DELTA Level 5 (Evaluation-Critique of Power Differences - through which culture and diversity are connected to power differences, structured inequalities, and disproportionate
power relations, systematic and social oppressions, and privilege, are unpacked) is fully engaged in 9% (77) of UA’s diversity-related graduate courses. [6% (53) of the diversity-related graduate courses topped out at DELTA Level 6 (Social Agency & Action — through which student identify and reimagine what a more inclusive, just, and equitable society and world would be like and the ways to create such a world).] The DELTA Level 5 (Evaluation-Critique of Power Differences) courses mostly engage Gender, Race/Ethnicity, Broad Culture/Diversity, and International/Global Cultures. DELTA Level 6 (Social Agency & Action) courses mostly engage Race/Ethnicity, Broad Culture/Diversity, and Language.

- UA’s diversity-related graduate courses connect aspects of diversity (in terms of identities, issues, contexts, and skills) to professions for graduate students/scholars. 62% (524) of the diversity-related graduate courses are diversity professions-based courses and represented integrated curricular designs to connect diversity to real-world contexts and scenarios as it related to the disciplines/professions-of-focus. It is interesting though that there is a strong sole international/global focus over a purely domestic focus in this graduate curriculum.

- As a point of pride, 92 (11%) of the diversity-related graduate courses featured elements of unique curricular approaches to diversity. Of these, 78% (72) featured a social justice (unpacking oppressions) approach, 11% (10) engaged an international or nations-based approach while 10% (9) highlighted a strong intercultural competence-based approach.

### Schedule Analysis Findings

- Our Schedule Analysis (through which we examine which diversity-related courses UA offers as opposed to just having on “the books” in the last 3 years) showcases that UA offers a significant portion of its already created diversity-related undergraduate courses. In terms of its undergraduate curriculum, UA has offered 83% (902) of its diversity-related courses in the last 2 years (180 diversity-related courses were not offered - or 17%). This is the highest percentage of offered diversity-related courses that we have ever found in any diversity mapping that we have conducted! However, only 16% (144) of the diversity related courses were offered every semester for the three-year time span.

---

### Diversity Engagement & Learning Taxonomy (DELTA)

(Dalualani, Haiker, & Lancaster, 2012)

- **Level 1 - Knowledge-Awareness**
  - Knowledge, Awareness, Appreciation
  - Touches on Social Approvability Level

- **Level 2 - Skills**
  - Application/Intercultural Competence/Skills-based

- **Level 3 - Interaction**
  - Active Involvement in Intercultural Interactions
  - Motivation, Seeking Out, Participating Behavior

- **Level 4 - Advanced Analysis**
  - Perspective-Taking/ Reflection/ Analysis, Self-Other Dynamic
  - Unscripted/Off the Beaten Path
  - Free-flying among concepts, areas to ferret out the big, difficult questions and major problematics, stakes, urgencies

- **Level 5 - Evaluation-Critique**
  - Evaluation/Critique of Power Differences, Positionality/Compassion
  - Posing Complex Questions

- **Level 6 - Social Agency & Action**
  - Designing Actions, Personal-Social Responsibility
  - Able to see connections across differences

- **Level 7 - Innovative Problem Solving**
  - Innovative thinking
  - Uses multiple perspectives to develop new, original, unique, impactful strategies & solutions to problematics
  - Relies on multiple heuristics (from all cultures, contexts, arenas of life)
examined. The highest percentage of diversity-related courses offered (23%, 206), was for two semesters for the three-year time span.

- The diversity-related undergraduate courses that were offered, were:
  - mostly partially-focused on diversity (64%, 694);
  - mostly focused on two or more cultures (61%, 554);
  - mostly internationally focused (40%, 358);
  - mostly engaged the DELTA Level 4 (Advanced Analysis) (72%, 653);
  - mostly focused on the historical dimensions of culture (72%, 653).

- The diversity-related undergraduate courses that were offered the most (6 and 7 semesters out of 7 semesters for slightly over three years), were:
  - mostly primary-focused on diversity (74%, 127);
  - mostly disciplinary content-related courses (76%, 130);
  - mostly culture-general in approach (66%, 114);
  - focused on two or more cultures (66%, 113);
  - mostly focused on a blend of international/global and domestic cultures (44%, 76);
  - mostly engaged the DELTA Level 4 (Advanced Analysis) (68%, 117);
  - mostly focused on the contemporary dimensions of culture (55%, 94), and
  - yet, also offered the most framings of diversity in terms of Race/Ethnicity (18%, 91).

- UA students are offered more undergraduate courses on Nationality (19%, 512), International/Global Formations (19%, 505), and Race/Ethnicity (17%, 448). But these students are NOT exposed as much to courses at the higher DELTA levels such as DELTA Level 5 - Evaluation-Critique of Power Differences and DELTA Level 6 - Social Agency & Action (collectively at 14%, 120).

- In the last 3 years, UA has provided 259,173 exposures to diversity-related courses to its undergraduate students (which is a huge number). More specifically, there have been 164,628 exposures to diversity-related courses through its Core Curriculum/GE Requirements program. Moreover, UA has provided 28,646 exposures to diversity-related courses to its graduate students. These diversity exposure numbers are some of the highest that we have seen in any diversity mapping. UA should continually assess how diversity is embedded into its courses and how regularly these courses are offered.

- In terms of the Core Curriculum/GE courses, UA offered 90% (328) of the diversity-related Core Curriculum/GE courses over the last three years. In fact, 23% (77) of these diversity-related Core Curriculum/GE courses were offered every semester over the examined three-year time span. The higher percentage of courses offered in the Core Curriculum/GE program reflects an expected pattern of General Education offerings (i.e., frequent, regularly offered courses in order to fulfill requirements).

- The diversity-related Core Curriculum/GE courses that were offered, were:
  - mostly partially-focused on diversity (69%, 227);
  - mostly focused on two or more cultures (61%, 201);
  - mostly internationally focused (48%, 156);
• mostly engaged the DELTA Level 4 (Advanced Analysis) (66%, 215);
• mostly focused on the historical dimensions of culture (44%, 143);
• mostly framed diversity in terms of international/global formations of culture (21%, 210; taken out of the multiple columns of definitions of diversity codings);
• mostly from the Writing Core Curriculum/GE Area (51%, 166) and the Humanities (HU) Core Curriculum/GE Area (21%, 68).

• The diversity-related Core Curriculum/GE courses that were offered the most (6 and 7 semesters out of 7 semesters for slightly over three years), were:
  • mostly partially-focused on diversity (78%, 71);
  • mostly disciplinary content-related courses (67%, 61);
  • mostly culture-general in approach (62%, 56);
  • focused on two or more cultures (62%, 56);
  • mostly internationally focused (43%, 39);
  • mostly engaged the DELTA Level 4 (Advanced Analysis) (59%, 54);
  • mostly focused on the contemporary dimensions of culture (46%, 42);
  • mostly offered the most framings of diversity in terms of Nationality (22%, 60), International/Global Cultures (21%, 57), and Language (19%, 51); and
  • mostly from the Writing Core Curriculum/GE Area (38%, 34) and the Humanities (HU) Core Curriculum/GE Area (24%, 22).

• With regard to its graduate-level courses, UA has offered 85% (720) of its diversity-related graduate courses over the last three years. The majority of the offered graduate diversity-related courses were offered two semesters for the three-year time span (31%, 222) and three semesters over the last three years (24%, 174). Only 6% (45) of the courses were offered every semester in the three-year time span.

• The diversity-related graduate courses that were offered over the examined three-year time span, were:
  • mostly partially-focused on diversity (52%, 375);
  • mostly focused on two or more cultures (63%, 454);
  • mostly internationally focused (49%, 354) and had a combined focus on international and domestic cultures (38%, 276);
  • mostly engaged the DELTA Level 4 (Advanced Analysis) (91%, 652);
  • mostly focused on the contemporary dimensions of culture (82%, 591); and
  • mostly framed diversity in terms of Intersectionalities (24%, 514), Race/Ethnicity (24%, 504), and Gender (20%, 425) (taken out of the multiple columns of definitions of diversity codings).

• The diversity-related graduate courses that were offered the most (6 and 7 semesters out of 7 semesters for slightly over three years), were:
  • mostly partially-focused on diversity (68%, 36);
  • mostly disciplinary content-related courses (75%, 40);
  • mostly culture-general in approach (96%, 51);
  • focused on two or more cultures (64%, 34);
  • mostly internationally focused (49%, 26);
  • mostly engaged the DELTA Level 4 (Advanced Analysis) (85%, 45);
  • mostly focused on the contemporary dimensions of culture (91%, 48); and
• mostly offered the most framings of diversity in terms of Intersectionalities (30%, 48), Gender (30%, 48), and Race/Ethnicity (30%, 47) (taken out of the multiple columns of definitions of diversity codings).

• Given that UA has an excellent record of offering the majority of diversity-related courses in its undergraduate, graduate, and Core Curriculum/General Education curricula, the primary focus should be on the curricular integration, incorporation, and design of diversity-related content, topics, contexts, and issues across its curricula (and in ways that make sense to those disciplinary fields and interdisciplinary urges to examine complex societal problems, challenges, and triumphs).

**********************************************************************************************

• Overall, Halualani & Associates identifies the following areas as urgent areas for action by UA for the next five years:

  • the creation of its next iteration of a university-wide diversity strategic plan
  • the building out of its diversity infrastructure
  • continued work on diverse undergraduate student recruitment (for all minority groups)
  • continued work on diverse graduate student recruitment (for all minority groups)
  • continued work on student retention and graduation for diverse groups
  • continued work on diverse faculty recruitment and retention
  • continued work on diverse staff recruitment and retention
  • continued work on diversity-related professional development for employees (staff, faculty, administrators)
  • designing an intentional diversity-centered undergraduate, graduate, and Core Curriculum/General Education curricula.
C) **Recommended Action Steps:**

In terms of the delineated findings, we recommend the following next action steps:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Recommended Action Step</strong></th>
<th><strong>Target Population</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Revisit UA's 2008 Strategic Diversity Plan's strategic vision, goals, priorities, and action steps related to diversity, equity, and inclusion and develop the next strategic iteration (with historical commitments and accountabilities in tact). This will provide a strategic direction to anchor and direct future diversity activity at UA (to make “movement” into “momentum”). Answer the following vision questions in terms of crafting a diversity strategic plan: What will UA be like and feel like as a transformative, diversity-centered and committed university in the next five years? What is the larger end goal/vision? [If the 2008 Strategic Diversity Plan is in perpetuity, then incorporating one or two priorities/goals to the extant five goals (which could be framed as continual core commitments) stands as the next best course of action.]</td>
<td>All Campus Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. As UA works on its next-level diversity strategy, it needs to determine which approach to diversity and inclusion it is pursuing in relation to its identified priority and goal areas. The approach to diversity determines how the institution will conceptualize and operationalize the framing and end goal of where it wants to go. For example, will it pursue an approach based on inclusive excellence? Or equity and educational achievement gaps? Or social justice? Or cultural competencies? Or a combination of all of these?</td>
<td>All Campus Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Detail diversity-related goal targets, milestones, action steps, benchmarks, and outcomes for its next-level diversity strategic plan.</td>
<td>All Campus Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ensure that there is an assessment schedule as well as accountability mechanisms for the goals and priorities of its diversity strategic plan.</td>
<td>All Campus Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. In line with Goal 5 of the 2008 Strategic Diversity Plan, identify evaluative frameworks to analyze the range of diversity efforts identified in the annual strategic diversity reports in order to pinpoint diversity progress and achievement at each point in time.</td>
<td>All Campus Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Make sure that the diversity strategic plan builds in the alignment structure among divisions on diversity-related strategic priorities. Meaning, how will all divisions, programs, and units bring these strategic priorities and goals into being? Are certain diversity-related strategic priorities assigned to the most relevant units? Do all divisions and units pursue each diversity-related strategic priority or a few of them? Will the diversity-related strategic priorities be centralized throughout all divisions and units or de-centralized and inhabited in different ways depending on the nature of the division or unit? How will the Vice President and Associate Provost for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion’s new office facilitate such alignment?</td>
<td>All Campus Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Action Step</td>
<td>Target Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Align the diversity strategic plan priorities and goals with that of UA’s university strategic plan, “The UA Strategic Plan: Advancing the Flagship.” Diversity priorities from the next-level strategic diversity plan could be integrated with Goals #1 and #3: Goal #1: “Provide a premier undergraduate and graduate education that offers a global perspective and is characterized by outstanding teaching, high-quality scholarship and distinctive curricular and co-curricular programs”; Goal #3: “Enrich our learning and work environment by providing an accepting, inclusive community that attracts and supports a diverse faculty, staff and student body.” Keep in mind that the “global perspective” emphasized in Goal #1 should be deepened with a focus on the global-local (or domestic) dynamics and flows of power, capital, and people across the larger sociopolitical spheres across and within nations, states, regions, lands, and oceans.</td>
<td>All Campus Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Build up the centralized diversity infrastructure (the one now established with the Vice President and Associate Provost for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion role) with staff members and resources. Such an infrastructure should a) centralize diversity, equity, and inclusion matters and b) provide enough direction for all divisions and units to align with the larger university diversity vision while also inflecting such a vision in their own ways. Such an infrastructure ought to create connectivity across diversity and inclusion units while also providing enough time and energy for the new Vice President and Associate Provost for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion role to focus on the proactive and strategic diversity needs of UA.</td>
<td>All Campus Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. In its next-level diversity strategic plan and emerging diversity infrastructure, develop strategies to build up UA’s organizational/structural resource type of capacity (i.e., a stable diversity infrastructure) and social capital resource type of capacity (i.e., formal social networking channels and opportunities for campus members to interact across all cultural backgrounds) around diversity, equity, and inclusion.</td>
<td>All Campus Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Conduct a campus climate assessment (as a “Campus Experience Survey”) every two years in order to take stock of campus members’ experiences of UA (in terms of structures of inclusion and belonging, the learning environment, the workplace environment). Connect these survey findings with these mapping results in order to identify leverage points and gaps to fill.</td>
<td>All Campus Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Examine the recruitment obstacles for diverse undergraduate students and especially for diverse graduate students, and implement responsive strategies.</td>
<td>Undergraduate Students, Graduate Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Action Step</td>
<td>Target Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Design and implement more creative (“outside the box”) or next-level strategies to recruit diverse faculty and staff. Examining innovative practices in recruiting diverse faculty and staff at other comparable public higher educational institutions, may provide useful information.</td>
<td>Faculty, Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Create more customized diversity efforts for faculty and staff members in terms of their diversity professional development (skill sets, behavioral tools). Trainings and workshops that are scaffolded and developmentally sequenced, could focus on diversity pedagogy, how to be an inclusive educator/adviser/mentor, building support structures for students, implicit bias, and micro affirmations and micro aggressions for faculty. Trainings for staff members could highlight implicit bias, cultural competency skills, and leading for inclusion.</td>
<td>Faculty, Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. In its continued focus on college completion for diverse students, UA should continue to design and implement customized, high-impact retention-graduation interventions for specific diverse groups especially African American students and various historically underrepresented students. This may involve examining the specific degree completion barriers, gaps, or stoppage points at UA that students across all diverse backgrounds, experience (in a focused institutional or transcript study). Identify retention-graduation targets for specific groups along with key action steps and outcome measures that will be help to achieve college completion goals for diverse students.</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Design diversity-related events and programming that targets the higher DELTA engagement levels such as DELTA Level 5 - Evaluation-Critique of Power Differences, Level 6 - Social Agency &amp; Action, and Level 7 - Innovative Problem-Solving.</td>
<td>All Campus Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Continue the dialogue/discussion series/events and especially at the higher DELTA levels (DELTA Level 5 - Evaluation-Critique of Power Differences) and connect these to related undergraduate and graduate courses for maximum learning.</td>
<td>All Campus Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Create additional programming and or diversity-related events that engage social justice and critical (or power-based) approaches to diversity and culture.</td>
<td>All Campus Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Connect the various diversity-related events and programming to specific courses, student learning objectives, and assignments for maximum diversity learning at UA. A committee of faculty can help identify ways to connect the co-curricular with the curricular (or create meaningful and integrated in-the-classroom and out-of-the-classroom diversity experiences).</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Engage the larger array of framings of diversity such as disabilities, active duty/veterans/military, region, political ideology, and age/generation through campus resources, academic support services, trainings/workshops, events, and initiatives.</td>
<td>All Campus Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Action Step</td>
<td>Target Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. With its excellent record of offering the majority of diversity-related courses that it has “on the books,” UA should spend more time on the intentional curricular design, incorporation, and integration of diversity-related courses with its disciplinary subject matter.</td>
<td>Faculty, Undergraduate, Graduate Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Conduct conversations among faculty with regard to the role of the undergraduate and graduate curricula in terms of engaging diversity. It is important to note that high impact and innovative practices in higher education reveal that diversity is no longer viewed in terms of just stand-alone content-based courses. Instead, as a way to be truly inclusive of all disciplines (including STEM) and core subject matter and skills (writing, communicating, public speaking, analysis, and research inquiry), diversity is now framed as an inquiry focus (way of thinking, viewing the world, a process of navigating complex questions and logics across all subject matters). Given this, a campus discussion among faculty members, department chairs, deans, and students should be conducted with regard to maximizing diversity in terms of course content and inquiry perspectives across more courses and disciplines. This could be facilitated through the next-level diversity strategic plan.</td>
<td>Faculty, Undergraduate, Graduate Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Conduct curricular conversations around the UA's intentions for diversity engagement across each step and class level of students' educational pathways and for major, minor, Core Curriculum/GE areas, and graduate study. Diversity should be life-staged as an educational resource and learning outcome throughout students' education at the University of Alabama. Meaning, that there could be an introductory point through which upon entry to UA, students discuss and engage diversity in terms of cultural competence and or the university's established diversity mission and commitment. At a midpoint stage, there may be some specific connection to diversity via a practical context and or specific population. An endpoint to students' education may be in terms of making the connection to critique and or engage in advocacy to help transform the social world. A rich discussion around this idea is ripe for fruition at UA. Campus members should have an urgent discussion around the extent to which students who take diversity courses are actually emotionally and cognitively prepared to traverse the higher DELTA engagement levels on Level 4 - Advanced Analysis and Level 5 - Critique-Evaluation of Power Differences and Inequalities. In addition, what happens to these students and their engagement levels once they leave these courses? Is that engagement level continued throughout their majors and or course pathways? Or is it halted altogether? What is the message provided to UA students about how to build on that knowledge as they complete their time at the university? An intentional and aggressive strategy should be developed here. This could be facilitated through a next-level diversity strategic plan with curricular goals.</td>
<td>Faculty, Undergraduate, Graduate Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommended Action Step</strong></td>
<td><strong>Target Population</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. The University of Alabama faculty community should also reflect on the importance of engaging diversity as a primary (or dominant) or integrated focus in its undergraduate and graduate curricula in areas with a suitable “fit” and robust webs of connection.</td>
<td>Faculty, Undergraduate, Graduate Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Engage in intentional curricula design that provides exposure to culture-general (etic) and culture-specific (emic) approaches to culture, intercultural communication, and diversity-related subject areas in undergraduate and graduate courses.</td>
<td>Faculty, Undergraduate, Graduate Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Across the undergraduate and graduate curricula, explore curricular opportunities to incorporate domestic diversity-focused courses that speak to the larger historical contexts of power relations surrounding that diversity.</td>
<td>Faculty, Undergraduate, Graduate Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Because a large proportion of undergraduate and graduate diversity-related courses highlight the international aspects of culture, there exists a curricular opportunity to deepen what is meant by “international” aspects of culture through the incorporation of the global-local (domestic) flows, dynamics, and histories of power, capital, and social impact across and within nations, territories, lands, and oceans.</td>
<td>Faculty, Undergraduate, Graduate Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Examine ways in which the partial diversity-related graduate courses could be further developed (where it makes sense) for full diversity integration or the complete embedding of diversity content to disciplinary subject matter, disciplinary questions, and disciplinary modes of analysis.</td>
<td>Faculty, Graduate Students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
28. As a dedicated issue, reconsider and or re-work the Core Curriculum/General Education Requirements Program in terms of its diversity-related coverage. Although diversity-related courses were found across ALL of the Core Curriculum/GE SLO/Outcome areas, there needs to be improvement in this program in order to ensure consistent diversity exposure and engagement no matter which Core Curriculum/GE course is selected and which GE SLO Outcome Area is engaged. Our analysis of the diversity-related courses in the Core Curriculum/GE curriculum indicates that the quality, consistency, and assurance that diversity is covered in a significant way in terms of both domestic and international issues and in relation to power differences and historical contexts, are not fully realized. We encourage the consideration of the following types of diversity-related student learning objectives in order to ensure that all students are sufficiently exposed to a meaningful diversity-committed education in a General Education or Core Curriculum/GE type of program:

- Locates the student in current sociopolitical contexts;
- Examines the historical dynamics around cultures and difference;
- Focuses on visible and invisible structured inequalities (and systems of power and control) in the U.S. context;
- Provides an understanding of the constructive actions of various racial, ethnic, gender, and cultural groups in U.S. society (historically and in contemporary times);
- Emphasizes the role of constructive actions to improve lives of others and bring about social justice;
- Exposes students to perspectives about difference, privilege, power relations, and intercultural justice that are not articulated in socially approvable ways in the surrounding region and society (this is extremely important given the sociopolitical climate in the region surrounding UA).

We encourage the thorough design of diversity-related student learning objectives and outcomes (that can be tracked and assessed) in these diversity areas and in relation to diversity geopolitically and socially on a global and domestic scale. Many institutions have an area dedicated for global issues and contexts and another for domestic issues and contexts; we recommend this as well given that research indicates that taking two GE diversity courses (Bowman, 2010, 2012; Bowman & Brandenberger, 2012).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Action Step</th>
<th>Target Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29. In addition to Recommended Action Steps #27 and #28, re-design the Core Curriculum/General Education Requirements Program to provide more diversity exposure at all class levels to domestic-focused issues of diversity, historical emphases on culture, and more varied constructions of diversity.</td>
<td>Faculty, Undergraduate Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Develop diversity learning outcome assessment rubrics for diversity-related courses so that academic departments and colleges can identify how students understand and engage with diversity perspectives with attention to critical or tipping points, perspectival barriers, and difficult to navigate conversational moments.</td>
<td>Faculty, Undergraduate Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Provide continuous professional development on inclusive pedagogical techniques for faculty members so that optimal diversity engagement in the classroom can be realized.</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Leverage and resource UA’s extant affinity groups or faculty and staff associations so as to help carry out related next-level diversity strategic action steps.</td>
<td>Faculty, Staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>