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COURSE OVERVIEW

This graduate seminar focuses on critical debates about diversity, merit and higher education in the 21st century. Scholarly literatures from education, psychology, and other relevant social sciences are critically reviewed to address related theoretical, methodological, practical, and policy issues. Topics highlight debates about traditional SAT/ACT-type tests and more comprehensive approaches to merit for a diversifying college student population (racial/ethnic/gender/class/cross-national/non-traditional, etc.). Students examine recent studies, practices, policies, and interventions by university-based, ETS, and ACT Inc. experts to address: (1) contested constructions of merit in higher education; (2) merit and opportunity issues in higher education; and (3) expanding merit indicators to guide comprehensive admission, student development, P-20 achievement gap, and STEM pipeline strategies. In addition to higher education, this seminar is also relevant to graduate students in psychology, other social sciences and interdisciplinary fields interested in bridging theory-driven scholarship with leadership roles in policy, administration, or professional practice to promote college student access and success in diversifying nations.

Students will engage in policy-relevant “diversity debates,” guided by critical reviews of recent literature on traditional merit criteria and “more holistic merit assessment” that also consider strengths-based factors. These debates engage controversies about the misuse of SAT/ACT-type assessments vs. the utility of “strengths-based” indicators of merit and/or predictors of college success. Controversy often intensifies with anti-affirmative action litigation, sharp enrollment declines for underrepresented students with “blocked opportunity” and enrollment increases for international students with superior admissions test scores. Despite controversies, a growing body of research suggests that strengths-based factors should be systematically included in “more comprehensive assessment” and may often be more powerful predictors of college success than SAT/ACT scores.

Guided by a translational research agenda, this seminar will also highlight related findings from an ongoing UM-based Diversity Research and Policy Program initiative. This NIH-funded project bridges theory-driven scholarship with policy-relevant research on exemplary interventions to promote higher education opportunity, talent development, STEM participation and national competitiveness. This multi-ethnic study can also help to clarify unique risks and strengths among White, African, Latino, and Asian ancestry students that differentiate intervention efficacy.
COURSE REQUIREMENTS AND BASIS FOR EVALUATION

1. Weekly Seminar Participation/Review Assignments & Discussion (25%)
2. Selected Computer Data-based Literature Review/ Written & Oral (20%)
3. Selected Expert Informant Interview/ Assignment & Presentation (25%)
5. Final Seminar “Term” Paper (30%)

SOURCES

REQUIRED TEXTS:


*Relevant readings are available on Class Canvas/C-Tools site & in-class hand-outs.

NEW RELATED BOOKS:


COURSE OUTLINE & WEEKLY READINGS:

Week 1-R – JAN 7: Introduction and Course Overview

1) Introductions/Overview of Syllabus/Course Requirements and Basis for Evaluation
2) Seminar Format & Logistics/Assignment Guidelines/Seminar Philosophy & Civility

Need for a 21st century merit agenda in higher education (C-1). In Bowman & St John (2012) DMHE. NY: AMS Press.


I. CRITICAL ISSUES IN DIVERSITY, MERIT AND HIGHER EDUCATION

A. CONTESTED CONSTRUCTIONS OF MERIT IN HIGHER EDUCATION: From the Big Test to the Diversity Debate

Week 2-R - JAN 14: Required Core Readings


Related Readings


B. MERIT AND HIGHER EDUCATION OPPORTUNITY: Complexities, Challenges, and Trends in a Diversifying Nation

Week 3-R JAN 14: Required Core Readings


Related Readings


II. TOWARD A COMPREHENSIVE MERIT AGENDA FOR THE 21ST CENTURY: 
Implications for Higher Education Practice and Intervention

A. EXPANDING Merit CRITERIA IN DIVERSIFYING POPULATIONS:
Comprehensive Noncognitive and Strength-Based Assessment

Week 4-R JAN 21: Required Core Readings


Sedlacek, W. (2004). BBT: NAHE - Ch. 1 - The Big Test … and an Alternative Approach/ Ch. 2 - Going Beyond the Big Test (pp. 1-12/13-20).


Related Readings


B. STRENGTHS-BASED & HIGHER EDUCATION ACTION RESEARCH:
A Reciprocal Translation Agenda for the 21st Century

Week 5-R JAN 28: Required Core Readings

Toward a 21st Century Meritocracy: Bridging Scholarship, Intervention, and Social Change, 

Diversity and Comprehensive Intervention Strategies in Higher Education,
Sedlacek, W. (2004). BBT: NAHE - Ch. 5 – Admissions and Financial Aid (pp. 59-78)/Ch. 7 – Advising and Counseling with Noncognitive Variables (pp. 101-128).

Sedlacek, W. (2004). BBT: NAHE - Ch. 8 – Evaluating and Designing Campus Programs with Noncognitive Factors/Ch. 6 – Teaching a Diverse Student Body Successfully/Conclusions and Recommendations (pp. 79-100/129-40/141-56)

Related Readings


C. FROM HOLISTIC ADMISSIONS TO P-20 PIPELINE INTERVENTION: New Directions in Strengths-Based Translational Research

Week 6-R FEB 4: Required Core Readings


Admissions, Academic Readiness, and student success: Implications for growing a


Related Readings


D. “WHY” STRENGTHS-BASED FACTORS PREDICT COLLEGE SUCCESS?: Theoretical, Conceptual and Measurement Issues

Week 7-R FEB 11: Required Core Readings


Related Readings


III. “UNDERSTANDING” HIGHER EDUCATION INTERVENTION EFFICACY: A Strengths-Based Role Strain and Adaptation Approach

A. INTERVENTION PROGRAM STRENGTHS

Week 8-R FEB 18: Required Core Readings

1. **SUPPORT PERSON**: Formal-Informal Support – Program Mentors, Staff & Peers - Outcomes


Related Readings


Johnson, A. D. and Mroczek, P. (Eds.), Mentoring minorities and women: A challenge for higher education (pp. 24-27). De Kalb: Northern Illinois University Press.


B. MOTIVATION STRENGTHS (Sense of Purpose)

Week 9-R FEB 25: Required Core Readings

2. LONG TERM GOALS: Path-Goal Achievement Motives- Outcomes?


Related Readings


3. **POSITIVE SELF CONCEPT: Global and Academic Self-Efficacy - Outcomes?**


Related Readings


4. **KNOWLEDGE IN A CHOSEN FIELD: Career Efficacy/ Work Attitude- Outcomes?**


Related Readings


WINTER VACATION (February 27 – March 7)

Week 10-R MARCH 10: Required Core Readings

5. REALISTIC SELF-APPRAISAL: Resilient Problem-Solving/Attributions - Outcomes?


Related Readings


6. HANDLING THE SYSTEM: Identity/Consciousness/ Diversity Efficacy - Outcomes?


Related Readings

Awad, G. (2007). Role of racial identity, academic self-concept, and self-esteem in the prediction of


**Week 11-R MARCH 17: Required Core Readings**

**D. ENGAGEMENT STRENGTHS (Sense of Generativity)**

**7. COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT: Community Service Commitment - Outcomes?**


Related Readings


**8. LEADERSHIP EXPERIENCE: Leadership Commitment - Outcomes?**


Related Readings


E. RETHINKING STEM PIPELINE INTERVENTIONS:  
Emerging Literature on the Role of Strengths and Barriers

(SEE BOOK OUTLINE FOR RELATED LITERATURE REVIEW)

Week 12-R MARCH 24: Required Core Readings

ROLE OF STRENGTHS IN STEM INTERVENTIONS: Selected Topics

Maton, K. (DRAFT). Strengths-Based STEM Intervention and Evaluation Paradigm?
Bailey, T. & Bowman (DRAFT). Formal Organizational Support and STEM Outcomes?

Selected Topics for Related Literature Review

- 1. Research Opportunity Interventions & STEM Outcomes?
- 2. Faculty Mentoring Support & STEM Interventions?
- 3. Informal Support, Self-Efficacy & STEM Interventions?
- 4. Culture & STEM Interventions?

ROLE OF BARRIERS IN STEM INTERVENTIONS: Selected Topics

Williams, K. (DRAFT). Financial and Academic Barriers in STEM Interventions?
Bowman, P.J. and Ebreo, A. (DRAFT). Racial/Ethnic Barriers in STEM Interventions?

Selected Topics for Related Literature Review

- 1. Psychosocial Barriers to STEM Intervention Success?
- 2. Gender, Ethnicity and Successful STEM Intervention Outcomes?
- 3. Racial Identity, Consciousness and STEM Intervention Outcomes?
- 4. African American Males and Successful Intervention Outcomes?

Week 13-R MARCH 31- UM Expert/Special Interest Panel Presentations

Week 14-R APRIL 7- UM Expert/Special Interest Panel Presentations

Week 15-R APRIL 14 – Presentations, Reflections & Wrap Up
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td><strong>Need for A New STEM Pipeline Research Paradigm:</strong> <em>Strengths-Based Talent Development in a Diversifying Nation</em>, Phillip J. Bowman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td><strong>Strengths-Based STEM Intervention and Evaluation Paradigm:</strong> <em>The Meyerhoff Scholars Program and Beyond</em>, Kenneth Maton, Mariano R. Sto. Domingo, Patricia Esparza, Rukiya Wideman, and Freeman A. Hrabowski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td><strong>STRENGTHS-BASED RESEARCH ON EXEMPLARY PIPELINE PROGRAMS:</strong>  Bridging Theory, Research, &amp; Policy-Relevant Interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td><strong>Exemplary Research Opportunity Interventions &amp; STEM Outcomes:</strong> Toward A Comprehensive Strengths-Based Approach, Phillip J. Bowman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td><strong>Strong Faculty Mentoring Support &amp; STEM Intervention Outcomes</strong> A Multi-Dimensional Approach for Underrepresented Students, Phillip J. Bowman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td><strong>Formal Organizational Support &amp; STEM Intervention Outcomes:</strong> <em>A Strengths-Based Approach</em>, TaShara Bailey and Phillip J. Bowman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td><strong>Multilevel Cultural Strengths &amp; STEM Intervention Outcomes:</strong> <em>An Open-Systems Perspective on Underrepresented Students</em>, Phillip J. Bowman &amp; Angela Ebreo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td><strong>OVERCOMING SYSTEMIC BARRIERS TO SUCCESSFUL STEM OUTCOMES:</strong>  Strengths-Based Challenges for Underrepresented Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td><strong>Financial and Academic Barriers to STEM Intervention Success</strong>, Krystal Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td><strong>Racial/Ethnic Barriers to STEM Intervention Success</strong>, Phillip J. Bowman &amp; Angela Ebreo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td><strong>Psychosocial Barriers to STEM Intervention Success</strong>, Angela Ebreo &amp; Hillary Kolb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td><strong>Gender, Ethnicity &amp; Successful STEM Intervention Outcomes:</strong> <em>Integrating Self-Authorship and Self-Efficacy Perspectives</em>, Michelle Randolph &amp; Phillip J. Bowman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td><strong>African American Males &amp; Successful STEM Intervention Outcomes:</strong> <em>Extending the Theory of Planned Behavior</em>, James Ellis &amp; Phillip Bowman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td><strong>METHODOLOGICAL AND POLICY ISSUES FOR THE 21st CENTURY:</strong>  Strengths-Based Intervention Research and Global Challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td><strong>Bridging Strengths-Based Scholarship with Policy-Relevant STEM Intervention:</strong> <em>Challenges, Opportunities, and Strategies for the 21st Century</em>, Phillip Bowman &amp; Edward St John</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ARTICLE/CHAPTER REVIEW GUIDELINES

TYPE: Critical Essay

ANNOTATOR:

TOPIC:

CITATION:

CENTRAL THESIS OF ARTICLE:

SUMMARY:

EVALUATION AND IDEAS:

_____________________________________

TYPE: Review Article

ANNOTATOR:

TOPIC:

CITATION:

AREA OF RESEARCH REVIEWED:

MAJOR CONCLUSIONS:
EVALUATION AND IDEAS
TYPE: Survey Study

ANNOTATOR:

TOPIC:

CITATION:

CENTRAL TOPIC OF THE SURVEY:

SAMPLE:

INSTRUMENT:

RESULTS:

CONCLUSIONS:

EVALUATION AND IDEAS:

__________________________________________

TYPE: Experimental Study

ANNOTATOR:

TOPIC:

CITATION:

HYPOTHESES:

METHOD:

RESULTS:

CONCLUSIONS:
EVALUATION AND IDEAS:
EXAMPLE

TYPE: Survey Study

ANNOTATOR: Amanda Johnson

TOPIC: Perceived academic stress and coping strategies


HYPOTHESES

1. Academic stress perceptions are predicted by objective academic load variables.
2. Perceived academic stress, objective academic loads and demographic characteristics are correlated with the types of coping strategies adopted by students.
3. Academic loads predict the use of task-oriented coping strategies, academic stress perceptions predict the use of emotion-oriented coping strategies and demographic characteristics predict the use of avoidance coping strategies.

METHOD

A sample of 283 college students matriculating at national colleges and universities in Israel completed questionnaires in regard to their perceived stress, actual academic loads and subsequent coping strategies.

RESULTS

In regard to the first hypothesis, the results confirm that academic stress perceptions can be predicted from objective academic loads. A Pearson correlation analysis showed that certain coping strategies were significantly related to perceived academic stress. However, avoidance was positively correlated with academic stress, but the correlation was not significant. The third hypothesis considered each of the three coping strategies as dependent variables and academic loads, stress perceptions and demographic characteristics as independent variables. Each of the coping strategies was significantly predicted by the independent variables. Overall, the results suggest that the greater the level of academic stress experienced, the more students tend to manage it through emotion-oriented coping strategies.

CONCLUSION

Academic stress perceptions and academic loads had significant and unique effects on students’ coping strategies. Individuals ponder their stressful circumstances and act based on how they interpret and perceive situations consistent with their customary behavioral patterns. If the situation is not resolved and the perception of stress remains, stronger emotional and affective reactions are evoked.
EVALUATION AND IDEAS

It is interesting to compare and contrast this study to related issues highlighted by (Bowman, 2006) in his review article on *Role Strain and Adaptation Issues in the Strength-Based Model: Diversity, Multilevel, and Life-Span Considerations*. Studies cited in the Bowman piece highlight how race-related socialization functions with racial/ethnic identity, ethnic-achievement orientations, and other personal strengths to help promote youth motivation and resiliency despite stressful barriers. These role strain and adaption findings as well as related studies in regard to race-related socialization (Bowman and Howard, 1985) were very salient for me. Admittedly, my particular demographic was not reflected in the Kariv/Heiman research and so my observations should not be considered critical of their results, discussion and subsequent conclusions.

The issues of role strain and task-oriented versus emotion-oriented coping strategies resonate for me because I have been on a significant odyssey in my attempt to navigate barriers in the academic environment. I came to realize that my best approach for success in the environment was, as Claude Steele counseled his children, to ‘lighten up on the politics, get the best education you can, and move on… realize that to do this you have to learn from people who part of yourself tells you are difficult to trust.’ Wow. It was true to my experience. Thankfully, to relieve the dysphoria I did have the comfort of going home every evening.

I found myself reflecting on intergenerational sources of resilience for me: (1) the proactive messages regarding ‘virtues of racial pride, ethnic achievement, strategic responses to racism, racial egalitarianism and self-development’(Bowman, 2006) from my parents; and (2) the activism and reputations of their parents and other significant extended family members to encourage myself to be tenacious. It was this intergenerational family legacy that I came to realize accounted for my resilience and refuse-to-give-up attitude. In addition, the support of my daughters, particularly one who was also matriculating at U of M concurrently; my ‘family-like friendship network’ and church were also vital and empowering in my pursuit consistent with the studies cited in the Bowman piece.

I can’t help but wonder sometimes why so much research is required to justify obvious solutions. I think I would like to see the academy become more prescriptive. There does seem to be movement in that direction.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conceptual/Theoretical Models</th>
<th>Researchers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Cognitive Trait-Factor Model</td>
<td>Sedlacek, Tracy, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement Models</td>
<td>Astin, Kuh, Tinto, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Intelligence Models</td>
<td>Mayer, Roberts, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/Cognitive Models</td>
<td>Bandura, Bretz, Robbins, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress-Coping Models</td>
<td>Bean, Neville, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Strain and Adaptation Approach</td>
<td>Bowman et al.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1

Traditional Deficit vs. Strengths-Based Approaches to Successful Pipeline Intervention Outcomes: Major Concepts and Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEFICIT-BASED</th>
<th>STRENGTHS-BASED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>_________________________</td>
<td>_________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External</td>
<td>Bias/Barriers &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment/Transformation &amp; Remedial Stigma</td>
<td>Comprehensive Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUSAL</td>
<td>System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_________________________</td>
<td>_________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Deficits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuccessful vs.</td>
<td>Successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Negative)</td>
<td>(Resilient)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTCOMES</td>
<td>OUTCOMES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted From:
## Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RSCA – Prince-Embury</th>
<th>NCQ – Sedlacek</th>
<th>Personal Level Strengths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>– Bowman</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sense of Mastery</strong></td>
<td>Long Term Goals</td>
<td>Path-Goal Motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Self-Concept</td>
<td>Salient Role Self-Efficacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge in a Field</td>
<td>Career-Related Efficacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emotional Reactivity</strong></td>
<td>Realistic Self-Appraisal</td>
<td>Resilient Problem-Solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handling the System</td>
<td>Diversity Commitment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sense of Relatedness</strong></td>
<td>A Strong Support Person</td>
<td>Perceived Social Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Experience</td>
<td>Leadership Commitment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Involvement</td>
<td>Service Commitment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted From:
### Table 3
Comparison of Major Concepts in ETS®PPI and Related Assessment Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETS®PPI (Prince-Embury – RAS)</th>
<th>Sedlacek – NCQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>KNOWLEDGE/INTEGRITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation (Sense of Mastery)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term Goals</td>
<td>Path-Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Self-Concept</td>
<td>Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge in a Field</td>
<td>Career</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| RESILIENCE/COMMUNICATION       |                |
| Solving (Emotional Regulation) | Handling the System |
| Commitment                     | Diversity      |

| TEAMWORK/ORGANIZATION          |                |
| (Sense of Relatedness)         |                |
| Commitment                     |                |
| A Strong Support Person        | Social Support |
| Leadership Experience          | Leadership     |
| Community Involvement          | Service Commitment |

Adapted From:
Table 4  
A Comparison of Sedlacek’s Non-Cognitive Predictors and Major Variables within Bowman’s Strengths-Based Approach to Intervention Efficacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sedlacek’s Non-Cognitive Predictors</th>
<th>Bowman’s Strengths-Based Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. INTERVENTION AND SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGICAL STRENGTHS</strong></td>
<td>-Strong Intervention Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NONCOGNITIVE PREDICTORS</strong></td>
<td><strong>SOCIAL-COGNITIVE STRENGTHS</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
-Strong Informal Intervention Support  
-Multilevel Cultural Strengths: Ethic & Emic |
| -A Strong Support Person | -Path-Goal Motivation |
| -Positive Self-Concept | -Academic & Global Self-Efficacy |
| -Knowledge Acquired in a Field | -Career-Related Talent/Efficacy |
| -Realistic Self-Appraisal | -Resilient Problem-Solving/Attributions |
| B. Personal Resources: Strong Social-Cognitive Motivation | |
| -Long Term Goals | -Path-Goal Motivation |
| -Positive Self-Concept | -Academic & Global Self-Efficacy |
| -Knowledge Acquired in a Field | -Career-Related Talent/Efficacy |
| -Realistic Self-Appraisal | -Resilient Problem-Solving/Attributions |
| C. Social Resources: Strong Social-Cognitive Engagement | |
| -Community Involvement | -Community Service Commitment |
| -Leadership Experience | -Generative Leadership Commitment |
| -Handling the System | -Identity/Consciousness Commitments |
| **II. STRESSFUL STUDENT ROLE STRAIN MODERATORS** | |
| A. ----- | **Objective Student Role Barriers** |
| | -Academic Barriers: SAT/ACT/GPA |
| | -Financial Barriers: SES/Poverty/Aid Eligible |
| | -Status-Related Barriers: Racial-Ethnic/Gender |
| B. ----- | **Subjective Student Role Appraisals** |
| | -Role Threats: Discouragement/Self-Blame/Stereotype |
| | -Role Stress: Conflict/Overload/Ambiguity/Distress |
| **III. SUCCESSFUL INTERVENTION OUTCOMES** | |
| A. Academic Achievement Outcomes | |
| B. Higher Education Plans/Outcomes | |
| C. Career Plans/Outcomes | |
| D. Psychosocial Development Outcomes | |
Figure 1.

ROLE STRAIN AND ADAPTATION MODEL: 
Toward A Multilevel Approach to Successful Student Development

Adapted From:
Figure 2
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
DIVERSITY RESEARCH AND POLICY PROGRAM
Bridging Diversity Scholarship with Policy-Relevant Intervention
Reciprocal Translation Approach: Diversity Scholarship ↔ Multi-Level Innovation