

HIGHER EDUCATION EXCHANGE



Institutions and the Public: A Troubled Relationship

Articles

Byron P. White

John J. Theis

Katie Clark

Jonathan Garlick

Timothy J. Shaffer and David E. Procter

Chris Gilmer

Afterword

David Mathews

Editors: Derek W. M. Barker and Alex Lovit
Managing Editor: Ilse Tebbetts
Formatting: Long's Graphic Design, Inc.
Copy Editors: Ellen Dawson-Witt and Renee Ergazos

The *Higher Education Exchange* is founded on a thought articulated by Thomas Jefferson in 1820:

I know no safe depository of the ultimate powers of the society but the people themselves; and if we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome discretion, the remedy is not to take it from them, but to inform their discretion by education.

In the tradition of Jefferson, the *Higher Education Exchange* agrees that a central goal of higher education is to help make democracy possible by preparing citizens for public life. *The Higher Education Exchange* is part of a movement to strengthen higher education's democratic mission and foster a more democratic culture throughout American society. Working in this tradition, the *Higher Education Exchange* publishes case studies, analyses, news, and ideas about efforts within higher education to develop more democratic societies.

The Kettering Foundation is a nonprofit operating foundation, chartered in 1927, that does not make grants but welcomes partnerships with other institutions (or groups of institutions) and individuals who are actively working on problems of communities, governing, politics, and education. The interpretations and conclusions contained in the *Higher Education Exchange*, unless expressly stated to the contrary, represent the views of the author or authors and not necessarily those of the foundation, its trustees, or officers.

Copyright © 2021 by the Kettering Foundation

ISSN 2469-6293 (print)

ISSN 2471-2280 (online)

HIGHER EDUCATION EXCHANGE



2021

CONTENTS

Derek W. M. Barker and Alex Lovit	Institutions and the Public: A Troubled Relationship? (Foreword)	1
Byron P. White	Toward the Community-Centric University	6
John J. Theis	Civic Engagement Contributes to Culture Change at a Community College	22
Katie Clark	Treating an Ailing Society: Citizen Nursing in an Era of Crisis	36
Jonathan Garlick	The Pandemic, Trustworthiness, and a Place for Civic Science in Higher Education	50
Timothy J. Shaffer and David E. Procter	Learning to Become a Civic Professional: Using Deliberation in Community Engagement	64
Chris Gilmer	“Attention, Attention Must Be Finally Paid”: A Case for Reinventing Liberal Arts Education	75
David Mathews	A Call for Academic Inventiveness (Afterword)	86
	Contributors	92

THE PANDEMIC, TRUSTWORTHINESS, AND A PLACE FOR CIVIC SCIENCE IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Jonathan Garlick

The global pandemic precipitated politicization of critical scientific information, erosion of the public's faith in science, and pervasive health inequities that disproportionately impacted communities of color. As the pandemic forged an uncharted and uncertain course, it felt as though the relationship between institutions of science and the public was also entering uncharted waters. Scientists and science information were going to be more central to our collective lives than ever before.

Preparing for a Moment of Reckoning with Science

As a stem cell researcher and civically engaged scientist, I had prepared myself for this public moment of reckoning with science. I had spent much time over the last decade developing programs and initiatives intended to make science more relevant and accessible to the public. As part of the growing field of civic science, I develop frameworks designed to help individuals explore the meaning and value of science and to reflect on how citizens and scientists can work together to shift the culture of science toward a more inclusive and collectivistic mindset. Ultimately, my goal is for civic science to link the vast potential of science to civic capacities in our communities in ways that might revitalize the democratic purposes of science for the public good.

The ideals of civic science have for many years influenced my approach to classroom education, communicating scientific findings, and engaging the public in dialogue about often divisive science-related issues. The COVID pandemic has both challenged and reinforced my commitment to civic science. As the events of the last year have made quite clear, scientists cannot prevent the continued spread of this deadly disease without collective public support and action that are necessary for effective responses to the threats this virus

poses. At the same time, while scientific knowledge is critical for personal decision-making, it is often not sufficient to help people make choices and take action. The psychological, social, economic, civic, and spiritual needs of individuals who feel mistrustful of and disengaged from health-related decision-making must also be understood. These inform the personal and structural influences on citizens as they balance the risks and benefits of vaccination and consider how to best protect themselves and others from harm.

Answering the Call to Shift the Culture of Science: A Civic Science Curriculum

The pandemic has revealed fault lines that have roots in a long history of failure to include citizens in science-related decision-making—an exclusion that has had a disproportionate impact on racial and ethnic minority populations, who have been underrepresented in science-based conversations and deliberations in the United States. If scientists want to build public trust, they need to listen to and respect concerns that individuals hold on complex and contentious science issues. Part of the challenge in doing so is that institutions of higher education have not focused on developing the skills needed to engage voices that have been historically missing from our national science conversation. And these are not skills that have been typically taught in graduate school. Since colleges and universities will continue to play a leading role in preparing students for the scientific professions, higher education must do more to bridge the divisions and distrust between scientific institutions and the public. Teaching these civic skills will better prepare students to embrace the full complexity of the science ecosystem from a socially engaged perspective as well as from a technological perspective.

The pandemic has highlighted the necessity for higher education to prepare future generations of scientific and medical professionals not only to efficaciously advance research and practice, but also to communicate in ways that respect both scientific information and citizens' knowledge, experiences, and values. How can higher education respond to this challenge? What skill sets do scientists need to be better listeners, to respect the experiences and identities of people without scientific credentials? What tools do scientists need to build inclusive partnerships between themselves and other citizens in democratic societies, to offer their wisdom in a fair and balanced way? What learning opportunities build scientists' capacities to listen across differences of beliefs, values, and levels of trust? How can scientists implement conversations that ensure that individuals feel seen and heard, especially about high-stakes

or polarizing science issues? How can scientists enter communities and act in ways that build trust and “do no harm” at the personal and institutional levels?

At Tufts University, we have taken these questions on by developing an undergraduate civic science program that spans the four-year curriculum and bridges the humanities, social sciences, natural sciences, and life sciences. Courses teach the principles and practices of civic science to advance students’

Since colleges and universities will continue to play a leading role in preparing students for the scientific professions, higher education must do more to bridge the divisions and distrust between scientific institutions and the public.

skills in communication, advocacy, dialogue, and deliberation about polarizing, complex, and uncertain science issues. Our courses challenge our students to consider the question: Now that you have learned about complex and controversial science and public health issues, how are

you going to speak to others who hold beliefs different from yours? Courses are designed to help students understand how they can actively engage on science-based issues by applying civic skills in communities they care about. They offer students a chance to grapple with science issues that are rife with uncertainty and to find their voices on topics of personal resonance at the interface of science and society.

We teach science communication approaches by creating facilitated dialogues on challenging science issues in which students learn practices to build mutual understanding between individuals who hold different convictions, beliefs, and values. These programs can also have educational benefits for students who help to convene and facilitate the dialogues. Students tell us that these dialogues help them discuss science-based issues in ways that inspire curiosity and empathy for positions that differ from their own.

Students also reflect on the limits of scientific expertise through a series of talks delivered by scientists deeply engaged in community work. This informs students’ understanding that, while scientists are trained to find the “right answer,” it is also legitimate to say, “I don’t know the right answer.” Students learn that scientists can gain public trust, but that proclaiming “expertise” can be an ineffective strategy to achieve this goal. They begin to understand that scientists can sometimes play the role of an expeditionary guide; Sherpas possess

expertise, but even an experienced Sherpa can't always predict whether the weather is going to turn bad on the other side of the mountain. When students realize that even the "expert" in the room can't see what's on the other side of the mountain, they also learn to put more trust in each other and in themselves. We teach students that scientists have experience that others do not have but they don't have all the answers that inform public decision-making. In this way, students understand that civic science can help bridge the gap between the generation of scientific knowledge and the translation of that knowledge into meaningful, real-world solutions through community action and social change.

Teaching Civic Science through an Equity Lens

This educational grounding in civic science provides curricular content based on the view that science issues are connected to students' identities, which incorporate race, gender, cultural heritage, ethnicity, and more. Our civic science courses aspire to provide more inclusive, equitable, and intersectional educational approaches to enhance science learning. These courses are dedicated to learning about exclusionary practices and policies in research and about the impact that the systemic structuring of opportunity and the values assigned to these opportunities have had on people of color. Most recently, we have taught this through the lens of the disproportionate harm caused to Black, Indigenous, and other people of color during the pandemic. Invited speakers give voice to the lack of diversity in institutions dedicated to scientific research, including underrepresentation and under-funding for research conducted by investigators of color and lack of inclusion of communities of color in science and research. We commit ourselves to teach

toward equity in the classroom. Becoming more effective anti-racism science educators requires that we reveal understanding of marginalized perspectives

We teach students that scientists have experience that others do not have but they don't have all the answers that inform public decision-making.

and illuminate the impact of structural oppression on science and its institutions. We challenge students to explore means by which they might address these inequities by moving toward broader inclusion in research and science as a collective investment in improving a democratic society.

Our classes make the case that diversity should matter to all scientists and not just those involved in community-based research. We delve into the

reasons diversity matters for the sake of science itself as a human enterprise. The scientific process challenges us to create the broadest possible potential for generating important new questions. If science is guiding the shape of our future, then science needs to embrace the greatest possible diversity of creative people. Our courses help students develop the skills and sensibilities to respond to the urgent challenges central to equity that science faces in our lives and

If science is guiding the shape of our future, then science needs to embrace the greatest possible diversity of creative people.

communities. We offer frameworks that teach how students can confront existing systemic and institutional barriers related to marginalization, bias, and

exclusion on the basis of race, gender (identity and expression), ethnicity, ability, socioeconomic status, sexual orientation, age, familial history of higher education, and the intersections of those identities.

Structural oppression has become evident most recently at the interface of racial injustice and the COVID pandemic. Through this lens, students learn that science and its institutions have a tremendous amount of work to do regarding those who have been historically excluded from research or have suffered harm from science and its institutions. We have found that students are highly motivated to address these inequities.

Shifting the Culture of Science and Building Trust for Science at the Institutional Level

As a next step in building trustworthiness with the public, we seek to explore how institutions of higher education might have a transformative impact on the culture of the scientific enterprise. Civic science is poised to play a role by weaving together its programs, expertise, and practices into a coherent framing of educational and research experience. This will support crossing the boundaries between STEM fields, the social sciences, the humanities, and the arts.

The challenge is to demonstrate the financial and academic contributions that civic science can offer the academy. Civic science can deliver hands-on, experiential learning through the lens of equity and identity, as well as conceptual framing of science issues that can build students' sense of civic agency. Civic science courses offer training in civic skills that include public and collective evaluation, strategic thinking, and organizing on science issues. Academic centers can further enhance their community partnerships by positioning

themselves as curators and disseminators of information needed to support public decision-making on complex science-based issues. This will ultimately cultivate educational programs and scholarly initiatives that can turn science-based information into valuable public knowledge and can generate trust in the communities they hope to serve.

Institutions of higher education have been hesitant at times to innovate in the area of civic engagement through curricular, research, and service work. This may be a barrier to

the institutional culture shift that will be needed to allocate resources beyond the traditional boundaries of science to these newly conceived civic dimensions. Civic science must make the case that it is essential to the institutional mission

Academic centers can further enhance their community partnerships by positioning themselves as curators and disseminators of information needed to support public decision-making on complex science-based issues.

of building trust with the public. Civic science should become an elevated institutional priority because of the impact of scientific research, scholarship, and teaching with civic dimensions on topics that are of growing importance to our society. An additional challenge is fighting the perception that public service and civic engagement activities lack academic rigor. Advocates for civic science must make the case that a civic lens is necessary to tackle some of the thorniest and most intractable problems of public engagement with science.

The Power of Dialogue and the Challenge of COVID

Many problems require engagement from both scientists and other citizens in order to promote solutions that are both efficacious and democratic. Most recently, the COVID pandemic has dramatically demonstrated the risks of mutual distrust between citizens and scientific institutions. We have learned that science information alone is not sufficient to impact decision-making when the public considers the risks and benefits of masking and vaccination. Civic science has an important role to play in helping to reconcile scientific evidence and the values that citizens hold dear.

At Tufts University, my colleagues and I have experimented with various forms of public discussion of science-related issues for many years now. Over time, we have learned how to create spaces that are as safe as possible to support

individuals who want to share their lived experience and beliefs. Once participants feel a degree of safety, they are better able to speak from a place of “productive discomfort” that helps them take the risks needed to share their experiences without feeling threatened. They learn to understand that feeling discomfort is not the same as feeling unsafe. This allows dialogue participants to share, with curiosity and humility, their hopes and concerns about science issues that impact their lives, even in the face of continuing disagreement. Our hope for these conversations is to instill a sense of wonder not only about science but also about the stories shared by those engaged in the dialogues.

This experience has led to dialogues with diverse public groups, creating conversations on a wide range of issues, including the abortion debate, the opioid crisis, the Flint water crisis, GMOs, and “designer babies.” Our hope was that these civic science “roundtables” could break down stereotypes and build trust, dignity, and security across diverse values and beliefs. At times, participants communicated deeply held beliefs and hopes with a sense of determination—as though their lives and well-being were hanging in the balance. We discovered that open-minded dialogue on contentious science topics could be a path towards exploring highly charged science issues with empathy and compassion for others.

As the pandemic raged on, I realized that one of our society’s greatest challenges might be how people talk to each other about complex and uncertain

“One-way” public health messaging has not worked sufficiently to build trust with communities that have suffered historical harms rooted in centuries of racist exploitation by American physicians and researchers.

issues during a time of intense polarization and politicization of science information. How were Americans going to speak to those who held beliefs that differed from their own? In response, we thought that issues such as vaccine hesitancy, COVID testing privacy, and the disproportionate impact of

COVID on communities of color might be ripe for the types of dialogues we had been bringing to our Boston communities. After a decade of developing civic science, we felt that it was time to put our ideas to the test in response to the pandemic.

The pandemic revealed that public health communication strategies about COVID required listening more intentionally to community voices, hopes, and

fears. “One-way” public health messaging has not worked sufficiently to build trust with communities that have suffered historical harms rooted in centuries of racist exploitation by American physicians and researchers. As an example, vaccination rates for Blacks and other minorities have consistently lagged behind those for Whites.¹ *The New England Journal of Medicine* recently called for “a collaboratively designed Operation Build Trustworthiness that matches the seriousness and scope of Operation Warp Speed,” the federal government’s vaccine-development program.² It was time to build community partnerships to initiate new communication approaches that could meet people where they are.

We decided to create community-specific dialogues built on recognizing the legitimate concerns many people have about COVID vaccination. Our hope was to support individuals who were feeling disconnected, mistrustful, and disengaged from COVID vaccine-related choices and to support them in feeling more connected, trusting, and engaged. Our goal was to address this by communicating that it is not the responsibility of community members who had been historically harmed by science or medicine to find ways to trust COVID vaccination. Rather, it is the responsibility of those offering the vaccine to demonstrate that they are worthy of that trust. Leveraging our experience with the community dialogues we have previously convened on topics related to health disparities, we are creating conditions in which citizens can feel as safe as possible to engage in open-minded conversation and listen and learn from each other by sharing life experiences that underlie how they *feel* about COVID vaccination. These conversations are meant to offer a space where people humanize one another as they consider the risks and benefits of vaccination. This approach starts with listening in order to understand the legitimate hopes and concerns of individuals by respecting what people are thinking and feeling. By honoring voices that have been historically excluded, those offering these types of conversations can be seen as more deserving of public trust.

As we are in the early stages of doing this work, several challenges feel daunting. Will citizens who are justifiably mistrustful of science and its institutions want to join these dialogues? Will people be ready to make decisions on the politically charged and scientifically uncertain issue of COVID vaccination? Can we develop community-specific approaches, such as community dialogues, that offer scientific information and conversations about the COVID vaccine in ways that will be viewed as trustworthy? Developing wider public discourse on COVID-related choices continues to be challenging in the face of increasing polarization of discourse around masking and vaccination as the pandemic crisis continues.

There are unavoidable tensions in this work. The pandemic has dramatically revealed the need for public health communication strategies that value people's legitimate uncertainties and fears about COVID vaccination. The goal of dialogue is not to persuade others, but rather to encourage empathic listening and mutual understanding by inviting participants to share their stories and life experiences. Dialogues invite speaking about foundational hopes and concerns in ways that go beyond the binary terms that inform "yes or no" or

Dialogues invite speaking about foundational hopes and concerns in ways that go beyond the binary terms that inform "yes or no" or "right or wrong" thinking, too often used in this time of political polarization.

"right or wrong" thinking, too often used in this time of political polarization.

Dialogues are *not* meant to coerce or convince others of what they should do or what choices they should make. However, this core principle of our dialogue work feels somewhat at odds with the need for scientists to make a con-

vincing case that COVID vaccines are safe and effective. Our hopes are, on the one hand, for increased vaccine confidence based on scientific evidence and, on the other, to create space for empathic listening and questioning that honor citizens' critical thinking about what they are reading and hearing about the risks and benefits of vaccination.

Dialogues must reflect community-specific needs and are built on partnerships with trusted community members. Such partnerships always take time to nurture and build. How can we balance the public health benefit of quickly getting "shots into arms" while honoring the concerns of community members and respecting the pace of change within each community? This heightened sense of urgency makes it challenging to take the necessary time to encourage democratic, inclusive, and thoughtful decision-making. This sense of urgency can also lead to a failure to acknowledge the creativity of community partners or to a willingness to sacrifice democratic and collaborative process in favor of efficiency.

I began to notice that many of the tensions that were coming up for me were aligned with the characteristics of white supremacy culture outlined by Tema Okun. According to Okun, this is a list of "15 behaviors, all of them interconnected and mutually reinforcing."³ They appear below:

- perfectionism
- a sense of urgency
- defensiveness and/or denial
- quantity over quality
- worship of the written word
- the belief in one “right” way
- paternalism
- either/or binary thinking
- power hoarding
- fear of open conflict
- individualism
- progress defined as more
- the right to profit
- objectivity
- the right to comfort

I began to see that these characteristics were linked to some challenges we were facing in our dialogue project. For example, “either/or binary thinking” was undermining the complexity and nuance of the relationships we were hoping to build with our community partners. The “sense of urgency” was evident in the need to vaccinate but seemed to be making it hard to be inclusive, encourage democratic thinking, and allow the consequences of our next steps with community members to be carefully considered. I was also finding that these characteristics were reflected in the culture of science and its institutions and were being promulgated by science training programs as necessary for professional success. I realized that this should not be surprising as institutions “to some extent require [these characteristics] and constantly reproduce them in order to benefit from them . . . which is why they are so prevalent in our culture and institutions.”⁴ I was further motivated to create these dialogues through my growing awareness that they might help me better understand the impact that white supremacy culture has on our work and on the institutions of science.

Challenges also arise over how to communicate information about COVID vaccination and booster shots in ways that will most effectively prompt community dialogues. It is important that we share scientific knowledge about the vaccine with transparency. This means that we need to explain what science knows and what remains uncertain about vaccination to help people accurately understand potential risks and benefits. Messaging used to deliver this information needs to acknowledge the historical context and lived experience of each community. There is no “one size fits all” approach to communicating science information as we need to first understand what COVID-related scientific information is relevant to the issues each community is trying to address and choices it needs to make.

This also raises questions about the limits of scientific expertise. As a research scientist, I lean into the limits of my expertise and into my humility every day. We thrive on the unexpected result and benefit greatly when our hypotheses are proven wrong. I embrace scientific uncertainty in my lab. How can I do the same when I engage with public groups about the uncertainties of COVID vaccination? Scientific evidence seems strong that the health risks

There is no “one size fits all” approach to communicating science information as we need to first understand what COVID-related scientific information is relevant to the issues each community is trying to address and choices it needs to make.

of the vaccines approved for use in the United States are low and the benefits are high. As a result, I feel the temptation, as a scientist, to weigh in with the “right answer” about vaccination. But how much risk people are willing to tolerate or how much they trust the people offering vaccines are not questions with scientific answers. This is a

moment for scientists to see the value in personal decision-making, rather than telling the public why they need to follow the “right” answer based on science. This is a reminder that while science information is important for decision-making, it is not always sufficient to help people make up their minds about what to do. The value of dialogue is that it brings in voices of individuals who have shared lived experience. In this context, citizens can learn from each other how they *feel* about taking action on science information relevant to COVID vaccination.

It is also important to communicate science information about COVID vaccination in ways that decrease stigma. The media often represent those who are hesitant to be vaccinated as uninformed, but recent surveys have shown that there are many among the hesitant who are quite well informed. Those declining vaccination are sometimes branded as ignorant and selfish, when, in fact, many of them are thinking critically about what they are reading, hearing, and seeing about COVID vaccination. Scientists can be more open to encouraging and validating this type of thoughtful analysis of scientific information.

If successful, community-specific dialogues can broaden public participation and support vaccine preparedness in communities of color and immigrant communities. Preparation for these dialogues is built on the grassroots involvement

of individuals and community organizations, such as local faith leaders and community advocates, with well-earned reputations for trustworthiness. The dialogues we are creating will engage these trusted local leaders as “community catalysts” to lead these discussions about the experiences of community members related to vaccination. These dialogues are built on recognizing the legitimate concerns many people have about COVID-19 vaccination. We strive to involve community members at each step of the communication process to inform the specific focus of each community dialogue.

Concluding Thoughts

Civic science is an inclusive ecosystem that welcomes scientists, other citizens, and institutions by inspiring, supporting, and promoting a new approach to civic participation in science. This path to civic discourse and problem solving on science issues offers transformative change in the culture of public engagement in science through which scientists and other citizens can engage as authentic partners and cocreators. Our civic science curriculum challenges students to find inclusive approaches to build scientific trust in communities they care about as they take action on complex and challenging science issues with individuals who may hold convictions, beliefs, and values different from theirs.

On the path to the institutionalization of civic science, we will likely encounter tensions that arise from the individualistic pursuit of scientific discovery, which seems embedded in the culture of research. As a stem cell scientist, I experience the need for rewarding the rugged individualism of scientific discovery every day in my lab. It is an engine that drives science, builds capacities, and cures diseases. But building relationships of trust with diverse stakeholders will require a shift of science towards a more collectivist culture. As communities continue to experience health disparities and disproportionate harm from the pandemic, scientists will benefit from grappling with the limits of their expertise as they engage with these communities. Learning to value all forms of knowledge is an important step toward holding productive dialogues so that voices of community members can be centered and better understood. To be effective, this community work needs to be firmly grounded in grassroots involvement of individuals and organizations with solid, well-earned reputations for trustworthiness. Those offering vaccines will have to work on developing a more communal way of thinking about what they have to offer. When this happens, science will be able to support people reaching out to each other across the divide to activate an open-minded, well-informed,

and empathic dialogue on highly charged issues that may help repair the broken landscape of our American discourse. Trust will follow.

Rebranding the role of the scientist as an outward-facing citizen will result in higher-quality teaching, research, and learning. Demonstrating that civic science can prepare people who work and learn in universities to lead lives of responsible citizenship, linked to meaningful personal and professional development, will help make this case, too. We have seen civic science training, skills, and sensibilities shift institutions and departments to a more productive culture of internal communication by building a culture of inclusion and representation.

As I was doing my clinical work in head and neck cancer, the Hippocratic Oath asked that I use my judgment for the benefit of my patients “to protect them from harm and injustice.” Civic science is making a similar request of me—to do “no harm” as I engage with stakeholders and communities that hold diverse identities. Building trust is not just about being credible and authentic. It is also about using this credibility and authenticity to protect others from harm and injustice. At times, even the best of intentions cannot prevent harm. But it feels as though civic science is asking me to constantly check my biases and assumptions and to clarify the intentions of my words. In this way, it is

Civic science is an inclusive ecosystem that welcomes scientists, other citizens, and institutions by inspiring, supporting, and promoting a new approach to civic participation in science.

teaching me what it means to be trustworthy. When I show up, I will try to do so in ways that are not going to make others feel disrespected, demeaned, or humiliated. Building trust in science will also depend on scientists recognizing their place in this process. Scientists can best serve

others by listening to the citizens they hope to serve and the communities they wish to support.

Civic science trains scientists not only to know the language and expertise of science but, more important, how and when to use it. The first step in this process is to listen and get to know the community. Handing over the “power of knowing” to others creates a space for scientists and other citizens to work together so they can share diverse forms of knowledge and experience across their diverse values and beliefs.

It has been said that immunity is a communal experience. Laboratory scientists, epidemiologists, public health specialists, and others are still puzzling about how we can get to “herd immunity” for COVID. While there is no certainty about what our journey as scientists will reveal, issues such as COVID vaccination will awaken us to communal choices that speak to the heart of our natural and societal order. These issues call on us to connect to our deeper sense of social justice and equity. They ask us to create inclusive dialogues. There is no turning back from our collective future.



NOTES

- ¹ As of this writing, 70 percent of White Americans, 65 percent of Black Americans, and 61 percent of Hispanic Americans have been vaccinated. The Kaiser Family Foundation tracks and updates this data. “KFF COVID-19 Vaccine Monitor,” Kaiser Family Foundation, <https://www.kff.org/coronavirus-covid-19/dashboard/kff-covid-19-vaccine-monitor-dashboard/> (accessed October 7, 2021).
- ² Reuben C. Warren et al., “Trustworthiness before Trust—Covid-19 Vaccine Trials and the Black Community,” *New England Journal of Medicine* 383, no. 22, <https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMp2030033> (accessed October 7, 2021).
- ³ Tema Okun, “White Supremacy Culture Characteristics,” White Supremacy Culture, <https://www.whitesupremacyculture.info/characteristics.html> (accessed October 7, 2021).
- ⁴ Okun, “White Supremacy Culture Characteristics.”

CONTRIBUTORS

DEREK W. M. BARKER is a program officer at the Kettering Foundation and coeditor (with Alex Lovit) of the *Higher Education Exchange*. With a background in political theory, his research focuses on the democratic role of higher education institutions, philanthropy, and nonprofit organizations, journalism, and the professions. Barker is the author of *Tragedy and Citizenship: Conflict, Reconciliation, and Democracy from Haemon to Hegel* (SUNY Press, 2009) and articles appearing in the academic journals *Political Theory*, *New Political Science*, *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, and the *Good Society*.

KATHLEEN (KATIE) CLARK is an assistant professor of nursing and the executive director of the Augsburg Health Commons at Augsburg University. She has over 13 years' experience working in higher education, where she teaches primarily in graduate nursing studies focused on transcultural nursing and caring for marginalized populations. Prior to her role in academia, Clark worked as an acute care nurse for eight years. During that time, she also volunteered working with homeless youth in Minneapolis and in various countries such as Haiti, Tanzania, and Peru. She holds a Doctorate of Nursing Practice in Transcultural Leadership.

JONATHAN GARLICK is a professor at Tufts University School of Dental Medicine, School of Medicine, and School of Engineering, and director of Science Communications at Tufts Clinical Translational Sciences Institute. His research team uses stem cells and human tissue engineering to pioneer "lab-made skin" to advance new treatments for cancer, scleroderma, and complications of diabetes. He is the founder and leader of the Tufts Initiative in Civic Science to explore human health and science through an equity lens, humanize public discourse on polarizing science issues, and foster more inclusion in science.

CHRIS GILMER is president and tenured professor of humanities at West Virginia University at Parkersburg and founder of the National Institutes for Historically Underserved Students. He earned a PhD in English from the University of Southern Mississippi. He is the founding co-convenor of the Research Alliance on Post-Secondary Success at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) and has served three HBCUs, one Hispanic-Serving Institution, and an Appalachian college. He is a national commissioner on college readiness for the American Association of Community Colleges and a member of the board of directors of the Community Colleges of Appalachia. His teaching focuses primarily on the intersections of literature and culture and the literature of marginalized people.

ALEX LOVIT is a program officer with the Kettering Foundation. He holds a PhD in history from the University of Michigan, where he studied 19th-century political history. He provides historical research for Kettering's Cousins Research Group, helps manage the foundation's research into democratic education both in K-12 schools and in higher education, and is the coeditor (with Derek W.M. Barker) of *Higher Education Exchange*.

DAVID MATHEWS, president and CEO of the Kettering Foundation, was secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in the Ford administration and, before that, president of the University of Alabama. Mathews has written extensively on Southern history, public policy, education, and international problem solving. His books include *Politics for People: Finding a Responsible Public Voice*, *Reclaiming Public Education by Reclaiming Our Democracy*, *The Ecology of Democracy: Finding Ways to Have a Stronger Hand in Shaping Our Future*, and *With the People: An Introduction to an Idea*.

DAVID E. PROCTER is professor of communication studies at Kansas State University (KSU). In 2004, he helped establish the Institute for Civic Discourse and Democracy to provide citizens with a stronger voice in local, state, and national politics and to build capacity for civil deliberation on important and controversial issues. Procter served as coeditor of the *Journal of Public Deliberation* and helped create a graduate certificate in dialogue, deliberation, and public engagement at KSU. He received his PhD from the University of Nebraska.

TIMOTHY J. SHAFFER is associate professor of communication studies and director of the Institute for Civic Discourse and Democracy at Kansas State University. He is also director of civic engagement and deliberative democracy with the National Institute for Civil Discourse. Shaffer has edited four books, including *Deliberative Pedagogy: Teaching and Learning for Democratic Engagement* (Michigan State University Press, 2017), *Jumping into Civic Life: Stories of Public Work from Extension Professionals* (Kettering Foundation Press, 2018), *A Crisis of Civility? Political Discourse and Its Discontents* (Routledge, 2019), and *Creating Space for Democracy: A Primer on Dialogue and Deliberation in Higher Education* (Stylus, 2019). He earned his PhD at Cornell University.

JOHN J. THEIS, a professor of political science at Lone Star College-Kingwood, is a founder and director of the college's Center for Civic Engagement. He also served as chair of the steering committee of the Democracy Commitment and was a member of the board of directors for the National Issues Forum Institute from 2017 to 2020. He has been involved in civic engagement work for over 20 years and started the LSC-Kingwood Public Achievement program in 2010. Theis holds his PhD from the University of Arizona.

BYRON P. WHITE is associate provost for Urban Research and Community Engagement at the University of North Carolina Charlotte where he oversees a new office charged with mobilizing, assessing, and advancing efforts that connect the university's interdisciplinary, urban research resources to community assets. He has spent his career as a journalist and administrator in academic, corporate, non-profit, and public sectors facilitating mutually beneficial engagement between institutions and urban communities. White has a doctorate in higher education management from the University of Pennsylvania, is a research associate at the Kettering Foundation, and serves on the advisory board of the E.W. Scripps School of Journalism at Ohio University.

Kettering Foundation

200 Commons Road, Dayton, Ohio 45459 (937) 434-7300; (800) 221-3657
444 North Capitol Street, NW, Suite 434, Washington, DC 20001 (202) 393-4478
www.kettering.org
