

>> STEPHANIE DOSCHER: You're listening to Making Global Learning Universal, conversations about engaging diverse perspectives, collaboration, and complex problem solving in higher education -- on campus, online, in local communities, and abroad. I'm your host, Stephanie Doscher, Director of Global Learning Initiatives at Florida International University and co-author of Making Global Learning Universal, Promoting Inclusion and Success for All.

>> DANIEL GRIFFITH: When you spend time in listening to someone's story, their testimonials, their deepest hurtful experiences and it broadens your understanding, that challenge you, that cognitive dissonance and so forth, and then you start to change how you view that person, or if not that person, how you view people who you have identified like that person in their group, there's a lot of connectedness there.

>> STEPHANIE DOSCHER: That was Daniel Griffith, Director of Conflict Resolution and Dialogue Programs at Indiana University - Purdue University Indianapolis, commonly referred to IUPUI.

I met Daniel at IUPUI's Intercultural Engagement Symposium in September of 2019 when I was giving a keynote on the relationship between intercultural communication and global learning. Later that afternoon Daniel gave a great talk on IUPUI's model of intergroup dialogue, and I knew I wanted to invite him on to the podcast.

Now before we launch into our conversation, let me share with you just a little bit about what intergroup dialogue is all about. It's basically a method for facilitating difficult conversations between people from two or more social identity groups. It involves sustained face-to-face discussions around issues related to social justice, identity, positionality and power. The dialogues are co-facilitated by trained individuals representing each of the groups. There's a lot to IUPUI's program which involves both faculty and students, and it's loosely modeled on University of Michigan's program on intergroup relations.

After you listen to the episode, check out the show notes for more resources on how you can facilitate intergroup dialogue on your campus. But for now here's my conversation with Daniel.

So I think as we get started on our conversation today, Daniel, it would be good to hear you talk a little bit about who you are and what you do in your own words. Right? People can read your biography, but I think it would be helpful for you to explain your place in your institution and the nature of your work.

>> DANIEL GRIFFITH: Sure. Well, that's a good question. I think of, how do I answer that in terms of the resume versus the who I am and what I stand for, I guess is kind of what we're looking at. Maybe as a step back, I know the broader picture here is looking at intergroup dialogue, and I certainly have been a part of that program for a number of years. But I guess in terms of the overall theme of what I do, I feel as though it's a matter of facilitating process, facilitating how people can connect and communicate and understand one another.

So, I mean formally my title is Director of Conflict Resolution and Dialogue Programs. I'm in the division of diversity and inclusion here at IUPUI. I also teach part-time such as in the course in negotiation alternative resolution for our School of Public Environmental Affairs. I also teach at

a law school part-time, and a mediation practice, and, by the way, I'm a lawyer. So, really, the background, I'm not sure the legal background is that unique, or not just unique, it's not that common in this area perhaps in terms of intergroup dialogue, but it certainly has evolved that way.

I have been in -- I tried for 20 plus years. Prior to that I practiced as a lawyer for a while in the state of Indiana. But I think it just evolved in terms of wanting to move from all that compliance kind of practice and getting people to behave, so to speak, in different ways to how people can reflect and think and communicate and solve their own problems.

I have a passion for intergroup dialogue, but I have a deep passion for mediation and also training others to be mediators. And I think the passion around it is helping people solve their own problems, helping them -- being a part of the process of helping them talk through issues. And frankly the most wonderful moments are when they are working out their own issues and they forget that I am in the room, and that's a classic way of mediating where they stop, they stop remembering you're there because they are starting to work things out on their own.

So I see a lot of that in terms of my background. It's facilitating those kinds of conversations, the process of how we communicate, work through things, and that's probably the broader theme, I guess.

>> STEPHANIE DOSCHER: I love this because you're already starting to change perspective a little bit on what lawyering can be all about. My mom has a saying about everybody hates lawyers until they need one. Right?

>> DANIEL GRIFFITH: Yes.

>> STEPHANIE DOSCHER: And then they are the most important people in your lives. But I don't think she's talking about the fact that lawyers help us to solve our own problems. Right?

>> DANIEL GRIFFITH: Right. Right.

>> STEPHANIE DOSCHER: You just kind of turn the tables on the common perspective of what a lawyer is there to help us do. And I think it would also help for us to share with listeners how it is that we met and why I invited you to be on in Season 2.

I was invited to come to speak at the Intercultural Communication Symposium at IUPUI, and you also spoke at that symposium. So could you share a little bit about how it is that you came to be invited to that symposium, because you talked about your placement, your program's placement within the university.

>> DANIEL GRIFFITH: Sure. Now, I will say that my background in terms of global learning, that's not where I come from, so to speak, but certainly I have connected with a lot of faculty on our campus on intergroup dialogue. So the most direct communication was through the organizer, and I'm trying to remember her name.

>> STEPHANIE DOSCHER: Estella.

>> DANIEL GRIFFITH: Yeah. There you go.

>> STEPHANIE DOSCHER: I just spent the week with her in Mexico.

>> DANIEL GRIFFITH: Okay. And we had already talked. A colleague of mine in my program had talked to her about intergroup dialogue a little bit, and then she contacted me saying, could you explain intergroup dialogue as a session at this conference, at this symposium. So that's the direct connection.

But I think more broadly the intergroup dialogue effort on our campus has been a matter of looking at broadly about how groups communicate, talk through issues, the importance of having serious conversations on the things that are hard to talk about. Race, gender, sexual orientation, social identity.

We got a lot of support in that model from the University of Michigan, program of intergroup relations, who I would recommend to any institution going to get more support on that. But it was just a process over many years of connecting with our community at large. It wasn't just faculty. A lot of staff and really first staff and faculty to look at ways of how we can understand intergroup dialogue so we can learn for ourselves and then move to teaching it in the classroom for students. But a lot of connections through faculty happened. So that was among them where they were trying to look at how intergroup dialogue can fit with global learning and those kinds of curriculum.

>> STEPHANIE DOSCHER: Yeah. And I'll clarify that Estella, who was directing and facilitating the intercultural communication programs and services that are happening at IUPUI, she's part of that leadership team. We were in Mexico not on vacation. We were in Mexico for a congress on innovation in education at Tecnológico de Monterrey (Spanish).

The tie-in there between global learning intercultural dialogue and some of the things that we're going to talk about today is collaborative online international learning. So bringing together groups of people who are studying perhaps different disciplines, different topics in those disciplines, and in different countries.

So our entire conversation today is about really bringing people together who may be seated in different perspectives into a common space, and the name of this process that you use at IUPUI and also at other institutions is intergroup dialogue. So could we take a deeper dive into what that looks like? I mean, we're not talking about just having a debate in our class.

>> DANIEL GRIFFITH: Far from it.

>> STEPHANIE DOSCHER: Okay.

>> DANIEL GRIFFITH: Far from debate. Yes.

>> STEPHANIE DOSCHER: So what does it really look like? An intergroup dialogue course.

>> DANIEL GRIFFITH: Well, since you mentioned the word debate, part of the training is comparing debate to concepts like discussion and dialogue. So we get down to some definitions about that. So we're careful about not using the word debate.

So obviously let's start with just the model of how it's set up. So any intergroup dialogue is basically a group of 14 to 16 people, and depending on the -- and each dialogue is focused on a particular aspect of social identity. It could be a couple of identities, but for the most part intersectionality is fine talking about that. But typically it's one identity. So we would have a race dialogue, a sexual orientation dialogue, religion dialogue, and what have you.

And the people in the room are more or less equally a parity in terms of representation. So obviously if you have 14 to 16 people, seven to eight people would be people of color, interracial dialogue. The other group would be white participants, and it's co-facilitated that way, and it's also looking at in the context of who is in the room. It's the target group, which is the underrepresented, disadvantaged group, and then the Asian group. And as a straight white man I'm typically the co-facilitator representing that group. In race dialogues, I have done many of them. It was typically with an African-American female. Not always, but for the most part a number of colleagues we have facilitated as race dialogues.

So that's the setup in the room and who shows up. Now obviously we do the logistics, but that's the basic idea of who shows up. And the dialogue process goes through an intentional step-by-step process of activities, and it's a four-stage model.

So the first phase is all about learning dialogue skills, visiting that, understanding listening, understanding what dialogue is as compared to debate. Debate being all about how we explore assumptions, how we inquire as well as listening, how we examine where we're judging one another, examining where we're shutting down because of something someone said. All these sort of things to develop an environment where we can truly understand dialogue and its principles.

As we do that, we then move into stage two which is a lot about looking at our identity. So I think stage two, frankly, as I have done these dialogues, are the most powerful where there's a lot of different activities we have done. Some low stakes, some higher stakes where people are sharing aspects of their identity and their experience.

A low stakes example, one thing we do is called a culture box. People bring artifacts that represent their culture. If it's a race dialogue, related to race but doesn't necessarily have to be but just sharing, this is meaningful to me, whatever that object is, it could be a picture. It could be a rock. It could be any kind of piece of jewelry. It could be a painting, a book. You name it. They bring it in. Or a picture of it if it's too big. They say this speaks to my identity in this way, and it's a matter of learning and listening in that regard.

Now higher stakes activities when we look at identity and share those experiences are about testimonials of when people have experienced privilege, when they have experienced oppression, discrimination, disadvantage, and the process is a lot of listening, not this deep inquiry, not probing, not to put people on the spot or to tax people more, particularly disadvantaged groups.

The whole idea here is those first two stages, understanding good dialogue principles, sharing our experiences and things like that so that we're better prepared for the third stage which we call in our institution critical conversations or difficult conversations.

So here's the thing. When you talk about issues of race, gender, on and on in terms of social identity and all of the aspects of that in terms of experience at different levels, interpersonal as well as systemic, we need to talk about these things, but we're often very hesitant to. We don't want to talk about them because it's perceived as too difficult, too negative, too much of a risk. I'm not saying it isn't a risk in the dialogue, but the point of the first two stages in going through that is to better prepare us for those difficult conversations, and it does help.

Again, I think another thing about the dialogue is sustained effort, a number of meetings over time, so you get to know the same people in that room. It's the dialogue among those people.

It's for them. It's not for anyone outside that. So it's learning experiences through that. So it creates an environment that's safer. Not always comfortable to talk about those difficult issues.

And then finally the fourth stage is about building alliances. So in my view that stage is about why do we do this. Why does this matter. So again we talk about being an ally for those who are disadvantaged, lacking, having negative experiences in different ways, and it's at all levels of how we can learn more about stepping in when we hear a prejudicial comment or how we can work together as a group or individually to address an issue in our university, for example, or even as simple as what's different about us after this dialogue, what's different about us individually that we might do differently to commit to social change and social action at different levels.

So it's really an intentional deeper exploration of these issues, and what we try to create is a safe environment to do that. Experiences have been good. People saw value in it. So that's the process, and that's been the -- I think it's been successful as far as the actual experiences we have been doing.

>> STEPHANIE DOSCHER: So I have a couple of questions. You said building these dialogues over time. So how long would an encounter last and over what period of time and how frequent do those encounters happen?

>> DANIEL GRIFFITH: So I will say the model that we started from is again the University of Michigan, the Program on Intergroup Relations, and their model is using the dialogue in the curriculum in their classes. I think it is psychology and sociology. There might be other courses.

So for their model, which we have not -- we are trying to replicate in our own way, not successful yet because it's an uphill battle. It really is a lot of resources involved. But their model is basically you take a 16-week course and an instructor teaches the content of that course, and usually the course is around something like diversity in some way. And then the ideal model is the dialogues are separate from the instructional piece.

Again, the ideal model is that it's purely facilitated. So the University of Michigan's model, they are developing students to go through the experience of dialogue. The peer facilitators are facilitating the dialogues with other students. We aspire to that. We are not quite there, but that just gives you an idea. If we could replicate their model, it would be basically in a 16-week semester. Maybe 13 of those weeks would be dialogues going through that process.

Now what we have done on our campus, we started out with looking at faculty and staff dialogues so it's not obviously a semester-based approach. We have actually signed up people, and we have started having either a three-and-a-half or four-day model. When I say -- it doesn't necessarily mean three-and-a-half compressed days. It could be like seven half days or that sort of thing, over the course of a number of weeks. And we sort of adapted that model to explore that with the same group over the course of that time period.

>> STEPHANIE DOSCHER: Okay. So you started with faculty and staff dialogues.

>> DANIEL GRIFFITH: Yes.

>> STEPHANIE DOSCHER: And was the purpose of that to build, to deal with issues that were happening in terms of faculty and staff and/or to enable faculty and staff to then facilitate intergroup dialogue?

>> DANIEL GRIFFITH: Yes.

(Laughter)

>> DANIEL GRIFFITH: All of the above.

>> STEPHANIE DOSCHER: Okay. Cool.

>> DANIEL GRIFFITH: Well, like any university, these days IUPUI has its challenges in terms of diversity, inclusion in terms of what students feel, what they're experiencing. Maybe just a little bit of how we started.

We have been at it for like 10 years now. Maybe not quite 10 years. The initial suggestion came actually from a former vice chancellor of, of all things, finance administration. She is actually a graduate of the University of Michigan, and her daughter was participating in the program at University of Michigan at the time that she took a job at IUPUI.

So at the time there were some things going on. Students had concerns about a few issues. I believe that was some initial suggestions by her to say you might want to look at your dialogue.

So in the course of a couple of years I was like, I was not one of the people involved. But maybe two years into that I was contacted to sort of take a leadership role. Again, partly because someone knew of my mediation background and my training background. But the whole initial conversations that I had along with many colleagues was we need to learn this ourselves first before we expect students to do so.

So that's sort of how I began. And frankly I also felt it was a matter that we have to get faculty and staff to experience this, to be able to talk it up, to feel positive about those experiences, to then build towards a model where we might look at the students in terms of the curriculum. So it really started with faculty staff. I think we're a little unique. I don't think -- I think many universities are looking at faculty staff dialogues. I think a lot of it more in the curriculum for students. It can go different ways.

But I am proud that we have been able to do some things with faculty and staff to look at that, and then hopefully it will translate into some faculty. Some faculty are already experiencing it. Choose your dialogue first. They are not looking at curriculum. We now have an undergraduate certificate, intergroup dialogue. We have four schools on our campus who are part of that certificate. So we are -- and a lot of growing pains. It's been a slow process, but we now have a certificate where many faculty have gone through the dialogue experience of this is now the curriculum or now I'm trying to look at how they can have courses where students can now have the intergroup dialogue experience.

>> STEPHANIE DOSCHER: So with the certificate, is that something that one would earn as a facilitator? Are there courses that one would take?

>> DANIEL GRIFFITH: Yes.

>> STEPHANIE DOSCHER: What does that look like?

>> DANIEL GRIFFITH: Sure. Well, again, this is sort of our version of what University of Michigan has done, but again we have gone our own way in many ways. It's a four-course certificate. So we have a whole series of what we refer to as dialogue intensive courses that any student can sign up for, and that is where we're looking at instructors building intergroup dialogue into the curriculum so that whatever learning in the curriculum they need to do, students are also experiencing through dialogue processes and conversations that way.

And so after that experience, if there's students who then want to pursue their certificate, there are three more courses that it would go through. One is a specific intergroup dialect training course, training facilitator course. We have co-instructors for that course, so they are learning how to facilitate those dialogue processes.

There is another course. They just need to do at least one additional course, a number of topics, a whole smorgasbord of different courses they could take that really would just be called additional grounding, not really intergroup dialogue specific. It's just a matter of something deeper, a women's studies course or whatever it might be.

Then the capstone is intended to identify students to then go back to those initial dialogue intensive courses to be facilitators in those courses. And that is more or less -- University of Michigan has their version of that which is pretty robust, but that's the intent, is simply a student's experience is initially through some other experiences to learn how to facilitate dialogue with their capstone or whatever their final issue is, if they have a semester where they are now going back into the classroom to be better facilitators, better students.

I suppose sort of early on would be a freshman, sophomore, more sophomore, junior dialogue intensive. And then by your senior year you're a capstone co-facilitator going into a course. Obviously, that's our model. We are slow in getting there, but that's the idea to do that.

So in the classroom the idea is that students be pure facilitators in that. There's a lot of issues about the instructor doing that in terms of power, in terms of other things. Until we get more resources, we're doing a little of that. We're trying to manage those dynamics, but the ideal is that students are literally pure facilitators for their fellow students.

>> STEPHANIE DOSCHER: So I have been looking at, I have been reading about we have not facilitated intergroup dialogue courses or activities in particular as part of the Global Learning Initiative at FIU. We have done some national issues for programming. We have a round table that we call the Tuesday Times round table discussion which is a free discussion every Tuesday about a global topic. It's an open dialogue. And dialogue, those difficult dialogues with diverse others every single year comes out as the experience that most highly impacts our students' global awareness perspective and engagement as we measure that through the global perspective inventory.

We use that as an assessment of our students. We take 10% samples when students enter FIU as either freshmen or transfers, and then again when they exit. We have tens of thousands of data points now, and we have analyzed on an annual basis, prepost, every which way these dialogues with diverse others stands out as a significant influencer of students' global mindset.

So I think that's a good spot to ask the question of what really is the relationship between intergroup dialogue, as you define it and describe it, and our concept of global learning as the

process of diverse people collaboratively analyzing and addressing complex problems that transcend borders. Where's the sticky spot. Right? Between what intergroup dialogue is and what global learning is.

>> DANIEL GRIFFITH: Well, I think that some of the stages in the model hit on that. I mean, when -- particularly I think it is a problem solving, looking at the big picture and how to address these complex issues and how to learn more about it.

So I think every stage does that. But I notice in terms of definitions that you actually provided earlier, global awareness and those sort of things, talking about things like interrelatedness, when you spend time in listening to someone's story, their testimonials, their deepest hurtful experiences, it broadens your understanding. It challenges you. That cognitive dissonance and so forth. And then you start to change how you view that person. Or if not that person, how you view people who you have identified like that person in their group. There's a lot of connectedness there.

And I think that when we talk about the critical conversations, say problem solving, well, first of all, understand the problem. A lot of those difficult conversations, understand what the issues are.

Now, in those conversations we talk about situations about how we interrelate interpersonally, talk to someone who is different than me or this group. I don't understand how they dress, something like that or all kinds of other things. Sometimes expressing some true ignorance about those experiences but managing it in a way that is supportive without being judgmental. And it also covers a lot of systemic issues, whether it's what's going on in the world, what's going on on our campus, what groups are not represented, what groups are being -- are individuals being treated badly because of a policy when the policy itself doesn't say it's wrong but it impacts.

So all those sort of things to me is a problem solving issue. Now, does it change the world as far as beyond the intergroup dialogue? Maybe not. But it certainly gets people thinking about how can I contribute to that. How can I contribute to influencing a change. To me that's the analytical problem solving that you talk about for global learning.

>> STEPHANIE DOSCHER: I think that our listeners might be particularly interested in this problem solving piece as it relates to intergroup dialogue because people will say all the time, well, that's just talk. Right? That's just talk. That's not meaningful. It's not doing something. But you implied earlier that there's this fourth stage of building alliances, and you talked about, if I heard you correctly -- please correct me if I didn't hear you correctly -- that space is around connection making?

>> DANIEL GRIFFITH: Somewhat. Yeah. I think all dialogue is. Yes. We do challenge our participants to think about what comes next after this dialogue. Well, first of all, the concrete discussions we have around that are what it means to be an ally for someone else, and also there's this continuum of how much you participate in or against social justice, social change.

So we have these conversations about people reflect not necessary to share for others but how they reflect where they are dealing with some of these issues.

So one dynamic in dialogue is from my own experience. I came new to the dialogue like anyone else. I'm not this perfect person. It's just a matter of maybe a little openness to say I'm



willing to hear the experience. Many white men in particular aren't always willing to do that. But I felt like I became willing to understand, whether it's me or people who look like me, how they come across, how they interact or whatever, and also came to see that not only do I have bias and prejudice, but with trusted colleagues in these rooms I can acknowledge that. I can say openly I have this, and I'm still struggling with it.

And what I meant was okay, we didn't expect anything different from our perspective. That's one. But also saying on our end we have our own issues, and that's part of being human and talking it through. But those deeper connections and having people reflect about the dialogue is what it is. It is transformational.

But you guys think about how you take what you have done in this seven-and-a-half, seven-and-a-half, seven half-day sessions or what have you, what you will do further to apply this. And in that hopefully it is that group of connect what they might do, particularly if it's -- I'm talking about staff mostly, how they are thinking about, if nothing else, going for coffee every now and then, or maybe there's some common goals that they have that they can address. But it is having people think about what's the change that I can affect.

First, I like to think for students it might finally change if not their major, not that there's an attempt to change their major, but to change the direction of their career differently than they thought before they started.

I will say about the certificate itself, one goal that I see in that certificate is obviously a student who has that certificate, they are looking for a job, they can wave that certificate, put it on their resume and what have you, and be able to say in this workplace that I may be hired into, I'm comfortable, relatively comfortable with the conversations that need to be had with other colleagues who are different than me. I'm not threatened by that.

In fact, I want to encourage it because that's how we create better teamwork and those sort of things. In other words, employers see this as someone coming in who is prepared for that global workplace, prepared for that multicultural workplace that is so needed. And so that's the best -- I think that gets a little bit to what you're asking there.

>> STEPHANIE DOSCHER: Yes. Those are some of the actions that are possible. And when you are, when you began that description you talked about being an ally, and I think you also talked about being an advocate, and you also talked a little bit about power.

So in the intergroup dialogue would it be correct to say that there's going to be an in-group and an out-group or, to use kind of sociological terms, that it's a group that tends to have power in this situation and a group that doesn't tend to have power? How does it not just become, well, I have to do something. It's my responsibility to lift these people. Right? That might be what the powerful comes out of, and the power, those who entered from a less powerful point of view walking in and saying or walking out and saying, well, it's my job just to empathize with the fact that they were brought up that way. They don't mean it, and I just have to understand better that that's why it happens or that I just have to school them. It's my -- like the action that I have to take is to keep calling them on their craft.

>> DANIEL GRIFFITH: Right. We don't want that.

>> STEPHANIE DOSCHER: How does it not do that?

>> DANIEL GRIFFITH: We don't want them to feel they have to school others or whatever or be put on the spot. But how does it become -- those things you're describing, first of all, power is definitely something we have to talk about, the differentials or how it's perceived in different ways. The definitions in terms of the Asian group and the target group is all about that.

So again race dialogue is probably one of the most difficult dialogues but the easiest in some ways to illustrate these distinctions just because it's quite a contrast and an experience. But the dialogues tend to be a lot of time. We have to manage that. But white participants have to come to understand, not them specifically, but how that Asian group is -- they are a dominant culture, their experiences, and not having to think about being disadvantaged, not having to think about many stories, the race dialogue about being stopped by the police, other kinds of situations like that where I have had to learn. I have had to teach my children how to manage interactions with law enforcement.

That's the example. And white participants not having any clue what that's about. But for the most part in our room are willing to listen or stand and then coming to the knowledge, yeah, I have never had an experience. I can't relate to this, but I can try, and I want to, and I want to do what I can to help in that regard.

Now, the other issue about the ally conversation is where I think again we would love for just anyone to show up in our dialogues, including those on the fringes, those who really -- we all know who they are, whoever they are, whatever spectrum. We're looking at this person needs to change and that person needs to go through this, but they don't show up. So obviously the people who do show up are inclined to have these conversations, inclined to engage, but they are not always doing what to expect.

I think one example would be a lot of white participants in a race dialogue where they can at times come across that I'm here to help. I'm here to be -- I'm an ally. I want to be an ally. I'm here to help. They don't quite say it that way, but they come across that way. And they need to come to realize that that is not welcome. That is not appreciated by people of color. What is welcome is openness, a willingness to learn, a willingness to acknowledge that I can't relate, but I want to be helpful. I'll be the last person to call myself an ally. That's not my job. It's really to do with where I can be supportive for others. And if I'm welcome to do that, and if I'm not, I'll still keep learning. I'll still want to commit to understanding that it's not -- there's not accolades for being an ally.

All these sort of conversations have to happen particularly for that target group, the Asian group, to understand what being an ally means, and it really means start with yourself. Start with exploring your issues of identity. Not feeling guilty. It's just a matter of feeling how I can look at myself first, then to be effective and reflective and supportive in the way that others would want me to be so that I can be a part to help solve these problems, whatever those are.

>> STEPHANIE DOSCHER: You started to talk about something just now that had bubbled up for me, which was a question about participation. You said, which stands to reason, that unless this is something that's compelled, people that tend to participate are those who have an interest in being an ally or who have a curiosity. They have some kind motivation to understand, to be there. So that probably has an impact on the outcome of the dialogue.

>> DANIEL GRIFFITH: Sure.

>> STEPHANIE DOSCHER: But do you prepare or do you screen participants at all?

>> DANIEL GRIFFITH: No. We have a process to make sure that we have a balance of participation, and we would look at any issues where any concern of, particularly in a workplace, relationships in the room of like a supervisor, of an employee reporting a supervisor and those kinds of things. So we have that.

I will say that if we can keep moving on with our undergrad certificate, if we could get anywhere close to how University of Michigan does, they do some screening in terms of serving of people who sign up for the course and in terms of identifying so they can parcel out the dialogue process so they can have that parity, and these are the dialogues that they do.

But I don't see that there's a screening out that -- well, let's just say that we do some surveying even for us. When we do it for faculty staff, we do a survey and say thank you for signing up. Before we get this scheduled, we want to know a little bit about you that you're willing to share on this aspect of identity, that may help us as co-facilitators to have an understanding of who is coming into the room. But we have never had a situation where we felt that we needed to screen out or to suggest that this is right for you or to not be able to manage it when certain things do come up. It's never been as extreme.

But I mean you have to have some care in how you manage it, and it could happen where things fall apart a little bit in the course of mediation because you didn't anticipate how someone is reacting. It's just being a facilitator to figure out how you would manage that.

>> STEPHANIE DOSCHER: How do you manage that with a co-facilitator? That -- whoa! So that's a whole other layer of intergroup dialogue between the facilitators, and you have to model certain behaviors. I have done that a little bit.

>> DANIEL GRIFFITH: Yeah. Sure. So you just don't go in -- I have never done this before, but I'm sure I'll try to facilitate.

>> STEPHANIE DOSCHER: Do you want to help me?

(Laughter).

>> DANIEL GRIFFITH: Obviously, even when we have done -- I mean, I went through a number of dialogues first. And I want to say obviously as a professional in the area of diversity, I obviously had other experiences that prepared me as well. Colleagues have backgrounds that are already prepared in that level. But fundamentally as a co-facilitator you do start with your co-facilitator. Understand each other. You do have to have some connection.

One thing too, when we ask any participant to share their story like a testimonial, we're the first to model that. We have to understand where -- we have to understand each other. And again sometimes when I have co-facilitated with a colleague that I don't know quite as well but certainly well enough -- one colleague who has now left the university, she's an African-American woman.

She and I co-facilitated a number of race dialogues. We had known each other for many years on campus anyway, worked together. In fact, we were the two who actually began some of the dialogues, and we just sort of understood each other. But we understood each other even more as we began the dialogues recognizing that we had to be transparent. We have to understand each other. We have to show our vulnerability and show our mistakes. There were times in the

dialogue, okay, we don't know what we're doing now. We don't exactly know, but we'll get through it, and we keep working together to find the right approach.

So again you don't go in with your co-facilitator. You get to know them a little bit. For the most part when we have done that pairing it's worked out. A few times perhaps not. But that's also, in my view, part of life. You work with it.

There can be obviously horrible things that can happen in dialogue, over the top, not well planned, not well managed, but beyond that, mistakes happen. People are human. That includes the facilitators and the experiences that we have learned from it. There is this glitch. There is this bump. There is this awkward moment or moments, but that's part of the learning, I think.

One other colleague who has also left the university to another institution, she was a former EO director. She always talked about if we don't learn, if we don't make mistakes and allow mistakes, meaning saying, showing ignorance, showing misunderstanding, risking a question when it's kind of off-putting a little bit. If we don't risk that and work through it and communicate and learn from it versus just judging it and closing it down, we will not get anywhere. I think about that a lot. Part of the learning is the mistakes and faux pas and things are said awkwardly or whatever, including by the facilitator sometimes. That's part of the process, and you have to embrace that. It's part of what we can learn.

>> STEPHANIE DOSCHER: We have listeners so far in 32 countries of this podcast, which is pretty exciting. So for them, when you said an EO director --

>> DANIEL GRIFFITH: Okay. Equal opportunity director, overseeing compliance of discrimination laws and things like that.

>> STEPHANIE DOSCHER: So that also brings up a question that I have with you or for you about where -- you're a lawyer. This person was an EO director. Is there a certain part of the university or part of the institution or are there certain characteristics that you would say make for a good facilitator of dialogue? Can anybody do it? Can anybody learn or is it more of a talent or by nature?

>> DANIEL GRIFFITH: Yeah. I don't think anyone can do it. I think anyone can learn if they are willing to do a lot of self-reflection. I say anyone can learn. Do I believe anyone will learn? Well, find a way to dive deeper in terms of their own prejudice and their own vulnerabilities, probably not, but I think that's important.

So let me also say in talking about being a lawyer or someone involved in compliance, as far as who typically goes into this, I'm probably not standard in terms of that. But I will say that, although I still have, I'm still a practicing lawyer, I still have my license. I got out of practicing law for a reason, other than the aspects of mediation that I did. So, obviously I don't know if lawyering skills per se are appropriate for dialogue. Mediation skills. Moving from being an advocate for someone to someone willing to help people connect through communication, listening, and those sort of things is at least a start to move to facilitating.

Now, I also want to make clear that mediation is very distinct from facilitation, but at least there are some similar skills that can transfer. But I think fundamentally am I someone who can be willing to open up here, some hard things about me, some hard things about my

misunderstanding based on cultural misunderstandings? Am I willing to first look at me and my bias, how I step on things and do things?

That's just not as a white man anyone in that regard. And can I be that vulnerable of a person. And can I, through that then, understand experience and spend time listening. Can I overcome the desire to talk all the time. Can I overcome the desire to interject my own viewpoint and realize that sometimes, whether as a facilitator or as a participant, by putting my voice out there when someone else is speaking or needs to be heard, can change the dynamic, and that's not where we're at right now. We need to give someone else time.

Can I understand this kind of relationship and who needs to speak now and what stories need to be heard now. Am I able to sense those kind of things as far as what goes on in a room and sense interactions where people are communicating well, when people are uncomfortable doing so.

I think there may be some innate skill in that, but I think anyone who tries to be attentive to how people interrelate and can sense the communication process. It's not just the words, not verbals, para-verbals, all those sort of things. That's important too. There's other things in that list that would be important for a facilitator to do, but it does start with a lot of vulnerability, willingness to look at one's self first before we expect someone else to trust us frankly to facilitate that conversation.

>> STEPHANIE DOSCHER: This is really taking me back. This is taking me back to dialogues that we have had, that I have had with FIU's global learning faculty over the years, especially during the early years of the initiative.

So we have open meetings at the end of every semester of all of our faculty who are teaching global learning courses. These could be in public administration. They could be in dietetics. They could be in anthropology. They could be in business. In all of our undergraduate disciplines do we have these courses. And early on as faculty we're inviting difficult problems, dilemmas, wicked problems into their courses as an animating feature or sometimes even the backbone of the syllabus.

So instead of just teaching a course on dietetics and learning what people eat around the world, a professor would ask some very essential questions about who gets to eat and what they get to eat. Like what are the causes of food deserts. Right? Deep, unpacking, political, social, economic, cultural ways and dynamics that surround our nutrition. And these are tough discussions to have, especially in an institution such as our own and perhaps like IUPUI as well where many of our students, the majority of our students come from, what would be deemed underprivileged backgrounds, like if they're Pell grant eligible. We have a terrible problem with food insecurity on our campus.

>> DANIEL GRIFFITH: As an urban institution IUPUI has those kinds of issues.

>> STEPHANIE DOSCHER: Exactly. So we're having these discussions about these things in a, quote, economic setting and some of the students in the room may not have had breakfast, may not know where their lunch is coming from, may not know where their dinner is coming from. So students would start to speak about these things, and it could get contentious, and some faculty would say, well, I just don't think there's a place for those kind of issues in my course. But then I started to wonder, is it not a place for those issues in their courses or is it that they are uncomfortable leading those dialogues or they are afraid? Right?

So would you say that the things that one would learn in learning how to lead or facilitate an intergroup dialogue would be applicable to a non-intergroup dialogue course, if you will? Like into any course. Because the way you describe it, it sounds to me like really good teaching skills in any course in which we would have discussion or which could move into a dialogue space.

>> DANIEL GRIFFITH: Yes. I think that, first of all, what we call our dialogue intensive courses where the dialogue is throughout the curriculum, there aren't that many courses doing that. And also there's a struggle to identify how to place it in the curriculum and having a time to cover the curricula, the content, as well as the dialogue in that. So we do think a lot about how certain parts of the intergroup dialogue can be used in other aspects of teaching. So, yes, I think there's applications there.

Probably the big distinction or, like I said, the stage one and stage two, the dialogue principles which doesn't necessarily take a lot of time, but the sharing of experience in managing that process, if we didn't get to the difficult conversations and what's going on in the world kind of conversations, but we prepare people to at least listen to one another in a different way than what we have done before, to me that is success.

So I do think you have to take the model fairly in order. So one thing I often say when I introduce the dialogue, I have been around for long enough that I have been part of bad diversity training, bad diversity education. And not only been a part of it, but I have been guilty of delivering it. And basically the idea is that we all have our experiences. We just simply come into the room, and today we're going to talk about race, or today we're going to explore all these issues, and we don't know each other, but it doesn't matter. You're expected to talk. You're expected to listen and learn. We leave unhappy. We leave not wanting to do this again. But that's stage three I talked about.

The difficult conversations is recognizing we do have to have those conversations, but it's how we have them and how we build to them, and that's why stage one and two comes before that to say let's understand dialogue and let's have an intact group to experience this, and let's spend time hearing experiences in the judgment, nonjudgmental format.

So I think there's a case, I'm talking to a faculty member about doing something a little different for the class. I can't do intergroup dialogue. I can't go that deep. Sometimes I have helped them in their classroom to do a few things to facilitate some things. It's just simply how far we go, but it's still meaningful.

So I definitely think that faculty can look at different models for parts of intergroup dialogue and how it applies. It's just how far they can go, but it's all meaningful. It's all helpful. It's all important.

>> STEPHANIE DOSCHER: What I think I -- I'm sorry to interrupt. Did I just interrupt you?

>> DANIEL GRIFFITH: We're fine.

>> STEPHANIE DOSCHER: Okay. Well, what I think I hear you saying is that the dialogue becomes the content of the course. It becomes part of the content of the course.

>> DANIEL GRIFFITH: Right. Right. Yes. It's how it's taught. Going away from all the didactic stuff to going straight to a different model of how students learn. I mean, we're all doing

that. I think there's obviously a change in how faculty are teaching courses over time versus just lecture. It's reducing lecture as an example, moving toward other ways of people learning or balancing lecture with these sort of processes. So there's a challenge of how am I going to change my curriculum versus what I have done in the past.

Let me -- one thing that the University of Michigan and all the research, and I should say it's not just the University of Michigan, but a number of institutions when the whole dialogue process came on board, they did what was referred to as multiversity research. I'm generalizing horribly here, but the basic research is simply comparing a number of courses where it's simply the lectures, simply the content, part of the content, and those are the things, and then the same course doing some lecture but then incorporating intergroup dialogue throughout that and showing the learning, the difference in learning and reflection, the comfort level of having these conversations, wanting to do more outside of the class in terms of social change. That study showed those distinctions in a significant way.

So a lot of it is validating the whole process over time in terms of intergroup dialogue makes sense. There's a lot of good research about it, not just University of Michigan, but many have done to show those distinctions and how applications of intergroup dialogue in the classroom changes learning, changes how students reflect their commitments to issues on diversity and things like that.

>> STEPHANIE DOSCHER: I have been watching kind of from afar this concept for a while and observing it, but you have got me ready to take more of a deeper dive. I want to do some looking into how can I engage in training, how can I bring training to my university, where might there be research that I could use to advocate for putting some resources into this. So can you help us with that a little bit? You have given us a beautiful kind of overview about what intergroup dialogue is, what it can look like at one institution. Now where do we go for more? Anything that you can share with us?

>> DANIEL GRIFFITH: Of course I'm happy to talk to people about our experience, but I will say that IUPUI is the -- we're moving along, and there's some things about what we do to the faculty stuff that might be a little distinct from some other institutions.

The University of Michigan, as I mentioned, would be the best source. They are not the only source. I think UMass Amherst, there's a program there. The University of Washington School of Social Work has a program. Skidmore College is one that is doing a lot of good things.

By the way, I think all of these institutions have connections to the University of Michigan anyway, but start with the University of Michigan. First of all, their website is very robust. There's a lot of research already on the website. The other thing is that every June they have an institute where they really are -- part of their program is supporting other universities as an intergroup dialogue and building up the program at their institution. So that's the best place to start. And again if you don't find the research through their website and others, you can call them up and they will help identify other research that others are doing, but that would be a good start.

>> STEPHANIE DOSCHER: And we'll definitely link to that program in the show notes. We'll link to your program in the show notes. And I'll do a little bit of looking to see if there's any evidence of intergroup dialogue being facilitated in other parts of the world. I don't know if you know that. I'm a beginner in this phase, so I don't know.

>> DANIEL GRIFFITH: I don't know for a fact. I can't imagine there are, and not to mention the connections other universities have with global learning and students from other countries coming in and partnerships with other universities. I would imagine that this is happening, but I don't know for a fact. I can say I thought about that issue a little bit. I know one place that universities might want to consider as far as sending students out, going through dialogue, would be a study abroad program. That area especially might be what can we do meaningfully for a intergroup dialogue experience before students go out to have that broader study abroad experience.

>> STEPHANIE DOSCHER: And while they are abroad.

>> DANIEL GRIFFITH: As well as while they are abroad.

>> STEPHANIE DOSCHER: If we're going to bridge that gap between food, fun and festivals and true global learning in an international space off campus, then wouldn't there need to be some type of dialogue baked into that curriculum?

>> DANIEL GRIFFITH: Yeah. I'm going to guess at University of Michigan would be very knowledgeable about other institutions beyond the United States that are doing some things.

>> STEPHANIE DOSCHER: I just want to thank you so much for spending some time with me this afternoon, Daniel. I remember listening to you speaking on -- it was my birthday actually. It was September 6. So I'll never forget the day that we met. It was my 53rd birthday, and I remember sitting there thinking I have got to invite this dude to be part of the podcast.

>> DANIEL GRIFFITH: Yeah.

>> STEPHANIE DOSCHER: So it's just been a delight to actually make that vision come true.

>> DANIEL GRIFFITH: Well, I enjoyed the conversation. Again, if I can be helpful and not just to you but to others about this issue in terms of our experience at IUPUI or how I looked at that, I would be happy to do so. I appreciate the time as well. I have enjoyed this.

>> STEPHANIE DOSCHER: Fantastic. Thanks for listening to this episode of Making Global Learning Universal. This podcast is brought to you by FIU's Office of Global Learning Initiatives, Media Technology Services, and our Disability Resource Center. You can find all our episodes, show notes, transcripts, and discussion guides on our web page [globallearningpodcast.fiu.edu](http://globallearningpodcast.fiu.edu). And if this episode was meaningful to you, please share it with colleagues, friends and students. You can even give it a rating on iTunes. Thanks again for tuning in and for all you do to make global learning universal.