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Students today are not prepared for postsecondary education.

Why are we admitting students who are not ready for college?
Are we lowering our academic standards?

Students are not motivated.
What is a student-ready university?

A Paradigm Shift
College-Ready

Student-Ready
Guiding Questions

• What does it mean for you to be a student-ready leader?
• What does it mean for you to be a student-ready educator?
• What would you do differently?
• How do campus values support an effort to make the campus ready for students?
Guiding Questions

• What are strategies for engaging the whole community in this effort to become student-ready?

• How can campus leaders make the case for change based on an urgent, shared, and powerful vision?
Principle One

All people who work on campus have the capacity to be effective educators.
Empowerment

Agency
Leading Beyond the Hierarchy

“Leaders in Balance”

• Approaches leadership as a relationship, not a position.
• Leaders embody the promise of the brand.

What is UT’s vision for student success?

What is your brand?
Leading Beyond the Hierarchy

• Thinks outside the pyramid in order to share power and to spread leadership, authority, and responsibility.
• Believes that teaching and leadership have much in common.
• Understands that a personal comfort with diversity is at the center of collaboration.

A Student-Ready College

• Are we living up to our mission?
• Are we committed to organizational learning and continuous improvement?
• Do we know and understand our students’ needs?
• Do we build institutional capacity to become student-ready?
Guiding Questions

• How can we accelerate broad-scale systemic innovation to advance educational practices that engage diversity and challenge inequities in student outcomes to make excellence inclusive?
Guiding Questions

• How can institutions increase student participation in high-impact practices (HIPs) and raise student awareness of the value of guided learning pathways that will promote quality and completion?
Guiding Questions

• How can we more directly connect measurement of the benefits of high-impact practices, including direct and indirect assessment of student learning outcomes, with justification for the resources needed to expand their usage?
About AAC&U

• The leading national association concerned with the quality of student learning in college

• More than 1,400 institutional members – half public/half private, two year, four-year, research universities, state systems, liberal arts, international
About AAC&U

• A network of over 50,000 faculty members, academic leaders, presidents and others working for educational reform

• A meeting ground for all parts of higher education – about our shared responsibilities to students and society
AAC&U’s Mission

To advance the vitality and public standing of liberal education by making quality and equity the foundations for excellence in undergraduate education in service to democracy.
AAC&U’s 2018-22 Strategic Plan
Strategic Goals

• Champion faculty-engaged, evidence-based, sustainable models and strategies for promoting quality in undergraduate education.

• Advance equity across higher education in service to academic excellence and social justice.
Strategic Goals

• Lead institutions and communities in articulating and demonstrating the value of liberal education for work, life, global citizenship, and democracy.

• Catalyze reform in higher education to emphasize discovery and innovation as fundamental aspects of a liberal education.
LEAP is a national initiative that champions the importance of a twenty-first-century liberal education—for individual students and for a nation dependent on economic creativity and democratic vitality.
The LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes

Knowledge of Human Cultures and the Physical and Natural World
- Focused on engagement with big questions, enduring and contemporary

Intellectual and Practical Skills
- Practiced extensively across the curriculum, in the context of progressively more challenging problems, projects, and standards for performance

Personal and Social Responsibility
- Anchored through active involvement with diverse communities and real-world challenges

Integrative and Applied Learning
- Demonstrated through the application of knowledge, skills, and responsibilities to new settings and complex problems
Essential Learning Outcomes

- Inquiry and Analysis
- Critical and Creative Thinking
- Written and Oral Communication
- Quantitative Literacy
- Information Literacy
- Teamwork and Problem Solving
- Civic Knowledge and Engagement—local and global
- Intercultural Competence
- Ethical Reasoning
- Lifelong Learning
- Across general and specialized studies
Of institutions have a common set of intended learning outcomes for all students. 85% report that almost all of their students understand those intended learning outcomes.

Source: AAC&U Member Survey, 2016 Recent Trends in General Education Design, Learning Outcomes, and Teaching Approaches
Is this true for your campus?
Do you believe in Making Excellence Inclusive for all students?
Making Excellence Inclusive

• A vision AND practice
• A focus on the intersections of diversity, inclusion, AND equity
• An active process
• A goal of excellence in learning, teaching, student development, institutional functioning, and engagement with communities
Making Excellence Inclusive

Diversity

Equity

Inclusion

Equity-Minded
“Being **equity-minded** thus involves being conscious of the ways that higher education—through its practices, policies, expectations, and unspoken rules—places responsibility for student success on the very groups that have experienced marginalization, rather than on individuals and institutions whose responsibility it is to remedy that marginalization.”
Funders and Partners

Strada Education Network

GREAT LAKES

CENTER for URBAN EDUCATION
Campus Participants

• Anne Arundel Community College (MD)
• California State University – Northridge (CA)
• Carthage College (WI)*
• California State University – Sacramento (CA)
• Clark Atlanta University (GA)
• Dominican University (IL)
• Florida International University (FL)
• Governor's State University (IL)
• Lansing Community College (MI)
• Morgan State University (MD)
• North Carolina A&T State University (NC)
• Pomona College (CA)
• Wilbur Wright College (IL)

*Carthage College is supported by Great Lakes Higher Education Corporation & Affiliates.
Committing to Equity and Inclusive Excellence: Campus-Based Strategies for Student Success

- A three-year project launched with support from Strada Education Network (formerly USA Funds) and Great Lakes Higher Education Corporation & Affiliates.

- The project is designed to expand the current research on equity in student achievement and to identify promising evidence-based interventions for improving student learning and success.
Project Objectives

- Campuses develop defined campus action plans and institutional tracking models to measure:
  
  - to increase access to and participation in high-impact practices (HIPs)
  
  - to increased completion, retention, and graduation rates for low-income, first-generation, adult learners and/or minority students
Project Objectives

- Campuses develop defined campus action plans and institutional tracking models to measure:

  - to increase achievement of learning outcomes for underserved students using direct assessment measures, including AAC&U’s VALUE Rubrics
  
  - to increase student awareness and understanding of the value of guided learning pathways that incorporate HIPs for workforce preparation and engaged citizenship (i.e. completion with a purpose)
A Vision For Equity
NATIONAL WEBINAR

Please join our upcoming webinar
“A Vision for Equity: Campus-Based Strategies for Committing to Equity and Inclusive Excellence” on Thursday, April 19, at 3:00pm ET.

Register at https://www.aacu.org/webinar/equity
How do you help students develop as intentional learners?
Intentionality by Design
“High-Impact Practices” that Help Students Achieve the Outcomes

- First-Year Seminars and Experiences
- Common Intellectual Experiences
- Learning Communities
- Writing-Intensive Courses
- Collaborative Assignments & Projects
- Undergraduate Research
- Diversity/Global Learning
- Service Learning, Community-Based Learning
- Internships
- Capstone Courses and Projects
What makes a practice high-impact?
HIPs: Eight Key Elements

• Performance Expectations Set at Appropriately High Levels
• Significant Investment of Time and Effort by Students Over an Extended Period of Time
• Interactions with Faculty and Peers about Substantive Matters
• Experiences with Diversity
• Frequent, Timely and Constructive Feedback
• Structured Opportunities to reflect and Integrate Learning
• Opportunities to Discover Relevance of Learning Through Real-World Applications
• Public Demonstration of Competence

Intentionality of HIPs

- Selection
- Design
- Access

Learning Outcomes

- Defined
- Evidence

- Assessment
- Data Disaggregated
- Integrated

Equity

HIPs

Association of American Colleges and Universities
HIPs Results of NSSE 2016

60% of first-year students surveyed participated in one HIP, with 7% of them participating in two or more HIPs.

90% of 2016 NSSE Seniors participated in one HIP, with 68% of them participating in two or more.

Source: NSSE 2016 High-Impact Practices (institutional report)
NSSE HIPs 2016 in relation to certain high-impact experiences

The data to the right includes compares the percentage of students from NSSE 2016 who participated in a High-Impact Practice, including the percentage who participated overall (at least one, two or more), with experiences in internships, undergraduate research, capstone courses, and learning communities highlighted.

Source: NSSE 2016 High-Impact Practices (institutional report)
“Ensuring Quality & Taking High-Impact Practices to Scale”

“Proportionately fewer first-generation students, black and Hispanic students, and transfer students do research with a faculty member, study abroad, do an internship, or have a culminating senior experience.” (Kuh & O’Donnell, 2013)
AAC&U’s VALUE Institute

• Partnership with Indiana University’s Center for Postsecondary Research

• Institutions are invited to participate in the VALUE Institute by collecting samples of student work, uploading the work into the digital repository and having the work scored using the VALUE rubrics by certified VALUE Institute faculty scorers.

• Participating institutions receive data and reports from the tested VALUE nationwide database for benchmarking student learning.
New Insights
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On Solid Ground / VALUE REPORT 2017

http://www.aacu.org/OnSolidGroundVALUE
What is VALUE?

What is the VALUE Approach to Assessment?
What is a VALUE Rubric?

- Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education
- Articulation of expected, demonstrated learning at progressively more sophisticated and complex levels of achievement
List of VALUE Rubrics

- **Knowledge of Human Cultures & the Physical & Natural Worlds**
  - Content Areas → No Rubrics

- **Intellectual and Practical Skills**
  - Inquiry & Analysis
  - Critical Thinking
  - Creative Thinking
  - Written Communication
  - Oral Communication
  - Reading
  - Quantitative Literacy
  - Information Literacy
  - Teamwork
  - Problem-solving

- **Personal & Social Responsibility**
  - Civic Knowledge & Engagement
  - Intercultural Knowledge & Competence
  - Ethical Reasoning
  - Foundations & Skills for Lifelong Learning
  - Global Learning

- **Integrative & Applied Learning**
  - Integrative & Applied Learning
The VALUE rubrics were developed by teams of faculty experts representing colleges and universities across the United States through a process that examined many existing campus rubrics and related documents for each learning outcome and incorporated additional feedback from faculty. The rubrics articulate fundamental criteria for each learning outcome, with performance descriptors demonstrating progressively more sophisticated levels of attainment. The rubrics are intended for institutional-level use in evaluating and discussing student learning, not for grading. The core expectations articulated in all 15 of the VALUE rubrics can and should be translated into the language of individual campuses, disciplines, and even courses. The utility of the VALUE rubrics is to position learning at all undergraduate levels within a basic framework of expectations such that evidence of learning can be shared nationally through a common dialog and understanding of student success.

Definition

Critical thinking is a habit of mind characterized by the comprehensive exploration of issues, ideas, artifacts, and events before accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion.

Framing Language

This rubric is designed to be transdisciplinary, reflecting the recognition that success in all disciplines requires habits of inquiry and analysis that share common attributes. Further, research suggests that successful critical thinkers from all disciplines increasingly need to be able to apply those habits in various and changing situations encountered in all walks of life.

This rubric is designed for use with many different types of assignments and the suggestions here are not an exhaustive list of possibilities. Critical thinking can be demonstrated in assignments that require students to complete analyses of text, data, or issues. Assignments that cut across presentation mode might be especially useful in some fields. If insight into the process components of critical thinking (e.g., how information sources were evaluated regardless of whether they were included in the product) is important, assignments focused on student reflection might be especially illuminating.

Glossary

The definitions that follow were developed to clarify terms and concepts used in this rubric only.

- Ambiguity: Information that may be interpreted in more than one way.
- Assumptions: Ideas, conditions, or beliefs (often implicit or unstated) that are "taken for granted or accepted as true without proof." (quoted from www.dictionary.reference.com/browse/assumptions)
- Context: The historical, ethical, political, cultural, environmental, or circumstantial settings or conditions that influence and complicate the consideration of any issues, ideas, artifacts, and events.
- Literal meaning: Interpretation of information exactly as stated. For example, "she was green with envy" would be interpreted to mean that her skin was green.
- Metaphor: Information that is (intended to be) interpreted in a non-literal way. For example, "she was green with envy" is intended to convey an intensity of emotion, not a skin color.
## Critical Thinking VALUE Rubric

**Definition**

Critical thinking is a habit of mind characterized by the comprehensive exploration of issues, ideas, artifacts, and events before accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion.

Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark (cell one) level performance.

### Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Explanation of issues</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Influence of context and assumptions</th>
<th>Student’s position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis)</th>
<th>Conclusions and related outcomes (implications and consequences)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated clearly and described comprehensively, delivering all relevant information necessary for full understanding.</td>
<td>Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a comprehensive analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are questioned thoroughly.</td>
<td>Thoroughly (systematically and methodically) analyzes own and others' assumptions and carefully evaluates the relevance of contexts when presenting a position.</td>
<td>Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is identified, taking into account the complexities of an issue. Limits of position/perspective, thesis/hypothesis are acknowledged. Others' points of view are acknowledged within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis).</td>
<td>Conclusions and related outcomes (implications and consequences) are logical and reflect the synthesis of information and ability to prioritize evidence and perspectives discussed in priority order.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated, described, and clarified so that understanding is not seriously impeded by omissions.</td>
<td>Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are subject to questioning.</td>
<td>Questions some assumptions. Identifies several relevant contexts when presenting a position.</td>
<td>Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) takes into account the complexities of an issue. Others' points of view are acknowledged within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis).</td>
<td>Information, including opposing viewpoints, related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated but description leaves some terms undefined, ambiguities unexplored, boundaries undetermined, and/or backgrounds unknown.</td>
<td>Information is taken from source(s) with some interpretation/evaluation, but not enough to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are taken as mostly fact, with little questioning.</td>
<td>Shows an emerging awareness of present assumptions (sometimes labels assertions as assumptions). Begins to identify some contexts when presenting a position.</td>
<td>Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is stated, but is simplistic and obvious.</td>
<td>Conclusion is inconsistently tied to information or some of the information discussed, related outcomes (consequences and implications) are oversimplified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capstone</th>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For more information, please contact value@acu.org
MULTI-STATE COLLABORATIVE

Demonstration Year Results (2015-2016)

A partnership initiative

SHEEO
STATE HIGHER EDUCATION EXECUTIVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION

AACU
Association of American Colleges and Universities
Participating States

12 States
Connecticut, Hawaii, Indiana, Kentucky, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, Oregon, Rhode Island, Texas, and Utah
7,114 papers were submitted

All students were near graduation. By the time that students graduate, are they proficient in writing, presenting, and interpreting data? Are they proficient at thinking critically?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Critical Thinking</th>
<th>Quantitative Reasoning</th>
<th>Written Communication</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-Year</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>2,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Year</td>
<td>2,056</td>
<td>787</td>
<td>1,936</td>
<td>4,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,896</td>
<td>1,363</td>
<td>2,855</td>
<td>7,114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1,156 faculty members submitted assignments

Faculty members across the country may learn from one another regarding assignments that effectively advance quality student learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Critical Thinking</th>
<th>Quantitative Reasoning</th>
<th>Written Communication</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-Year</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Year</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>1,156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project-Level Outcome Scores

Average Outcome Scores by Institution Sector

* Indicates a significant difference between sectors

These scores reflect work submitted by students at 2-year institutions with at least 45 semester credits, and students at 4-year institutions with at least 90 semester credits. These are average scores of student work in each outcome as scored by faculty scorers using the AAC&U VALUE rubrics. These results are not generalizable across participating states or the nation. Please use appropriately.
Project-Level Outcome Scores

Outcome Score Distribution at 2-Year Institutions

Percent of pieces of student work scored 0-4 by faculty scorers using the AAC&U VALUE rubrics. These results are not generalizable across participating states or the nation. Please use appropriately.
Project-Level Outcome Scores

Outcome Score Distribution at 4-Year Institutions

Percent of pieces of student work scored 0-4 by faculty scorers using the AAC&U VALUE rubrics. These results are not generalizable across participating states or the nation. Please use appropriately.
Equity Results

• Are there discernable differences between subgroups?
• Do students who are eligible for Pell have scores that are more similar than different from their peers?
• Do female and male students have scores that are more different than similar?
• Do the scores of subgroups differ at the conventional threshold of statistical significance?
## Differences by Gender

### Sample Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Critical Thinking</th>
<th>Quantitative Reasoning</th>
<th>Written Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-year</td>
<td>4-year</td>
<td>2-year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>1,013</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Differences by Gender

2-Year Institutions

* Indicates a significant difference in average outcome scores between genders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative Reasoning</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Communication</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These are average scores of student work in each outcome as scored by faculty scorers using the AAC&U VALUE rubrics. These results are not generalizable across participating states or the nation. Please use appropriately.
Differences by Gender

4-Year Institutions

* Indicates a significant difference in average outcome scores between genders

Critical Thinking
- Female: 2.00*
- Male: 1.90

Quantitative Reasoning
- Female: 1.95
- Male: 1.85

Written Communication
- Female: 2.48*
- Male: 2.39

These are average scores of student work in each outcome as scored by faculty scorers using the AAC&U VALUE rubrics. These results are not generalizable across participating states or the nation. Please use appropriately.
Differences by Pell Eligibility

Sample Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Critical Thinking</th>
<th>Quantitative Reasoning</th>
<th>Written Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-year</td>
<td>4-year</td>
<td>2-year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pell Eligible</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Pell Eligible</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Differences by Pell Eligibility

2-Year Institutions

* Indicates a significant difference in outcome average scores between Pell-eligible and non-eligible students

Critical Thinking
- Pell Eligible: 1.65
- Not Eligible: 1.64

Quantitative Reasoning
- Pell Eligible: 1.89
- Not Eligible: 1.78

Written Communication
- Pell Eligible: 2.11
- Not Eligible: 2.17

These are average scores of student work in each outcome as scored by faculty scorers using the AAC&U VALUE rubrics. These results are not generalizable across participating states or the nation. Please use appropriately.
Differences by Pell Eligibility

4-Year Institutions

* Indicates a significant difference in outcome average scores between Pell-eligible and non-eligible students.

- Critical Thinking:
  - Pell Eligible: 1.95
  - Not Eligible: 1.98

- Quantitative Reasoning:
  - Pell Eligible: 2.28
  - Not Eligible: 1.99

- Written Communication:
  - Pell Eligible: 2.51
  - Not Eligible: 2.53

These are average scores of student work in each outcome as scored by faculty scorers using the AAC&U VALUE rubrics. These results are not generalizable across participating states or the nation. Please use appropriately.
# Differences by Race/Ethnicity

## Sample Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Critical Thinking</th>
<th></th>
<th>Quantitative Reasoning</th>
<th></th>
<th>Written Communication</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-year</td>
<td>4-year</td>
<td>2-year</td>
<td>4-year</td>
<td>2-year</td>
<td>4-year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asian</strong></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Underrepresented</strong></td>
<td>199</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>White</strong></td>
<td>572</td>
<td>1283</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>1,221</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Underrepresented (UR) = Hispanic or Latino, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, American Indian or Native Alaskan, and Two or More Races*
Differences by Race/Ethnicity

Critical Thinking

* Indicates a significant difference in average outcome score between underrepresented (UR) and white students

** UR = Underrepresented = Hispanic or Latino, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, American Indian or Native Alaskan, and Two or More Races

These are average scores of student work in each outcome as scored by faculty scorers using the AAC&U VALUE rubric. These results are not generalizable across participating states or the nation. Please use appropriately.
AAC&U’s Equity-Driven Guided Learning Pathways

• With Equity and Belonging Paramount Values, Institutions Meld High Touch and High Tech to Support and Monitor Student Engagement and Progress, Giving Special Attention to Frequent or Systemic Barriers and Challenges
AAC&U’s Equity-Driven Guided Learning Pathways

• Faculty Define and Programs Address Essential Learning Outcomes – Across Systems and Within Institutions

• Sequence Programs, Courses and Well-Designed Assignments to Foster Essential Learning Outcomes
AAC&U’s Equity-Driven Guided Learning Pathways

• All Students Participate Frequently in High Impact or Active Learning Practices, From First to Final Year

• Every Student Completes Applied Learning Projects—Connected to Program and Student Goal
AAC&U’s Equity-Driven Guided Learning Pathways

• Students’ Own Work—including Their Applied Learning Projects—Provides the Primary Evidence of their Progress Toward Degree Level Learning and Educational Achievement
THE INCONVENIENT TRUTHS
We must examine “the ‘real’ versus the ‘ideal’ view of campus environments and the inconvenient truths that these views are often dissimilar.”

We must engage in vigorous dialogue about the gaps between *aspiration* and *reality* in order to create “enhanced opportunities for students to cultivate a commitment to excellence and integrity, to engage across differences on and off campus, and to develop moral discernment and action on their public and private lives.”

“I am no longer accepting the things I cannot change. I am changing the things I cannot accept.”

--Angela Y. Davis
Thank you!

Dr. Tia Brown McNair
Vice President
Office of Diversity, Equity and Student Success
mcnair@aacu.org
202-884-0808