**National Resource Centers Survey Questionnaire**

**Introductory Script**: KEN Consulting, Inc. has been contracted by the Department of Education to evaluate the National Resource Centers (NRC) program application process, particularly as it relates to understanding and addressing Absolute Priority 1: Promoting diverse perspectives and a wide range of views and generating debate on world regions and international affairs. We invite you to share your insights about this requirement and overall experiences with the program to improve the application process. The questions relate to your institution’s National Resource Center (NRC) activities Specifically, we are looking to better understand how you and peer institutions in this program are interpreting and addressing the requirement in section 601 of Title VI of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended. That section requires applicants desiring a grant to describe how their activities will promote diverse perspectives, and how they will assess the effectiveness of efforts to promote diverse perspectives and a wide range of views and generate debate on world regions and international affairs.

We have already reviewed all 100 successful applications in the current NRC funding cycle to see how grantees proposed to address this requirement in their applications, and we found that they interpreted and responded to the diverse perspectives requirement in many different ways. We then followed up with virtual site visits to five of the grantees to get a more in-depth understanding about their approach and to get their thoughts about this absolute priority and its impact on their programs. Our next step is to conduct an online survey of all NRCs on this topic. The goal of our study is to help provide clarity for future applicants so that they can better understand the purpose of the requirement and respond in their applications and proposed programs in ways that ensure they are meeting the intent of the legislative requirement.

**Questions**:

1. Which world region/theme is the NRC’s focus of study?
   1. Africa
   2. Canada
   3. East Asia
   4. International
   5. Latin America
   6. Middle East
   7. Russia, Eastern Europe, Eurasia
   8. South Asia
   9. Southeast Asia
   10. Western Europe
2. What type of NRC?
   1. Comprehensive
   2. Undergraduate
   3. Comprehensive Consortium
   4. Undergraduate Consortium

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Please select the description that best describes the NRC’s use of the following activities to meet the diverse perspectives requirement. | Used | Planned to use, but didn’t | Not used |
| 1. Sponsoring or cosponsoring a lecture series with experts who present multiple points of views |  |  |  |
| 1. Hosting or cohosting conferences or workshops designed to present opposing views and generate debate |  |  |  |
| 1. Hosting or cohosting conferences or workshops designed to promote common understanding and consensus among those with differing points of view |  |  |  |
| 1. Creating, revising, or expanding university curricula and course offerings to include more points of view |  |  |  |
| 1. Using visiting-faculty or faculty-exchange programs to bring in additional views |  |  |  |
| 1. Teacher training and research opportunities to support learning about groups, cultures, and religions that are less often studied or were not previously offered by this NRC |  |  |  |
| 1. Sponsoring or cosponsoring cultural events (performances, film series, festivals, etc.) that promote diverse perspectives |  |  |  |
| 1. Working with university departments that do not traditionally incorporate an international perspective in their teaching and training (e.g., medicine, law, business) |  |  |  |
| 1. Expanding library holdings to include more materials that reflect diverse perspectives relative to your NRC world region or thematic focus |  |  |  |
| 1. Using online videos, podcasts, blogs, etc. to disseminate information about issues in your NRC world region or thematic focus that include diverse perspectives |  |  |  |
| 1. Publishing studies, conference reports, books, etc. about your NRC world region or thematic focus that present diverse points of view |  |  |  |
| 1. Creating new positions or hiring new faculty to bring in additional perspectives |  |  |  |
| 1. Leveraging linkages with other Title VI grantees that focus on world regions (e.g., American Institute of Indian Studies, the Palestinian American Research Center, and the Inya-Burma Institute) |  |  |  |
| 1. Other activities not fitting in the above categories |  |  |  |

1. If “other” was selected from above, please describe the other activities you had in mind for that selection.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Of the activities the NRC is using to meet the diverse perspectives requirement, which ones do you think have been most effective for promoting diverse perspectives and/or generating debate among . . . | Academic audiences, such as faculty, graduate students, leading scholars/ researchers (***Select up to three***) | Non-specialist audiences, such as K-12 students and teachers, most undergraduate students, the general community (***Select up to three***) |
| 1. Sponsoring or cosponsoring a lecture series with experts who present multiple points of views |  |  |
| 1. Hosting or cohosting conferences or workshops designed to present opposing views and generate debate |  |  |
| 1. Hosting or cohosting conferences or workshops designed to promote common understanding and consensus among those with differing points of view |  |  |
| 1. Creating, revising, or expanding university curricula and course offerings to include more points of view |  |  |
| 1. Using visiting-faculty or faculty-exchange programs to bring in additional views |  |  |
| 1. Teacher training and research opportunities to support learning about groups, cultures, and religions that are less often studied or were not previously offered by this NRC |  |  |
| 1. Sponsoring or cosponsoring cultural events (performances, film series, festivals, etc.) that promote diverse perspectives |  |  |
| 1. Working with university departments that do not traditionally incorporate an international perspective in their teaching and training (e.g., medicine, law, business) |  |  |
| 1. Expanding library holdings to include more materials that reflect diverse perspectives relative to your NRC world region or thematic focus |  |  |
| 1. Using online videos, podcasts, blogs, etc. to disseminate information about issues in your NRC world region or thematic focus that include diverse perspectives |  |  |
| 1. Publishing studies, conference reports, books, etc. about your NRC world region or thematic focus that present diverse points of view |  |  |
| 1. Creating new positions or hiring new faculty to bring in additional perspectives |  |  |
| 1. Leveraging linkages with other Title VI grantees that focus on world regions (e.g., American Institute of Indian Studies, the Palestinian American Research Center, and the Inya-Burma Institute) |  |  |
| 1. Other activities not fitting in the above categories |  |  |

1. What made these activities/programs most successful at promoting diverse perspectives and/or generating debate?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Of the activities the NRC is using to meet the diverse perspectives requirement, which ones do you think have been least effective for promoting diverse perspectives and/or generating debate among . . . | Academic audiences, such as faculty, graduate students, leading scholars/ researchers (***Select only one***) | Non-specialist audiences, such as K-12 students and teachers, most undergraduate students, the general community (***Select only one***) |
| 1. Sponsoring or cosponsoring a lecture series with experts who present multiple points of views |  |  |
| 1. Hosting or cohosting conferences or workshops designed to present opposing views and generate debate |  |  |
| 1. Hosting or cohosting conferences or workshops designed to promote common understanding and consensus among those with differing points of view |  |  |
| 1. Creating, revising, or expanding university curricula and course offerings to include more points of view |  |  |
| 1. Using visiting-faculty or faculty-exchange programs to bring in additional views |  |  |
| 1. Teacher training and research opportunities to support learning about groups, cultures, and religions that are less often studied or were not previously offered by this NRC |  |  |
| 1. Sponsoring or cosponsoring cultural events (performances, film series, festivals, etc.) that promote diverse perspectives |  |  |
| 1. Working with university departments that do not traditionally incorporate an international perspective in their teaching and training (e.g., medicine, law, business) |  |  |
| 1. Expanding library holdings to include more materials that reflect diverse perspectives relative to your NRC world region or thematic focus |  |  |
| 1. Using online videos, podcasts, blogs, etc. to disseminate information about issues in your NRC world region or thematic focus that include diverse perspectives |  |  |
| 1. Publishing studies, conference reports, books, etc. about your NRC world region or thematic focus that present diverse points of view |  |  |
| 1. Creating new positions or hiring new faculty to bring in additional perspectives |  |  |
| 1. Leveraging linkages with other Title VI grantees that focus on world regions (e.g., American Institute of Indian Studies, the Palestinian American Research Center, and the Inya-Burma Institute) |  |  |
| 1. Other activities not fitting in the above categories |  |  |

1. What made these activities/programs least effective for promoting diverse perspectives and/or generating debate?
2. Do you think the Absolute Priority as currently written asking applicants to describe how the activities funded by the grant will “reflect diverse perspectives and a wide range of views and generate debate on world regions and international affairs” is too vague, too specific, or appropriate?
   1. Too vague
   2. Too specific
   3. Appropriate
3. Specify
   1. If “too vague”: What should the Department of Education do to provide more clarity about this requirement?
   2. If “too specific”: What are your concerns about how specific it is?
   3. If “appropriate”: Why is this degree of specificity acceptable to describe your NRC’s activities and programs?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. To what extent do you agree that the following considerations should be included in your NRC’s response to the diverse perspectives requirement? | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neither agree nor disagree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| 1. Expose university students to a variety of perspectives and opinions in area studies, international studies, and international aspects of professional studies |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Acquaint the local community and the general public about these perspectives and views |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Incorporate diverse perspectives in K-12 teacher training, MSI and community college courses, and research projects developed in collaboration with your NRC |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Provide classes, forums, conferences, lecture series, events, etc. where relevant perspectives are presented and respectfully debated |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Seek common ground among those with differing views on specific issues in the world region, or at least enable them to recognize and understand (if not accept) the views and positions of others |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Identify and share perspectives from groups and cultures that are not usually studied in your world region |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Present a diversity of perspectives to targeted non-university audiences (journalists, military, business leaders, etc.) engaged in your world region |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Promote the university’s diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) policies and initiatives |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Identify and share new perspectives from faculty and students at MSIs and community colleges |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Identify and share new perspectives from junior faculty and graduate students at the university |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Engage members of the local community in selecting debate topics and in choosing which perspectives to include |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Other |  |  |  |  |  |

1. If “other” was selected from above, please describe the other considerations you had in mind for that selection.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| To what extent do you agree that NRC-sponsored panels or debates about issues in your world region should include speakers representing the following? | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neither agree nor disagree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| 1. The major groups, voices, and positions found in the world region. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The views of other groups from the region with unique perspectives on an issue (e.g., women, indigenous minorities, LGBTQ, migrants, diaspora, etc.) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The views of the US administration and its international allies |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The foreign policy views espoused by the major political parties in Congress |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The views of other world powers with interests in the region (e.g., China, E.U., Russia, India) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. A variety of academic disciplines |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Different theoretical perspectives or schools of thought within the same discipline (e.g., economics, government, environment, public health, etc.) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The views of nonacademic experts with experience in the region (e.g., military leaders, human rights advocates, journalists, investment bankers, former diplomats, etc.) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. The perspectives of individuals from various racial/ethnic groups |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Advocacy organizations espousing the views of particular ethnic/racial/national/religious groups |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Other |  |  |  |  |  |

1. If “other” was selected from above, please describe the other types of speaker representation you had in mind for that selection.
2. Please rank these forms of diversity from the one that was given the most emphasis when completing the NRC’s application and planning related projects and activities to the one given the least emphasis. (***Most Emphasis = 1***)

\_\_\_\_ Interdisciplinary diversity

\_\_\_\_ Racial/ethnic diversity

\_\_\_\_ Political/ideological diversity

\_\_\_\_ Gender/sexuality diversity

\_\_\_\_ Language diversity

\_\_\_\_ National diversity within your NRC’s world region

\_\_\_\_ Cultural/religious diversity within your NRC’s world region

\_\_\_\_ Diversity of perspectives across world regions

\_\_\_\_ Diversity of your NRC’s institutional partners

\_\_\_\_ Other

1. If “other” was selected from above, please describe the other type of diversity that was focused on.
2. What influenced the “highest emphasis” rating for the diversity aspect you chose? (***Select all that apply***)
   1. Impression that was what the Department of Education and/or Congress wanted

* 1. The NRC has a history of successfully addressing this type of diversity
  2. An awareness that the NRC needs to focus more on this type of diversity than previously

* 1. Faculty generally agreed that this type of diversity was most important
  2. Consistent with the university-wide initiative to promote this type of diversity
  3. Other (Specify): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. What influenced the decision to address the other types of diversity in the application, even though the emphasis was not as highly prioritized? (***Select all that apply***)
   1. Impression that was what the Department of Education and/or Congress wanted
   2. The NRC has a history of successfully addressing this type of diversity
   3. An awareness that the NRC needs to focus more on this type of diversity than previously
   4. Faculty generally agreed that this type of diversity was most important
   5. Consistent with the university-wide initiative to promote this type of diversity
   6. Other (Specify): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
2. Which of the following procedures/structures are in place to ensure diverse perspectives are represented on the NRC’s board/committee/council?

1. Regular elections for board/committee/council seats open to a wide range of academic departments across the university
2. Ex-officio seats on the board/committee/council to ensure representation from key subject areas and partners (e.g., former department chairs, academic deans, emeritus faculty, library personnel)
3. University student representation on board/committee/council
4. Community member representation on board/committee/council
5. Administrators for local school districts that serve as feeder institutions to the NRC institution representation on board/committee/council
6. Rotation of board/committee/council chairmanship among various disciplines
7. Other (Specify): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
8. How does the NRC governing body receive input from outside to ensure diverse perspectives are considered when making decisions about your projects and activities? (***Select all that apply)***
9. Faculty surveys/focus groups
10. Student surveys/focus groups
11. Community member surveys/focus groups
12. Informal conversations among faculty
13. Informal conversations between faculty and students
14. Informal conversations with community members
15. Administrative data (course enrollment data, student body demographics)
16. Event feedback
17. Media and the general public
18. Other. Specify:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
19. None of the above
20. Does the NRC have any formal decision-making procedures in place for considering/promoting diverse perspectives in your projects and activities?
21. No
22. Yes. Please explain below:
23. Did the NRC develop performance measures that directly assess the effectiveness of your activities in promoting diverse perspectives?

1. No.
2. Yes. Only used for grant reporting to the Department of Education through IRIS
3. Yes. Only used internally for NRC evaluation and decision making
4. Yes. Used both internally and for grant reporting
5. When the NRC has tried to expand the diversity of perspectives offered and generate wider debate on world issues, how often has there been pushback or negative reactions from faculty?
6. Often
7. Sometimes
8. Rarely
9. Never (Go to questions 25)
10. IF “Often” “Sometimes” or “Rarely”, What was the general nature of the concerns? (***Select all that apply)***
11. Viewpoints presented perceived as being too conservative or extreme
12. Viewpoints presented perceived as being too liberal or extreme
13. Viewpoints presented perceived as being biased, bigoted, or discriminatory (not specifically related to partisan politics)
14. Objection to partnerships or collaborations with groups or organizations they viewed as controversial

1. Concern that a controversial topic or speaker would cause tension and disruption
2. Questioned the academic rigor or evidence used to support certain viewpoints
3. Other (Specify):
4. When the NRC has tried to expand the diversity of perspectives offered and generate wider debate on world issues, how often has there been pushback or negative reactions from students?
5. Often
6. Sometimes
7. Rarely
8. Never (Go to questions 27)
9. IF “Often” “Sometimes” or “Rarely”: What was the general nature of the concerns? (***Select all that apply)***
10. Viewpoints presented perceived as being too conservative or extreme
11. Viewpoints presented perceived as being too liberal or extreme
12. Viewpoints presented perceived as being biased, bigoted, or discriminatory (not specifically related to partisan politics)
13. Objection to partnerships or collaborations with groups or organizations they viewed as controversial
14. Concern that a controversial topic or speaker would cause tension and disruption
15. Questioned the academic rigor or evidence used to support certain viewpoints
16. Other (Specify):
17. When the NRC has tried to expand the diversity of perspectives offered and generate wider debate on world issues, how often has there been pushback or negative reactions from the local community?
18. Often
19. Sometimes
20. Rarely
21. Never (Go to questions 29)
22. IF “Often” “Sometimes” or “Rarely”: What was the general nature of the concerns? (***Select all that apply)***
23. Viewpoints presented perceived as being too conservative or extreme
24. Viewpoints presented perceived as being too liberal or extreme
25. Viewpoints presented perceived as being biased, bigoted, or discriminatory (not specifically related to partisan politics)
26. Objection to partnerships or collaborations with groups or organizations they viewed as controversial
27. Concern that a controversial topic or speaker would cause tension and disruption
28. Questioned the academic rigor or evidence used to support some viewpoints
29. Other (Specify):
30. When the Title VI of Higher Education Act is reauthorized, what is your recommendation regarding this requirement?
31. Retain as currently stated
32. Revise current language
33. Replace with another requirement
34. Eliminate altogether
35. Are there any further comments you would like to share regarding the NRC absolute priority to promote diverse perspectives and generate debate?

**Public Burden Statement**

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number.  The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1840-xxxx.  Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 30 minutes per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information.  The obligation to respond to this collection is voluntary.  If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate, suggestions for improving this individual collection, or if you have comments or concerns regarding the status of your individual form, application or survey, please contact Sarah Beaton, National Resource Centers Program, 400 Maryland Ave.,SW, 2nd floor, Washington DC 20202, or at sarah.beaton@ed.gov.