

Women Scientists as Academic Leaders
February 24, 2009

Women as Academic Leaders: Insider Voices with Outsider Values

Nancy Cantor, Chancellor and President
Syracuse University

It's a great pleasure and a privilege to join you today at Bryn Mawr as part of this series co-sponsored by the Center for Science in Society and by the Katherine Houghton Hepburn Center that honors and encourages the spirit and backbone of intrepid women, one of whom is your new and distinguished president. I congratulate Jane McAuliffe for highlighting the increasingly important role of women in science and academic leadership during her inaugural year.

President McAuliffe personifies the breadth of such leadership. Not only has she been an internationally respected scholar of Islamic studies and an educator on issues of religious diversity and pluralism, she has also been a leader who could raise funds for a new performing arts center and a new science center while collaborating on international projects ranging from Qatar to Afghanistan.

As we think about her work---and the work of women leaders around the world---we are well aware that this is hard work, for we live in precarious times. But it's worth remembering that we also live in hopeful times. I'm sure I'm one of millions who felt a sense of reassurance when the first law signed by President Obama was the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act, both for its new protections against discrimination in pay and its acknowledgement of the profound wrongs done to working women. The woman who fought this battle---for herself, for the memory of her mother, for all of us---was an obscure worker in an Alabama tire factory. Although she ultimately lost in the Supreme Court, she won in Congress and danced, at the age of 70, with the President at his inauguration.

From the factory to the courts to the Congress to the academy, we should take heart and redouble our efforts to open the doors to the possibilities that can await us all, women and men, black, brown, and white, for we are not playing in a zero sum game.

In higher education, the demographic trends are hopeful for women. In the past 20 years, the proportion of female college and university presidents has more than doubled. In 1986, less than one in 10 presidents was a woman. In recent years, according to surveys from the American Council on Education, that number has grown to one in

four, and 38 percent of chief academic officers are women.¹ The situation is not as good for members of minority groups. Only 10 percent of chief academic officers are African-American, American Indian, Asian, or Hispanic. But we are expecting a new demographic window of opportunity. More than half of all college and university presidents today are older than 60.² And this opening deserves a vigorous and organized effort to move women and members of all under-represented groups into leadership positions, especially in research universities and other four year institutions, where we have historically been missing from the ranks of leadership.

Leave No Group Behind As We Move Inside

As this movement into leadership occurs, with more women, for example, “inside” the circles of influence in the academy and in other organizations, it will be critical that we not forget where we came from, as these memories can help shape our behavior in highly constructive ways. For me, this means constantly remembering two powerful lessons that I learned early in my career, in moving from the confidence of my undergraduate days at Sarah Lawrence (not dissimilar I imagine to the confidence of women at Bryn Mawr) to the then male-dominated world of graduate school at Stanford in mathematical-cognitive psychology.

My first day in graduate school, I found myself riding the elevator with one of the most powerful cognitive psychologists in the department. He was also quite tall, and I, obviously, was small. He looked down at me and bellowed, "So who are you, and where are you from?" I said my name and that I was a new graduate student recently graduated from Sarah Lawrence. He reared up and said, "We don't take girls from Sarah Lawrence." I said, "Well, you did," and then, thankfully, I arrived at my floor. In an instant, I had learned to be wary of insider status, as you can so easily be reminded of your outsider roots and the ways you can personify difference---as I am constantly made aware when tall guys (and women for that matter) take public note of my height. Stereotype threat is a powerful force, and once you know that you carry your “outsider” marking with you no matter how successful you may be, it's either empowering or a problem, and I think we all need to take it as the former!³

The second lesson I learned quickly was that we all have a penchant for lauding exceptional individuals but not revising our implicit views of the groups from which they come. I did very well in graduate school and received tenure after three years at my first

¹ Jacqueline E. King, "On the Pathway to the Presidency: Characteristics of Higher Education's Senior Leadership," The American Council on Education, cited by Audrey Williams June in "Pipeline to Presidencies Carries Lots of Women, Few Members of Minority Groups," *Inside Higher Education* (15 Feb 2008).

² The American College President: 2007 Edition (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 2007). See also Audrey Williams June, "Presidents: Same Look, Different Decade," *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 16 Feb 2007: A33.

³ S.J. Spencer, C.M. Steele, & D.M. Quinn, "Stereotype threat and women's math performance," *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 35 (1999): 4 -28.

job at Princeton, but I doubt that my senior colleague at Stanford ever revised his views of “girls from Sarah Lawrence.” My point is not that I am exceptional---quite the contrary--- but rather that we all glamorize the individual who rises above the expectation for her group but tend to overlook the situation of the group itself. We rarely revise our implicit schemas about groups based upon how individuals within them actually fare, and even more critically, we don’t worry about the talent lost by leaving groups behind.

The Vital Importance of Groups

Moving groups along is critically important. As we expand the possibilities for higher education, we must bring along more than the one or two exceptional women or men who succeed against the odds. We must include more than the heroines, the Lilly Ledbetters of the world, and more than those of us who happen to move through the ranks in unusual ways. It has to become the norm, not the exception, to see women and members of other under-represented groups in the circles of influence, and then we all have to change the group expectations that work in subtle ways to routinely hold back progress.

This is more difficult than it seems, because individualism is the most pervasive American ideology, often expressed as deep-seated reverence for self-made opportunity. The paradigm of the American success story is the individual who triumphs despite the odds. I think of Eileen Collins, a small-town girl from Elmira, New York, who gained a degree in physics and engineering from Syracuse and then went on to become the first woman space shuttle commander. Indeed, it is hard not to be taken by the triumphal element of such a story and too easy to forget what stacked the odds in the first place. We must work to even those odds.

I think that women scientists can be very effective in leading change in part because we often have a heightened awareness of those odds and therefore of how we can be marked as exceptions that do not “change the rule” for others. As the National Academy report---*Beyond Bias and Barriers: Fulfilling the Potential of Women in Academic Sciences and Engineering*---shows, talent in math and science is not the issue: girls in high school take as many mathematics and science courses as boys and earn better grades.⁴ Half the degree recipients in a number of scientific fields are women, and women make up half the nation's workforce. *However*, we make up only one-fifth of the scientific and technical workforce, and the proportion of women in science and engineering declines with every step up the academic ladder.⁵ As Cathy Trower and

⁴ M. E. Evans, H. Schweingruber and H. W. Stevenson, "Gender differences in interest and knowledge acquisition: The United States, Taiwan, and Japan," *Sex Roles* 47.3-4 (2002) :153-167; C. Morgan, J. D. Isaac, and C. Sansone, "The role of interest in understanding the career choices of female and male college students," *Sex Roles* 44.5-6 (2001) : 295-320; Y Xie and KA Shauman, *Women in Science: Career Processes and Outcomes*, (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003).

⁵ *Beyond Bias and Barriers: Fulfilling the Potential of Women in Academic Sciences and Engineering* (Washington, D.C.: The National Academies Press, 2007) 14.

Richard Chait have written, these women experience "social isolation, a chilly climate, bias and hostility."⁶

The National Academy report underscores the dire situation for minority group women, who are subject to dual discrimination, and are in a position that can only be described as "extreme." As Donna Shalala observes, "Women scientists and engineers with minority racial and ethnic backgrounds are virtually absent from the nation's leading science and engineering departments."⁷ Between 1989 and 1997, the proportion of tenured minority group women went down.⁸ As Donna Nelson reports, as recently as five years ago there were no African American, Hispanic, or Native American women in tenured or tenure-track faculty positions in the nation's "top 50" computer science departments.⁹ And in the "top 50" physical sciences and engineering departments, no Native American woman and only one African American woman held the position of full professor.¹⁰

The solo status of women in science can give us an appreciation of how marked we are by our group identity, and by the often subtle implication that it would take something special for a member of our group to make it in science or in leadership for that matter. I will never forget hearing about the comments of Sheila Widnall, the first woman United States Secretary of the Air Force from 1993-1997 and a professor at MIT, who is reported to have told leaders at the National Academy of Sciences that she would be happy with the progress of women when she saw as many mediocre women in the Academy as men. After all, it only took an off-hand remark by Lawrence Summers, then-President of Harvard, about gender differences in mathematical ability, for all women scientists to feel marked by the low expectations for the group. So it is easy to understand how so many young girls drop off the science radar screen even if they are purely talented enough and could be the exceptional ones to rise above the group.

We can see, therefore, how necessary it is to move whole groups---whether they are women or other under-represented groups---into the mainstream of these fields and of the academy, rather than expecting isolated individuals to overcome all odds and expectations. As several colleagues and I wrote in *Science Magazine's Policy Forum*, "systematic change can only be fostered if propelled by a vigilant and widespread campaign launched by tenacious women and men at all levels, and advocated by prominent leaders of our universities."¹¹ And this is why environments such as Bryn

⁶ C. Trower and R. Chait, "Faculty diversity: Too little for too long," *Harvard Magazine* March-April, 2002, cited in *Beyond Bias and Barriers*, 18.

⁷ Donna Shalala in *Beyond Bias and Barriers*, xi-xii.

⁸ Trower and Chait, cited in *Beyond Bias and Barriers*, 19.

⁹ D.J. Nelson, *A National Analysis of Diversity in Science and Engineering Faculties at Research Universities*, (2005), online at <http://cheminfo.chem.ou.edu/~djn/diversity/briefings/Diversity%20Report%20Final.pdf>, cited in *Beyond Bias and Barriers*, 19.

¹⁰ Nelson, cited in *Beyond Bias and Barriers*, 19.

¹¹ J. Handelsman, N. Cantor, M. Carnes, D. Denton, E. Fine, B. Grosz, V. Hinshaw, C. Marrett, S. Rosser, D. Shalala, & J. Sheridan, "More Women in Science," *Science* 309 (2005) : 1190-1191.

Mawr's have played a special role in producing women scientists and leaders in many fields. The entire group, not just one individual, is supported in these environments, with positive support for group membership and identity, and a different set of implicit expectations that changes the landscape for everyone, men and women.

If our environments support them, groups can motivate, mobilize, and energize individuals in the best possible ways. We can gain inspiration not just by telling and retelling the triumphant story of one amazing woman, but by looking at a sea of faces of women who are pushing on, reminding us all about the diversity of talent all around us. Indeed, when I spoke not too long ago at the inauguration of Sarah Lawrence's new president, Karen Lawrence, I told her that she would be overwhelmed by the individual and collective talent that she would find there---I told her that I am constantly overjoyed to walk into a room and find that the most interesting person in the room went to Sarah Lawrence---and it isn't just one unusual person---it happens all the time.

The time to remember our groups, all of them, is now. As a social psychologist, I believe we *can* change the culture of the academy and our larger society by developing our collective, collaborative purposes and not falling prey to the temptation in hard economic times to stop pushing for a leveling of the playing field that brings all the talented people in our groups along. In fact, it is precisely in these times that we most need innovation, challenging the norms and practices of our institutions and thinking outside of the proverbial box, and that is what an institution that cares about groups of people, not only the exceptional few, can best do, as Bryn Mawr surely has shown over the years.

In this context, it's particularly appropriate that the Center for Science in Society and the Katherine Houghton Hepburn Center are *co*-sponsoring this inaugural lecture series because they both are advocates for innovation, for new kinds of collaborations, for bridging the gap between the academy and larger social issues, and for supporting transformation that will change the ways in which we all live so that we all can thrive together.

A Legacy of Transformative Leadership

This is also what President Obama called upon us all to do in his inaugural address ---to "remake America" and to do it together, with all the diverse faces of America at the table. When he spoke of higher education, he encouraged us to take our rightful place *in* the world, to partner with K-12 to reverse the course of America's failing schools, to use our intellectual capital to help sustain our natural environment and to bridge the destructive chasms between groups that corrode our social environment, at home and abroad.

We can do it together, but to do it we must do three fundamental things---invite more diverse talent *to* our table, open up our institutional habits to transformative scrutiny, and bring our minds (and all of our talented people) *out* into the world to collaborate on the pressing issues of our time.

In this regard, I am inspired by the model of the suffragists who held the Seneca Falls Convention in my region of upstate New York in 1848 to demand full rights for women as human beings and as citizens, including the right to vote.

As the National Women's History Museum has so eloquently documented,¹² many of the women in attendance at Seneca Falls were deeply involved in work for abolition and for temperance, but the discrimination they faced within these movements politicized them on woman's rights. Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Lucretia Mott were refused seats at the World Anti-Slavery Convention in London in 1840 because they were women. Susan B. Anthony, whose family occasionally hosted William Lloyd Garrison and Frederick Douglass at their farm on Sundays, was president of the Daughters of Temperance in Rochester, N.Y. but was refused the right to speak at the state convention of the Sons of Temperance in Albany. So she left the meeting and called her own.

These suffragists did not abandon their commitments to temperance and abolition. Anthony, who was an agent for the American Anti-Slavery Society, was hung in effigy, and her image was dragged through the streets of Syracuse. But their sense of justice made them expand their vision. To promote the rights of women---their rights and those of their mothers and daughters, their sisters and friends, all the women who were lesser under the law---they created a movement that had to last much longer than they hoped, 72 years, until the 19th Amendment to the Constitution was passed in 1920. Even then, it was ratified by just one vote, and thanks to a woman. Tennessee became the last state to ratify when one young legislator, Harry Burn, changed his vote to "yes" after receiving a letter from his mother telling him to "do the right thing."

As the suffrage movement grew, so did its work for social justice more generally. In Chicago, Jane Addams founded Hull-House and brought together a brilliant collection of women who pioneered social services in working class and immigrant neighborhoods, fighting child labor, slum housing, and dangerous factories. Addams made common cause with members of other groups. She was the first president of the Woman's International League for Peace and Freedom and won the Nobel Peace Prize. She actively supported the founding of the NAACP in 1909, and in 1920, in the face of attacks on civil liberties and pacifists, she helped to found the American Civil Liberties Union.

The transformative possibilities of the woman's suffrage movement can be seen in the life of Katherine Houghton Hepburn, an early advocate of birth control. The vote would allow women to pressure legislators to reform the Connecticut statute that banned birth control. This law, she argued, this "police under the bed" statute, prevented poor women---not wealthy ones---from learning about contraception and consigned them to years of bearing child after child. Without the vote, women had no power to change even those laws affecting the most intimate, personal areas of their lives.

¹² The stories of these women and many others are available from the National Women's History Museum, online at <http://www.nwhm.org/>

Nannie Helen Burroughs, a prominent black educator, suffragist, and church leader who taught night classes and set up women's industrial clubs all over the South, captured the suffragists' optimism and determination in the motto she created for the school for African American women and girls she founded in Washington, D.C. in 1909: "We Specialize in the Wholly Impossible."

Activists Outside, Voices Inside

In many respects, the genius of this movement and the transformative legacy of its leaders was that it combined a persistent call from the outside of "normal institutions" for those inside them to change their ways with a willingness to get inside and help them see the way. This was an outside-inside dialectic that is worth all of our attention today as we push for a more inclusive, more innovative, more agile America and work both on the outside and the inside to make this a reality. In this effort, we also have modern day heroines to inspire us.

Take Anita Hill, for example, who was courageous enough to speak publicly about sexual harassment and the abuse of power in the workplace during the confirmation hearings for Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas in 1991. More recently, she described the transformative role that women have played as insiders with outsider values.

She wrote a remarkable opinion piece in *The New York Times* entitled "Insider Women with Outsider Values."¹³ Her subjects were two other exceptional women---Coleen Rowley and Sherron Watkins---who challenged highly respected, male-dominated institutions---the F.B.I and Enron---and pushed for reform as insiders.

As Hill noted, these two outstanding women, as leaders, had access to information and authority over others, as well as heightened awareness of the resistance within their own institutions to any efforts at change. It's likely that this knowledge deepened their resolve to speak out---in their cases, "to blow the whistle." Hill articulates a critical contrast between *insider status*---positions of authority and leadership within previously male-dominated institutions---and *outsider values*.

She also argues that it is no coincidence that women like Rowley and Watkins spoke out, for this balance of insider position and outsider values can be a powerful impetus for institutional activism. Women in leadership positions can serve the larger good in part because their memories from the outside are still fresh and they don't necessarily take at face value the norms of the institution.

Of course, in cases like Rowley and Watkins, as it was for Anita Hill, speaking out resulted in their leaving the institutions as a consequence of their activism.

¹³ Anita F. Hill, "Insider Women With Outsider Values, *The New York Times* 6 June 2002: A 31.

Hopefully, this is not always the outcome, as some institutions may actually stretch to accept the outsider values of their new insiders.

The Multiple Meanings of Insiders with Outsider Values

As we consider the growing number of women in leadership in higher education, it's worth considering the multiple implications of finding ourselves situated as insiders with outsider values. And, in this regard, we can again take inspiration from the legacy of the suffragists as they pushed from the outside, and also worked whenever possible on the inside, to change our laws and our institutions and create opportunity for many groups to claim a rightful place at the table. As we move inside, we should retain a fair measure of their outsider spirit, perspective, and courage, as did Rowley, Watkins, and Hill, a century and more afterwards.

What does this legacy tell us?

- In the first place, as insiders with outsider values, we should care deeply about bringing others into the room with us, both within and across the many groups that define our human social landscape.

Like Virginia Wolfe, we want a room of our own, but we want it to be a large, expansive room, with diverse participants at the table. Like the suffragists, we can make common cause with others, opening many doors at once.

Belva Ann Bennett McNall Lockwood, who won the right for women lawyers to practice before the Supreme Court, also won a precedent-setting legal case for the Cherokee Indian tribe in 1906 based on their treaty rights with the United States government. Like Lockwood, we can keep our identity and work to create a "new normal" that is good for everyone, not just those who are fortunate or extraordinary, and not just for one group, but many.

- Our legacy from the suffragists reminds us, in the second place, that, as we come in to positions of leadership inside, we should remain as open to institutional transformation, to scrutinizing the way we do things on the inside, as we would be if we were still pushing from the outside.

Lucy Stone was an advocate for women's rights and abolition, and she managed to promote her cause within the institution of marriage, even as she teamed up to form an "outsiders" group. She kept her maiden name when she married, and women who refused to take their husband's names became known as "Lucy Stoners." Julia Ward Howe, who may best be remembered for writing the "Battle Hymn of the Republic," teamed up with Stone to found the American Woman Suffrage Association. Like Howe and Stone, we are individuals who can each make a mark on the institution within which we reside, even as we team up across them to collectively ensure the staying power of these changes.

We have already found this to be true in workplace cultures formerly geared restrictively to married men with stay-home wives. The work-life reforms that allow for flexible career paths or time out to care for children and parents have benefited everyone, men as well as women, working women and those who work at home, married couples as well as domestic partnerships. These reforms have substantially “softened” the climate within both the academic and the corporate worlds, without dampening the drive for excellence seemingly at all.

- And thirdly, the example of the suffragists reminds us to remain committed to the outside, the broader society, and to work to bring other insiders out into the world to create broad-based change.

Once the 19th Amendment had passed, the suffragist Carrie Lane Chapman Catt founded the League of Women Voters in 1920 to bring women into the political mainstream. Then she went on to become an international advocate for peace, and her concern about Hitler led her to become one of the few to speak openly on behalf of German Jewish refugees.

Like Catt and her contemporaries, we must be comfortable with our group identity and our lives as members of a group, recognizing that insiders with outsider values are ideally situated for the kinds of leadership that can truly be described as transformative, opening up our institutions to diversity, scrutiny, and change, and at the same time carrying that “work” outside again in common cause with the broader democracy in which we exist.

Moving Together Beyond the Ivory Tower

In drawing today on the legacy of the suffragists, and the modern day inspiration of women like Anita Hill, Sherron Watkins and Coleen Rowley, I’ve purposely emphasized that it takes many different voices in different positions to make change. It takes more than the exceptional heroine suffering alone or outside of “normal society.” I’ve been moved to do this by the worry that when the times get hard, as they surely are now, common causes, collectives, movements, may splinter, pulling us back to the American individualist ideology of “self-made opportunity” and “survival of the fittest.”

I do not believe that any of us can do it alone; nor should we want to. In our case, as academic leaders, we do not want the academy to be an exclusive club, an ivory tower, in any of the senses of that phrase. It must be situated on a two-way street with the rest of the world, with sustained and reciprocal relationships that promote access, opportunity, innovation, and solve some problems of the world, beyond our disciplines alone. This is expansive, challenging work. It tests our ability to foster transformations within our institutions and yet also move outside them to make a broader difference in the world. It requires many of us working together; it will succeed on a foundation of diversity. It will succeed only if we learn to talk to each other across the many unnecessary zero-sum divides constructed to pit groups not to enhance us all.

In closing today, I'd like to mention briefly three projects at Syracuse University that are closest to my heart because each one involves work like this.

Inter-group dialogues. The first has been the establishment of inter-group dialogues. These have a strong community history in Syracuse, as the city has one of the nation's longest-standing programs of Community-Wide Dialogues Against Racism. We've established "dialogue circles" in our residence halls and credit-bearing courses in our curriculum to facilitate meaningful, sustained interaction among students across such divides as race, gender, and sexuality. In these, we acknowledge and explore the nature of groups---we don't paper over difference---as we promote the difficult conversations between and among groups that must be a central part of any diversity agenda.

SU is one of nine members of the Multiversity Project headed by University of Michigan social psychologist Patricia Gurin. These nine institutions have together developed and evaluated an inter-group dialogue curriculum to leverage diversity as an asset and an institutional strength. We use structured dialogues, intended to affirm groups while also enhancing inter-group empathy. No one in them experiences the process as easy, but at the same time, everyone in them cherishes the opportunity to try to make our pluralism work.

Public scholarship. The second project, also in collaboration with other colleges and universities, is an effort to create a more expansive reward system in higher education, to transform the ways we evaluate scholarly excellence to include scholarship that is outward-looking and engaged in the world. As part of its Tenure Team Initiative, for which I served as co-chair, Imagining America, a national consortium of more than 80 colleges and universities, studied the obstacles faced by faculty members doing public scholarship. The goal is to show, as Timothy Eatman, an assistant professor of higher education at Syracuse and a co-author of the report, suggested, that "excellent scholarship is just that---excellent scholarship." At tenure time, it's important to make sure that there are ways for public scholarship to be evaluated, "so we can discern what is excellent and what isn't."¹⁴

At the moment, many junior faculty members are advised by their senior colleagues to stay away from collaborative work that is inter-disciplinary and publicly engaged. We have all heard or even said: "You'd better wait until you get tenure before you do that"? A culture like this extracts a steep price. It's costly not only to those who find it hard to make their work count at tenure time, but also to students looking to the curriculum for opportunities for significant public work. And, as George Sanchez, chair of the board of Imagining America and a faculty member at USC, has often noted, this hesitance about public scholarship disparately impacts the career trajectories of women and faculty of color, many of whom feel a strong commitment to community and to

¹⁴ See Audrey Williams June, "Colleges Should Change Policies to Encourage Scholarship Devoted to the Public Good, Report Says," *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 26 June 2008. See also Nancy Cantor and Steven D. Lavine, "Taking Public Scholarship Seriously," *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 9 June 2006: B20.

scholarship together.¹⁵ We must do better if we are to have an expansive room of our own!

Say Yes to Education. The third project in which I have been deeply involved is a public-private partnership that has the potential to turn things around for a whole generation of talented children. It's a project I think Jane Addams would have liked because it seeks a better future for our communities and our democracy by starting with the youngest members of our society.

The children and youth who represent our future college-going talent base and competitive edge in the global knowledge economy are increasingly coming from *groups* with histories of exclusion. All of us have a substantial stake in evening their odds for success, especially the urban poor, who are largely children of color, and the rural poor, who are increasingly isolated from educational opportunity. We need a “no group left behind” campaign---and we need it soon.

SU is working on a district wide school reform project, in collaboration with the Say Yes to Education Foundation, Inc. and the Syracuse City School District, and we are addressing the achievement gap directly as a gap in opportunity not ability. We believe that if inner city students had the same opportunities as their middle-class peers in nearby suburban schools, they too would thrive.¹⁶

In this comprehensive demonstration, which we call “Syracuse Say Yes to Education and Economic Development,” we will strive to remove the barriers --- socio-emotional, academic, health, and financial --- identified time and again by educational research as roadblocks standing in the way of graduation and college.

Starting in kindergarten, students and their families across the district will experience the programmatic supports and educational opportunities, from the arts to the sciences, before and after school, from preventive health to pro-bono legal work, that can make schools centers of community and of hope. They will also experience the promise of full college tuition for students who graduate and qualify for admission to one of over twenty private institutions and the campuses of the State University of New York and the City University of New York.

In a world like ours, in a post-industrial city like Syracuse, where schools are routinely described as “failure factories,” education is the place to begin making things right, to keep children and teens whole, to ensure that they have the heart for dreams and the means to pursue them. We want to bring them in, not keep them out.

As a small woman from Sarah Lawrence who was made to feel uncomfortable at Stanford, I still remember how it felt to be an outsider, step off an elevator, and find

¹⁵ George Sanchez, “Crossing Figueroa: The Tangled Web of Diversity and Democracy,” The John Dewey Lecture, University of Michigan, October 2004.

¹⁶ <http://partnership.syr.edu/Partnership/uploads/Say%20Yes%20to%20Education%20overview.pdf>.

myself on the inside. As women and as leaders, we owe it to ourselves to hold onto our "outsider" sensibilities, to value the groups to which we belong, and to make common cause with others to create a "new normal" in our institutions and in our democracy.