Having just finished work at the restaurant, I rush over to the College of Education. [I hope I do not appear frazzled]. When I arrive, I meet Rene. After a short while, Susan Fowler greets us. [She has a firm but welcoming handshake]. She informs us that she'll be with us in a moment but that we are welcome to get situated in her office. As we walk into her office, I am struck by its size. It is a rather large, spacious office, decorated with bookshelves, quilts, couches, tables, chairs, and a desk. I wonder if we should sit at the taller table with chairs or the lower table with couches. I ask Rene what she thinks. We then agree that sitting at the table with couches might make for a more relaxed, comfortable, and open environment. Rene and I set up our equipment, as we wait for Susan to return.

Susan enters the office and sits slightly kitty corner from Rene and I. I begin the interview by referring back to Susan’s remarks at the College of Education’s Brown versus Board Symposium concerning the desire to paint Brown with a broad stroke; why did she and others believe it was important to do so; how does she see Brown in relation to other minority groups such as women (athletics) and those labeled as “disabled” (these are some of the groups she mentioned in connection with Brown at the symposium). Susan reveals that Brown has always been important to her on a personal level because she went into special education as an undergraduate. In 1974, she became certified and taught a special education pre-school program. She states that 1974 represented a period of time “before, in the state of Kansas where I lived, there was any guarantee that children with special education needs could go to school.” By the age of seven or eight years old, children with special needs were forced to enter residential programs at state hospitals, having to live without their families if they wanted to receive any more education: “I guess I had a social justice pulse in me at that time because I could conceive of nothing worse than children not being able to go to their neighborhood school.” Also, as Susan began to take more courses and read various books, such as Warriors Don’t Cry and literature on civil rights movements, she also saw injustice in terms of skin color, which, as she states, turned out to be the precedent for changes in other groups of children who could not go to the same schools [as the majority?].

Susan provides several reasons for her delight in accepting the position of co-chair: 1) She was interested in the Brown decision as a historical decision and particularly in terms of how it effected schooling for children; 2) “We were also right in the middle of the civil rights decree or order for Champaign schools. It was moving from neighborhood schools to schools of choice, and I happen to have a young son in the schools and just thinking back that this was the right thing to ensure that schools were not segregated and that they were integrated, even though it wasn’t comfortable
knowing that he might not go to the school that was right across the street from us” [paraphrase] [Susan’s discussion reminds me of reading Jim Crow’s Children, particularly with regard to considering issues of busing and so forth]; 3) As she studied Developmental Psychology and Special Education, the Brown decision really seemed to provide a foundation for all subsequent civil rights decisions, such as (although perhaps indirectly) the civil rights voting act and other legislation based on the civil rights voting act, “…that essentially said that it was discriminatory to provide any kind of separate accommodations or separate educational arrangements whether it was for children with disabilities or for girls who were athletic” or for children who spoke languages other than English. In all of the literature Susan has read in relation to special education, the citations always refer back to Brown (and the separate but equal arguments?). Brown was effectively used to pass legislation 94142 for special education, and in 1976 it became possible for children with disabilities to go to public schools; this was an improvement on the lives of thousands and thousands of families, and “it had a direct impact on me because I was teaching those kids, and I no longer had to send them away to a state residential program for them to go on into school.” [Paraphrase] So I guess I’ve always had a real passion for Brown and so when we took (Brown on?) as a campus, we started out by asking what to do with Brown, how are we going to make it relevant to the students, faculty, and staff on campus? We asked, did people know what far ranging impact Brown had on all facets of our lives? Here, Susan mentions that she went to school before Title IX and how she never got to play on any athletic team and did not even conceive of it as a possibility. However, now, she sees young women coming to college, asking about scholarships, when (before Title IX) it never occurred to Susan and others to ask about such scholarships: “So we should make sure that title 9 is represented because that’s a relevant issue for kids on campus.” [Here, I see an important theme developing during the course of our interview with Susan. Twice already, she has made it a point to mention her desire to make Brown relevant to those on campus. Later in the interview this point is further emphasized, as Susan again stresses how crucial it is not only to make Brown relevant to our campus but to people’s (current) lives and to make Brown a living decision with a strong presence not only in the past but also in the present and future, a here and now phenomenon]. Additionally, Susan states that students/people also need to know that the sweeping legislation for people with disabilities really came out of Brown. She says that because college students were born after such legislation was passed, things (i.e. with regard to special education programs, facilities, and etcetera) may appear the norm, “but if you lived before it was the norm, you could really see what a difference it makes.” Susan said that discussions then led to talking about current issues on campus, such as concerns about gay, bisexual, and lesbian rights, as they represent another disenfranchised group helped by the Brown decision. Brown also helped linguistic minority children; [paraphrase] before, it used to be fine to test everyone in English, and if they did poorly, then they didn’t have opportunities, and that’s certainly not true anymore. There were also test cases that rested on Brown versus Board that said separate wasn’t equal… Brown just seemed like such a “relevant, living, ongoing issue,” not to mention the ongoing or increased re-segregation of schools across the country for children who are minority, which can’t be ignored either. “So I thought one way to capture everyone’s attention on Brown would be to take it out of the historical context of 1954 and make
sure that it was still a live, active, vibrant message that impacts the way we live today and that still needs to be understood so that it can be protected. And you know, it worked really well because by painting a broad stroke, almost all of the colleges got interested and involved. It wasn’t restricted to Education and Law, you know, which is what we wanted. We wanted really high involvement across campus.” [Susan again reminds us of the importance of considering Brown not only in terms of yesterday but in terms of today, as a living message].

Rene then asks whether or not Susan was disappointed with any colleges that didn’t participate as much as Susan had hoped. Susan responds, “Well, yes, I was.” She then states that she and/or Rose Ann Miron and/or Tom (“two of us usually went”)… “Between the three of us, we met with every dean and director on campus, and almost all were very enthusiastic and particularly when we had asked the chancellor if she could identify a pool of funds that would support proposals from faculty and students to investigate a specific issue or to put on an event or celebration or artistic performance or, you know, whatever the case might be a symposium, and she identified some funds that we could use, so we were able when we when out a year and a half ago to say there’ll be a competition and faculty can apply with grad students and undergrad students for up to 15,000 dollars to do something that would really explore and critically analyze the impact of the Brown decision on today, on the way we live today.” [Again, Brown’s relevance to today is emphasized]. Susan then says that they [the deans of colleges?] all pretty much said it [the Brown commemoration?] was terrific and wonderful, but a few said that they didn’t see the close relevance to their college, basically stating that while they did think it was an important effort, and they were supportive of it and glad to see such an effort funded, not to be surprised if people don’t see any applications from their colleges. (Susan notes that this is a paraphrase of responses from a few deans). Susan informs us that she believes nine different colleges did submit applications. From memory, she lists the following as colleges that did submit applications: LAS, Education, Law, Applied Life Studies, Fine and Applied Arts, Social Work, Graduate School of Library and Information Studies, and ACES. She does not think she received applications from Vet Med, Engineering, or Medicine. However, she states, the majority of the campus did respond, and it was a fairly short timeline. In total, 52 proposals were received, and the 28 projects that were funded are available for view on the web.

Rene then shifts the discussion back to disabilities, as she asks, “What kind of disabilities were you talking about?” Susan responds, “Cognitive, physical, emotional…” “When I think about people with disabilities, I think about identified disabilities that are protected under the law for services under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act,” which ranges from cognitive disabilities to physical disabilities to emotional disabilities.

I then ask Susan, “At the school you taught at, did they have separation between people with different disabilities, or was everyone grouped into one category…? Susan responds by stating that she was from a small town and the special education class basically took anybody that nobody else would take, so the kids in the program had
different disabilities… Some had autism, some severe language delays, some hearing impairments, some were severely emotionally disturbed, and the class was a class of children with special needs; it was not an integrated class with children without special needs. She proceeds to state that now, of course, this would not be acceptable either, “but at that point just getting those kids into a program and into services was where we lived in anomaly, was unusual… they often just had to stay home or be institutionalized.”

I then ask Susan if she thinks there has been a lot of progress made with regard to “disabled” individuals and issues of segregation and education/schooling, stating that my personal feeling is that segregation still strongly exists and persists for those with “disabilities.” Susan responds stating that there is still segregation of children/students with disabilities into separate classrooms (and that this is problematic in some, well many, cases) but that there isn’t… the goal of IDEA was to ensure that all children were afforded free, public, and appropriate education. And, before that act, children weren’t afforded free, public, and appropriate education. Now, however, we know that they have free and public education, so the question becomes, is it appropriate education, and to what extent may they (children with special needs) need individualized, re-segregated education for part of the day versus being part of the group of normally developing children for the full day. Part of today’s debate is focused on where children are better served, in regularized versus specialized classes, or can sufficient resources be provided to the regular classes in order to adequately meet needs of special education needs students in those classes. Susan states that such a debate will continue, and at its very heart, it is a resource debate.

In this moment, I share a personal aspect of my life with Susan and Rene, in part to convey my personal interest in children with special needs and education for the “disabled.” Within the past year-year and a half, my cousin became “disabled.” He was nearly eleven when he entered the hospital and nearly twelve when he was released. Even now, the doctors are not sure of the exact cause of my cousin’s illness, but I do know that whatever illness he contracted caused swelling to occur in the areas of both his spine and skull, the neurological damage rendering him completely paralyzed, with the exception of him being able to move his eyes and make limited facial movements. Although my cousin cannot move and cannot (audibly) speak, he is cognitively functional at the level of his peers. While in the hospital, he was removed from his classroom. However, there were a few times when he was able to visit his classmates, communicating with them through a special electronic notebook, which would vocalize the words that he typed. I believe his visits to his classroom were uplifting, and I personally believe it is so important to have that kind of interaction between classmates regardless of whether or not the students have or do not have special needs. My cousin now attends class again with his friends, and I think, for him, it is best that he remain with his classmates, his friends, rather than to be separated from them and sent to another school. Perhaps integrated (in terms of both “disabled” and “non-disabled” students) schooling might not be the best option for all “disabled” and/or “special need” children, however, I think it would be wonderful to include resources in classrooms that could accommodate those with particular needs, especially if the child and his or her family believe an integrated classroom with both “disabled” and “non-disabled” children
is in the best interest of the child. [And with the term “disabled,” I wonder, does my cousin consider himself “disabled?” For eleven years of his life he was not “disabled,” and now…] [Note: Not all of what I have written above was included in the interview].

Susan then tells me of what is called an Individualized Education Plan, which requires that students receive the most appropriate education. Families are involved in advocating for what they believe is the most appropriate education for their children, for instance if they believe it is most appropriate for their special need children to remain in a regular classroom. Susan states that she herself has served as an advocate a number of times for families who wish to advocate for alternative placements or services in the best interest of their children.

At this point in the interview, I say to Susan, “I know in the beginning of the interview you discussed how Brown was personally important to you early on in your life, but, in the process of reviewing proposals and learning about different opinions on Brown, and so forth, were there new things you learned about Brown, or did you have changes in your opinion on Brown? [Paraphrase]”

Susan responds by saying that one of the neat things about being on the committee was that the members had agreed to read five or six books a year before this year, so that they could identify some books for the provost that might serve as a freshmen book. And, although they didn’t end up with a freshman book, they did end up with a book that was provided to a lot of the honors courses and freshmen in honors courses. [I wonder why the book was distributed to honors courses and freshmen in honors courses, rather than to the freshmen population at large, for example]. Susan states that she “read like mad” for a year, gaining exposure to books that she might not necessarily have otherwise thought to pick up and read. Jim Crow’s Children was the book selected for distribution to students. [As I’m writing up my notes, I realize that I wish I had asked Susan how and why Jim Crow’s Children was decided upon]. Susan also read Patterson’s book as well as a whole series of other books, in addition to re-reading Warrior’s Don’t Cry. (Here, Susan interjects that the author of Warrior’s Don’t Cry is coming on March 1st, and Susan is very excited about her visit. In sum, Susan believes she has read about seven books. Reflectively, Susan states, “It just brought back so vividly, and more vividly perhaps than when I was a college student, the injustices that African American families and children withstood in seeking adequate education and how hard… what a big… what a struggle it was and how it’s still a struggle… I think it brought more closely to home the realization that it’s not over that the promise of Brown is still not achieved and that there are other ways to segregate children, families; it can be by economics, and it still can be by language.” [As Susan is speaking, I reflect on how much I have personally learned about Brown as well as education inequalities more generally since joining EBC, attending Brown or Brown related events, conducting interviews, and reading related literature. I believe the recent exposure I’ve gained to such social injustice issues has encouraged me to more closely examine social injustices in relation to systemic powers]. Without explicitly saying so, Susan again brings Brown related issues into the present, as she informs Rene and I that as she has worked with other schools around the state and the inner city of Chicago, it has become
very clear that there continue to be schools where nearly 100% of the population is minority, and there is no guarantee that the schools always have the most experienced teachers and best and/or appropriate resources. She then proceeds to say, so it’s “okay” because they’re in their city school, but it’s not okay because the funding equity in the state is not equitable to school districts based on property tax, and so where we have poor parts of the city, we have poorer schools. In Illinois, we might spend 16,000 dollars per child in one school, whereas we will spend only 4,000 dollars per child in another nearby school, and the state’s contribution to promote equity is so small that it makes very little difference. Susan states, “I think it [her involvement on the committee?] just highlighted again for me that one decision can start the change process, but it takes continued determination and more decisions to continue the change process.” Susan again speaks about re-reading Warrior’s Don’t Cry, discussing the Little Rock battle to integrate the central high school, six or seven years after Brown. She talks about how the school was closed after the first year of its attempted integration, and so there was no high school for a year. Susan comments on the extreme measures people took [to prevent integration (I myself have also been shocked by what I have read concerning the drastic measure people took to ensure segregation)]. Susan states that she doesn’t think that [people’s extreme measures] had really sunk in before, even though she did remember seeing on TV clips of the riots at Little Rock because she was about her age: “So I think, you know, it was just a terrific experience to be able to really immerse myself in the history of Brown and then to reflect on what is happening today in our society, and the affirmative action decision that was made with regard to Michigan seems so timely to our looking at the Brown versus Board commemoration… Understanding the privilege that many of us have because of our educational background that an SAT score probably does reflect our potential, but we can’t take for granted that it reflects everyone’s potential and that we need a far more diverse way of assessing or evaluating not competence for college but promise for college, or we’ll have a very narrow group of people admitted to college but promise for college, or we’ll have a very narrow group of people admitted to college.” [Again, Brown is brought into the present by considering such issues as affirmative action as well as current modes of testing and college admission processes]. Susan also discusses new legislations such as No Child Left Behind, commenting that she thinks it also reminds us of the inequalities that exist today, because now that test scores have to be desegregated by race and socioeconomic class, schools might rank high because they have high averages, but now we’re seeing that there are subgroups within schools that are failing, and so while the school as a whole may not be failing, its educational practices are not embracing and supporting all of the children.

Thinking back to the symposium and also with discussing schools, I’m prompted to ask Susan how she sees the College of Education interacting with the community outside of the University for instance with regard to the local school districts and their participation in Brown.

Susan slightly rephrases my question asking do I mean to ask how the College of Education interacts with local school districts to increase participation in Brown or to make them aware of… She then states that there were a couple of things the College of Education participated in with the hope of engaging the local school districts, particularly
with regard to Brown. At the beginning of the school year, there was a kind of introduction, a gathering between people from the College of Education and Urbana schoolteachers. Susan, however, does not believe such a gathering occurred with Champaign, but the College of Education did send a lot of information to Champaign to describe the Brown activities and tried to do a number of things that would engage teachers, children, or administrators from the district. For example, in the symposium, the College of Education wanted to ensure that school district personnel were aware of and welcomed, hopefully, to come and spend some time discussing the achievement gap with us [College of Education faculty?]. A second project to promote community involvement and/or interaction with the College of Education was to develop a [Brown?] mobile library exhibit that will go around to the local schools. Susan also mentions that the Brown sisters are visiting March 11th, and the College of Education is arranging for teachers to come and participate in a workshop with the Brown sisters because the Brown sisters are quite expert in talking about how to talk about race, having been through so much themselves. Susan also discusses the Martin Luther King essay contest in local schools, stating that faculty from the College of Education and others read the letters, the essays that students wrote, and the College of Education has invited the ten top awards (Here, Susan mentions that the students were instructed to write a letter, a poem, an essay, and so forth to Linda Brown, and such projects can be viewed in the lobby on the third floor. I would like to return to the College of Education and take a picture of said display) to come to the Brown sisters’ talk and be recognized on March 11th. Other projects meant to reach out to the schools included dances, musical events, and a film series at the Virginia Theater. Susan does state, however, that the film series did not elicit the kind of reception that was originally hoped for. With the film series, the College of Education was hoping to bring people from the community to watch some classic films that dealt with race. Susan thinks perhaps the College was overly ambitious and initiated the event too soon and didn’t advertise enough. In the summer, there was a reception held at Krannert in which about 100 members of the community were invited to discuss ways to bring the news and the word about Brown into the community, and to have the community participate in events that would be going on on-campus, and how to go into the community and share... It was during this discussion at Krannert, that the idea for the Virginia Theater film series developed. Again responding to my question about community involvement and interaction with College of Education (and particularly in terms of Brown) Susan states, “I guess, you know, I would say that it hasn’t been as successful as I might have hoped for community involvement at this point in time, but a lot of the projects are still on going, and I think that we'll have outcomes, products in the next year, year and a half that still could be very much shared with the community so even though the formal commemoration of Brown will end in May, there will still be, I mean people will still be finishing the, either the performances, or the papers, or the symposia and writing chapters and lesson plans and things like that hopefully will still have an impact.” [Because I have heard several people speak about the community’s dissatisfaction with the level of involvement and interaction between the local community and the University, I am glad that Susan, while presenting the University efforts put forth to engage the community, does acknowledge that community involvement and/or engagement with the University has not been entirely successful and that there is at
least the intention to try and strengthen the relationship between the local school districts/community and the University community. I would like to interview people involved with the local school districts and other such community members to ask them their opinions and viewpoints on their involvement and/or interaction with the University. Does the community recognize or agree with the efforts (such as those that Susan has articulated) the University has made to engage the community (particularly with regard to Brown)? How might the community be better engaged? How has the community tried to engage the University, or has it, does it want to, why or why not?

With Susan mentioning the hope for continued future impact (for example with regard to the community), I ask her, “Beyond the Brown commemorative events of this year, what would be your hope, or the impact that you hope such events will have in future years at the University [paraphrase].

Susan hopes for the raising of the level of conversation among faculty, students, and staff about race, segregation, integration, equity, and access. She notes that it’s startling to think that just 50 years ago, black children couldn’t be in same schools as white children and how it seems so strange now; yet, when one looks around, he or she recognizes that the majority of students at the University of Illinois, as undergrads, continue to be white, and the percent of minorities remains fairly low, and that’s a legacy of Brown, and it’s an opportunity legacy that we haven’t fulfilled. [Susan’s comment about the low percentage of minority undergraduate enrollment brings to mind similar discussions I’ve heard concerning low minority percentages on our campus but in terms of faculty]. Susan asserts that it’s important that right now the campus has a goal to increase minority enrollment by 20% over last year’s. There are several high level committees working on strategies to identify improved merit funding opportunities in order to attract high caliber students, minority and non-minority, to campus. Thus, Susan sees the conversation occurring at that level [the level of high level committees?] and she hopes for conversation [about the kinds of issues outlined earlier: race, segregation, integration, equity, access, and etcetera] to occur among freshmen, sophomores, juniors, and seniors and that even though Brown took place during their [students’] parents’ or grandparents’ generation… that lived during Brown, that they [students] are stepping back a moment and thinking, wow fifty years is a long time ago, but are we in danger of going back, are we taking advantage of getting to know people who are different than us and not just in terms of skin color but also in terms of language, values, religion, and are we using such opportunities to learn more? [Again, it seems that Susan wants to ground Brown in the present in that she emphasizes how it is not only important to have current dialogues about the issues of Brown, but it is also important that those dialogues bring issues of Brown into the present, considering current issues of race, segregation, integration, and so forth. Brown today appears central to Susan’s conception of Brown and her vision of this year’s commemoration and the College of Education’s efforts in that commemoration].

I then pose the question to Susan: In terms of our campus, even if the numbers of minorities increase… Well, I’ve participated in various discussions on diversity as existing versus being alive, if you will… That is, that it takes more than just a diverse
population to make diversity happen… [Paraphrase]. [Here, I’m thinking about and referring to EOTU discussions about diversity in terms of numbers on campus versus actual interaction occurring between diverse groups of people. In thinking about my developing definition of diversity, I think I am starting to personally associate it with interaction, that “active diversity” would result in interaction among diverse groups, as opposed to “static diversity,” in terms of diversity only existing in statistics yet still resulting in isolated groups without communication among such groups.

Susan interjects stating that we have to have diverse ideas and life experiences… it’s a small town and large town… there’s diversity right there, but we also know that if 30% of the school children in the state are minority, then the percentage of minority adults is going to increase. So, an example very vivid for Susan right now is that only 9% of teachers in Illinois are of minority background and yet 30-35% of students are minority. Susan then asks, “[Paraphrase] Are they [the students/children] seeing the same population of teachers as classmates, and, if not, what do they think about that-that right there can begin to define how one views race. Most teachers are white, so more whites become teachers; why is that and how much of that is an opportunity, access issue versus a choice issue?” [Here, although I’m not sure exactly why, I think back to comments made at the symposium about the need for a positive image for minority students/children to be projected in order to better support students and to encourage them to associate education with success and positive feelings, rather than failure and negativity.]

Returning to my initial question about diversity and interaction on our campus, I ask Susan her opinion on how different groups, student groups, interact with one another on campus. For example, I mention that in another interview I asked how the cultural houses did or did not interact with one another. I also mention the 2-day versus 3-day orientation discussion from last semester, noting that I myself went to the “minority” orientation and therefore a visit to the cultural houses was included in orientation. However, those who attended the 2-day orientation did not visit the cultural houses and how such orientation decisions might in and of themselves be setting up a separation among students to begin with… Susan interjects, “Yeah, absolutely that it’s not for me it’s for them, and that’s a real problem. It’s a lack of… It’s putting white in the middle and assuming anyone who’s not white is needing extra support services and extra opportunities, and it’s a dangerous position to be in because you forget what the majority students need, and they need to know that there are a whole range of choices and options and cultures and places where they could go and engage in discussion and dialogue and learn more about the way in which other people live…” [It is interesting that Susan brings up the notion of considering the cultural houses in terms of assuming minority students need extra support and opportunities. I have heard some students discuss how such assumptions at times seem condescending, as if it is implied that minorities will struggle more and therefore need extra help. However, I have also hear the same issue discussed in a positive light from both minority as well as non-minority students (with non-minority students in particular stating that they wished such services were available to them, but, I believe they are… Perhaps it’s just a matter of feeling welcome to use those services or not… Again, I think back to orientation]. Susan
continues, students don’t have to live with a roommate from the same town, high school, and etcetera. She states that she has to admit that she didn’t go to school here, and she tends to be more involved with faculty and grads, so she doesn’t know how well the undergrads take advantage of the cultural resources on campus, but she does know that in looking at the faculty, 30% of the faculty in [the College of Education?] are from minority and/or underrepresented groups and that they (including herself) engage in a lot of debate and conversation, which she didn’t have has an undergrad and has more of now as a faculty member. She also says that it would be really sad if the [College of Education?] didn’t have as diverse a faculty, because “[Paraphrase] we wouldn’t know as much and wouldn’t have their [who’s? people with different backgrounds than Susan?] perspective, which they gently or sometimes not so gently share with me.” She goes on to say something to the effect that we all say dumb things sometimes, and it’s good to have friends who say, you know, what an assumption you just made, but “[paraphrase] that’s how we change and learn through those dialogues and conversations and to hear what their experiences were like and to reflect on how different my experiences may have been.”

The interview proceeds with me asking Susan what the College of Education or she has done to incorporate Brown into the (University) curriculum. For example, has, and if so, how has Brown been brought into the classroom this year, or how might it be incorporated into courses in the future?

Susan responds by stating that about seven years ago, there was a major re-design in the Undergraduate Teacher Education Curriculum to include a much stronger theme of diversity through the curriculum, and so there are a number of classes (that directly through their title in fact) include and/or address diversity. Also, the philosophy of the College of Education includes diversity as one of its four pillars… She states that the college has tried to incorporate issues of diversity in everything that it does and in all of its classes, the college attempts to ensure that student field observations and student teaching assignments provide students with several diverse teaching experiences. For instance, student teachers are in classes with high minority enrollments, rural enrollments, in classes where children have and do not have “disabilities:” “so that they [the students] really gain a flavor for the population of the nation.” Susan also notes that some faculty members have included participation in some of the Brown events as extra credit and/or optional assignments and how such assignments are sometimes just the nudge that students might need on a cold evening to go out [and attend events]. [I think this raises an important question both with regard to student motivation to attend Brown and other events in general, as well as what others perceive to be motivating forces for students to attend events outside of the classroom]. Lastly, Susan mentions that there are also discovery classes that are particularly focused on the Brown versus Board education decision.

Lastly, I ask Susan how the Brown versus Board decision and particularly the commemorative events of this year made her think of the University of Illinois and the place of the College of Education in relation to the University (at large).
Susan responds stating that she’s always seen the College of Education as central in the University of Illinois because without preparing teachers, there would not be students equipped to come to the University of Illinois. Additionally, she says that it has “Heightened my awareness of the importance of our being more engaged with the Chicago public schools and with school placements, school opportunities that have a higher percentage of minority students not only to provide the exposure for our undergraduate students to live and work in those environments but also to ensure that we’re providing a message to the high school students and the middle school students and younger students that the University of Illinois is a place where they can come, and learn, and grown, and hopefully be comfortable, so it’s increased our efforts to reach out more I think to Chicago public schools.” She notes that the college will be having a Shadow Day where 30 students from Chicago public schools will be coming down to shadow junior college students in their classes to see what it would be like to be a teacher. The following is Susan’s closing statement: “I think it’s also highlighted how important it is to me the way in which issues of race of equity and access are presented to children and that teachers are often among the first to present those issues, and they really have an opportunity to make Brown come alive, the Brown decision come alive in their teaching.” [Phrases I think about as I reflect on Rene’s interview and mine with Susan: “Brown as Alive;” “Brown Today;” “Past/Present/Future Relevance (of Brown);” “Far Ranging Impact (of Brown);” “Hope for Continued, Future Impact;” “Learning through (Experiencing) Diversity;” “Learning through Dialogue, Conversation.” In my notes, I’ve attempted to underline at least some of the areas in the interview that I believe illustrate the phrases/themes I’ve just outlined. I don’t believe the underlining will come through on WebBoard, so I may email a word document attachment of this particular set of field notes so that people may see where and what I have underlined].