HARVARD GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

# A Fork in the "Rhodes": *Facilitation Guide*

*By Caroline Tucker Mehta, Sara O'Brien, Orelia Jonathan, and Meira Levinson*

www.legacyofslavery.harvard.edu/normative-case-studies and www.justiceinschools.org

*Learning about a topic like the legacy of slavery can be overwhelming. Community Care Resources are available for members of the Harvard community seeking support for mental, spiritual, and emotional well-being.*

## LEARNING GOAL

Participants will explore ethical challenges related to individual, historical, and institutional legacies of white supremacy, imperialism, and racism, and to the intersections among student achievement, justice, and personal values.

## TIME

75–90 minutes

## GROUP SIZE

Normative case discussions generally work best in groups of 6–10 people. If your group is much larger, we suggest splitting into smaller groups to discuss the dilemmas and values in the case (see lesson plan for details). This activity assumes breakout groups are created through neutral assignment methods, consistent with nondiscrimination expectations and law.

## MATERIALS

Case study (normative case study): case narrative or reader's theater script

- A Fork in the "Rhodes" (normative case study): case or reader's theater script
- Slides and this facilitation guide
- Some way to write (pen/paper, laptop/tablet)

## BACKGROUND

Layla, an African American college student with South African and Zimbabwean ancestry, grapples with whether to apply for the prestigious Rhodes Scholarship, knowing that its creator and primary funder spread white supremacy and imperialism across the African continent. Should Cecil Rhodes's historical legacy impact her decision—and if so, in what direction?

The goal of this discussion is to surface the many competing values at play in the dilemmas raised by the case. Discussion participants should know that the goal of the discussion is not to generate the "right" answer to the central question above but rather to find new questions that exist within that main question.

The issues raised in this case are complex, and there are, in fact, no easy answers to the questions that will come up during this discussion. Both participants and facilitators should expect non-closure and ambiguity here.

In addition to raising dilemmas related to the legacy of slavery at Harvard, this case study is built to help participants think about their relationship to this challenging issue. This protocol scaffolds this discussion by first asking participants to think about how the multiple backgrounds and experiences of the characters in the case influence their feelings about the topic before asking them to think about their own backgrounds and perspectives. While not all participants may feel comfortable exploring their relationship to this topic aloud with the group, the protocol allows for them to at least reflect on the topic.

## LESSON PLAN

Session Agenda
Part I: Introductions and Norms (5-10 minutes)
Part II: Reading the Case (10-15 minutes)
Part III: Group Discussion (50-60 minutes)
Part IV: Reflections and Takeaways (10 minutes)

## Part I: Introductions and Norms (5-10 minutes)

### Discussion Protocol

1. If this is a one-off group (rather than an on-going class, for instance), introduce yourself and explain why you are excited to be leading this case discussion. Also share the agenda for the session. (Slides 1-2)
2. If there is a small number of participants, invite each person to introduce themselves briefly. If there is a large number of participants, explain that they will have the opportunity to introduce themselves to one another in small groups when they are getting ready to discuss the case.
3. Explain that the conversation will explore difficult themes related to race and responsibility.
4. Present norms to the group. You can use the following list or bring your own. (Slide 3)
    - **Respect for Self and Others**
      (e.g., Actively listen. Maintain confidentiality. Challenge ideas, not people.)
    - **Acknowledge the Different Backgrounds, Perspectives, and Experiences of Others**
    - **Accept Challenge and Anticipate Discomfort**
      (e.g., Push your thinking. Hold yourself and others accountable. Contribute to the conversation.)
    - **Keep an Open Mind**
      (e.g., Allow for growth. Listen before responding. Stay engaged.)
    - **Embrace Uncertainty and Non-Closure**
5. Ask participants whether they would like clarity about, to amend, or to add any norms.

### Facilitator Tips

If your group meets regularly for discussion, you likely already have norms in place. You can decide whether to simply review those norms here, or whether you need to bring in some new norms today.

If you have more time, you can make norms setting a collaborative experience. If you are pressed for time, you may want to present norms to participants rather than co-construct them.

For additional resources on norms creation and facilitation with norms, see "Leveraging Norms for Challenging Conversations" (2016).

## Part II: Reading the Case (10-15 minutes)

| Discussion Protocol |
| --- |
| 1. Explain the purpose of today's session: to surface the many issues at play in the case and the conflicts that arise when searching for a solution. There are, in fact, no easy answers to the questions that will come up during this discussion. Both participants and facilitators should expect non-closure and ambiguity.<br>2. Distribute and read the case together (Slide 4)<br>• For the Reader's Theater version, assign roles and read the case out loud.<br>• For narrative cases, give participants time to read the case (out loud or silently). If you want participants to annotate the case, let them know. |
| **Facilitator Tips** |
| We often find that the Reader's Theater version of the case makes for an engaging opening. Both the Reader's Theater version and the written case should take about ten minutes to read. |

**Part III: Group Discussion (50-60 minutes)**

## RAISING DILEMMAS (10-15 MINUTES)

### Discussion Protocol

1. Define "dilemma." (Slide 5)
    - We define a dilemma as "a situation where there is no one right answer and it is hard (even impossible) to realize all important values and principles at once."
    - In fictional cases like this one, dilemmas often present as choice points or questions.
2. Ask participants: *What are the dilemmas in this case, and for whom are they dilemmas?* (Slides 6-7)
    - Tell participants that the goal of this part of the discussion is to raise dilemmas in the case—as many as possible.
3. Follow-up questions, if needed: (Slide 8-9)
    - *Who are the stakeholders involved in this case?*
    - *What are the dilemmas for individual characters here? How does each character's perspective shape their dilemmas?*
    - *What are the dilemmas for Harvard as an institution?*
    - *How are the dilemmas similar or different for different stakeholders?*
    - *What dilemmas arise specifically for your school or department here? How are these similar to or different from those for the institution more broadly?*
    - *What dilemmas arise as characters weigh past and present?*

### Facilitator Tips

If your discussion group is larger than 10 people, split into smaller groups (ideally 6-9 people) for this part of the discussion. If you're discussing online, you can use breakout rooms.

If you are leading a virtual discussion with breakout rooms, make sure that participants have the slideshow link so they can access the questions without you.

Participants sometimes forget to name for whom these are dilemmas. You may need to ask the clarifying question: *For whom is that a dilemma?*

Participants often want to quickly move from raising dilemmas to "solving" them. However, once participants propose a course of action for the characters, it becomes more difficult to see new dilemmas or alternative courses of action. If participants begin discussing what the characters should do, let them know there will be time for that part of the discussion later.

## EXPLORING VALUES (15-20 MINUTES)

### Discussion Protocol

1. Briefly summarize (1-2 minutes) the dilemmas that the participants have raised.
2. Ask participants: *Why are these dilemmas? Are there competing values at stake? Or important practical considerations?* (Slide 8)
3. Follow-up questions, if needed:
    - *How should we engage with institutions whose founders perpetuated beliefs that had negative implications for major social systems and policies?*
    - *How do we reconcile what we know about a present-day organization with its difficult past, especially if that organization currently makes positive contributions to the world?*
    - *How much influence should this conflicting information have over decisions that we make, if any?*

**Facilitator Tips**

If you have split your large group into smaller groups (ideally 6-9 people), leave them in their groups for this part of the discussion. Again, be sure they have access to the slideshow link.

If participants struggle to identify key values raised in the case, you might share this list and ask them to choose the top value they see at stake in the case:

- Fairness
- Responsibility
- Truth
- Choice
- Community
- Learning
- Action
- Belonging
- Safety

There are far more follow-up questions here than any group can cover in one discussion. Before you begin, you may want to identify a few questions that feel most relevant for your group.

## WHAT SHOULD BE DONE IN THE CASE? (15 MINUTES)

### Discussion Protocol

1. Ask participants to take 2 minutes to write an answer to the questions: *What should be done in this case? By whom? Why?* (Slide 10)
2. Ask participants to share their thoughts. This can be done in several ways:
    - In virtual sessions, we often use the "waterfall" approach: We have participants type their responses and then all enter them into the Zoom chat at the same time. Then we can ask questions based on the patterns that we see, or we can ask individuals to share more of their thinking based on their responses.
    - Asking participants to share with a partner can be helpful, particularly if this group is not as comfortable sharing all together. You can then ask some pairs to share their thoughts.
    - You can simply open the floor to discussion if you have ample time and a group that feels comfortable sharing.

### Facilitator Tips

You could ask participants to think about this question for characters who share some identity marker with them. For example, students might think about what the students should do. Again, participants sometimes forget to name the person who should actually take the action they are proposing. If they do, ask a brief clarifying question: *Who should do that?*

## MAKING IT PERSONAL (10 MINUTES)

### Discussion Protocol

1. Ask participants to complete a quick write (2 minutes) on the following questions: *Which character in the case do you identify with most? Why? How does this character help you think about your own relationship to the legacy of slavery at Harvard?* (Slide 11)
2. Ask participants to share the ideas from their quick write. This can be done in several ways:
    - If participants are comfortable sharing their ideas with the whole group, open the floor to sharing.
    - Participants could partner with others who chose the same character. How do their reasons for choosing this character compare to their partner's reasons? What can they learn from each other? If there's time, pairs can share their learning with the larger group.

### Facilitator Tips

This part of the discussion is crucial. Few people at Harvard are in the position to create policy that addresses the University's responsibility in this case. However, everyone can reflect on their own responsibility to confront this difficult history and engage with it presently. Be sure to leave enough time at the end of your discussion for this reflection.

This is likely to be the most difficult part of the conversation for participants, as we move from the world of the case to our world. If you have the sense that participants would feel uncomfortable with open discussion, choose the partner option.

## Part IV: Reflections and Takeaways (10 minutes)

| Discussion Protocol |
| --- |
| 1. Ask each participant to take one minute to write a single sentence or question that they will continue thinking about after the conversation. (Slide 12)<br>2. Go in a circle and have each person read their sentence/question aloud (if you're in person).<br>3. For a virtual discussion, a waterfall technique could work well here. Have each person type their sentence/question into the chat but not press enter. Then, have everyone press enter at the same time. |
| **Facilitator Tips** |
| You may want to allow participants the option to pass (opt not to share) during this final section, depending on the level of comfort in the group. |

Tucker Mehta, C., O'Brien, S., Jonathan, O., & Levinson, M. (2022). A Fork in the "Rhodes": Facilitation Guide. *Justice in Schools*. https://www.justiceinschools.org/fork-rhodes-case and *Harvard & the Legacy of Slavery Initiative*. https:// legacyofslavery.harvard.edu/normative-case-studies/.

*This work is openly licensed via CC BY-NC-SA 4.0*

## ADDITIONAL RESOURCES

For more information about the life and legacy of Cecil Rhodes, see this biography from Oriel College, University of Oxford, and this Britannica biography.

To learn more about the fundamentals of the Rhodes Scholarship and the application process, see the Rhodes Scholarship overview page.

To learn more about what the Rhodes Trust is doing to address its legacy and work continuously toward a more diverse and equitable future, see the Rhodes Scholarship website.

To read a South African Rhodes Scholar's personal account of living under the legacy of Cecil Rhodes and his time at Oxford, see the *Guardian* article "'Colonialism Had Never Really Ended': My Life in the Shadow of Cecil Rhodes," by Simukai Chigudu.

To learn more about faculty and student-led protests against Oxford's connection to Cecil Rhodes, check out the following articles:

- "Scholars at Oxford University Refuse to Teach under Statue of Colonialist," from the *New York Times*
- "Rhodes Must Not Fall—Head of Scholarship Programme Rules Out Name Change," from *Cherwell*, an Oxford-run publication.
- "Rhodes Must Fall in Oxford: A Critical Testimony," from *Critical African Studies*, Volume 12.