Introduction

There is an ongoing dialogue on diversity taking place at the University of Victoria (UVic), Canada. Although this dialogue has occurred in many locations across the University over time, it is rendered more public at an annual, campus wide, interdisciplinary Diversity
Research Forum hosted by the University’s Office of the Provost. In the months leading up to the 2011 forum, the planning committee decided to experiment with an arts-based method called Métissage: an approach to story-telling that weaves different people’s narratives together (described in more detail below). The four quotations above are the closing lines from the four participants’ narratives that were brought together in this Métissage project.

In this chapter, we document the process leading up to the Métissage performance, describe the effect it had on the audience, and reflect on lessons we learned along the way. While this chapter incorporates the views of the three key organisers of this project, sections that are written in first person singular (“I”) voice represent Catherine’s perspective.

We have two key reasons for writing this chapter. First, in sharing our experience, we are in fact advocating for more widespread use of arts-based methods in University settings. Conferences, classrooms, meetings, and research projects continue to be dominated by more traditional methods such as PowerPoint lectures, panel presentations, or debates. While these time-honoured methods certainly have their place, they are but a few among endless possibilities for teaching, learning, and scholarly communication. We suggest that the unexamined ubiquity and dominance of these traditional methods limits our ability to learn more holistically in academic settings. As many have argued before us, arts-based methods tend to have a different effect on the audience than these more traditional methods, and can create more possibilities for engaging our hands, hearts, spirits, and minds, as we will demonstrate below. In documenting how an arts-based method was successfully employed as part of a Provost’s Research Conference, our desire is to join our voices with the many arts-based practitioners and scholars
who are inspiring new ideas for what is possible—not only for conference organisers, but for administrators, educators, and researchers alike.

For readers who are already convinced of the power of the arts, our second purpose in writing this chapter is to provide a behind-the-scenes look at the process leading up to the Métissage performance. We offer this as a description, not a prescription, and invite you to take what is useful from our experience and adapt it to the nuances of your own context. We hope that the key decision points we have highlighted here, and the particular way in which we have employed Métissage will inspire new ideas for your practice.

We open the chapter with an introduction to diversity and multiculturalism in Canada. This opening section provides background information on UVic’s Diversity Research Forum and, by demonstrating the intersecting elements of the diversity debate, sets the stage for why Métissage – a method that showcases intersecting narratives – was an appropriate method to choose for this context. We then describe Métissage in more depth, revealing the link to arts-based research in general, and the theoretical nuances of this particular method. Next we move to an overview of how we employed Métissage in the context of the Diversity Research Forum: our creation process and a discussion of the quality of conversation that resulted from the performance. Here we emphasise the importance of conversation following the performance, and discuss the measures we took to create a welcoming space for the deeply personal dialogue that ensued. We close with a hope that other scholars and practitioners will continue encouraging the use of arts-based methods and working to create holistic ways of engaging within academic settings.
Note that this chapter is intended to accompany and complement – not replace – the performance. We therefore encourage interested readers to view a recording of the Métissage online (listed in the references as Etmanski, Weigler & Wong Sneddon, 2011).

The diversity dialogue in Canada: Why is this forum important?

The Provost’s Diversity Research Forum has been an annual occurrence at UVic since 2008. The purpose of this forum is to provide a space for faculty, staff, and students to showcase their work on issues related to diversity in its various manifestations. Members of the University community come together to build strategic alliances, hold critical conversations, and address discrimination and oppression of all kinds. The forum is fully funded by the University, and organisers make every attempt to put values of diversity into practice. The existence of controversies and human oversights mean that the conference cannot satisfy everyone, but it is a sincere effort to tackle difficult and seemingly intractable topics related to diversity. The forum has been growing with every year, and attendees report through anonymous feedback forms that this is a unique space for holistic academic engagement with ideas and actions on diversity in our home University context.

Such diversity conversations are shaped by Canada’s complex colonial history that includes waves of settlement by peoples from around the world. The Canadian Multicultural Act (Canada, 1985) is an attempt to promote equity and equality amongst people of all cultural backgrounds. However, the dominance of European colonisation remains enshrined in the two official languages (English and French) and there is a growing body of literature exposing the inconsistency of achieving equality in practice (e.g. Abu-Laban & Gabriel, 2002; Bannerji, 2000; Lee & Lutz, 2005; Razack, 2002). Such scholars suggest that a contradiction exists between the
welcoming discourses of multiculturalism and the myriad of real challenges endured by people outside of the ‘Euro-white’, English-speaking Canadian norm. Goldberg (1993) describes this contradiction as a key paradox of modernity: “the more open to difference liberal modernity declares itself, the more dismissive of difference it becomes” (p.6). This dismissal of difference has implications for how people interact in a University setting, as standardised evaluative and pedagogical practices are often employed to assess and teach an infinitely diverse range of people.

In addition, the disproportionate level of poverty amongst Canada’s Indigenous peoples creates a significant challenge to the rhetoric of multiculturalism. The University of Victoria is located on the traditional territories of the Coast Salish and Straits Salish First Peoples of Canada, and many Indigenous people assert that their traditional territories are occupied or have been stolen (a view supported by some of their non-Indigenous allies). This fundamental struggle over waterways and land, as well as blatant social and economic inequity, adds complexity to conversations around diversity in Canada. Various efforts are currently underway at this University to support Indigenous-centred education (e.g. Williams & Tanaka, 2007), bridge Indigenous-non-Indigenous relations, and build and sustain meaningful relationships between settlers and the surrounding Indigenous communities. Unlike most academic conferences, organisers of this forum make significant efforts to follow protocols for acknowledging the traditional territory, welcoming newcomers and visitors to the territory, and inviting Elders from local Indigenous communities to hold a place of honour during the conference, especially during meals and opening/closing ceremonies. These efforts, as well as the content of some of the conference sessions, encourage non-Indigenous people to not only become more aware of the struggle for land and basic human dignity, but also to work as allies in this struggle.
This forum, however, is not simply about cultural diversity. Forum organisers endeavour to recognise a breadth of human possibility. Presenters highlight their work around intersecting elements of power and privilege, including how class, for example, intersects with sex, gender, sexuality, religion, (dis)ability, country of origin, language, culture, and more. In recent years, forum organisers have sought to weave an ecological analysis into the conversations as well, thereby drawing clearer links between diversity and biodiversity, social and environmental justice.²

During the summer of 2010, organising committee members were starting to plan for the 2011 forum. Feedback from previous years indicated that while the conferences had been successful in generating inclusivity amongst faculty and students, there was one group of people whose voices had been absent from the conversations to date: members of the University staff. While Grace, in her position as lead organiser and Diversity Advisor to the Provost, goes out of her way to ensure staff members can take time away from work to attend this forum if they so wish, the reality of institutional constraints means that many do not, or cannot participate in a meaningful way. As a result, committee members began pondering how they could create an opportunity for staff voices to be heard. Adding another panel presentation to the conference schedule was a possibility, of course, but, as the resident artist on the committee, Will had a different idea. He had previously seen Catherine and her students facilitate a Métissage-based dialogue related to graduate student experiences on campus and suggested to the committee that this method might be a good fit for this purpose. He then got in touch with Catherine to help facilitate the development of Métissage-based presentation.

What is Métissage?
Métissage is an arts-based method of enquiry and education, which, by its nature, defies
categorisation and concrete definition. It draws from the traditions of life writing, storytelling,
theatre and—symbolically—from the art of weaving or braiding. When presented in written
form, the genres can vary, as multiple personal narratives are woven together with theory, poetry,
photographs, and more. When performed orally, Métissage is similar to Reader’s Theatre, where
people read openly from their scripts, with minimal attention to staging or costumes—though
these are also welcome. Projected still images, video, and other creative possibilities may
complement the reading as well. Part auto-ethnography, part performance, Métissage resists
“19th century scholarly conventions of discrete disciplines with corresponding rhetorics for
conducting and representing research” (Chambers, Hasebe-Ludt, Donald, Hurren, Leggo, Oberg,
2008, p. 142). It is a process of uncovering and co-constructing knowledge about self, others, and
the world around us, and a means of making that knowledge public.

The simple practice of narrative Métissage (i.e. without images, poetry, and so on) results
in the interweaving of short personal stories. To enable this process, a small group of three to
five participants can self-organise, or a researcher-teacher-artist can facilitate the writing of
participants’ narratives. These narratives are often, but not necessarily, on the same theme.
Participants write independently then come together to share their narratives with others. The
individual texts are then divided into vignettes or shorter segments so that people can take turns
reading segments of their narrative aloud. Person A shares one vignette or a few sentences, then
person B speaks, then person C, back to person A, and so on. The weaving or order of segments
can be negotiated as a group, or prepared by one person. The ordering of segments creates a
further layer of meaning, as the juxtaposition of different scenes can demonstrate how individual
stories diverge and converge, complement and contradict. Through this braided storytelling, one
person’s story is interrupted by another’s—just as our lives and identities are often overlapped and interwoven with the people with whom we come into contact. Métissage can highlight both the threads of individuality and the common experiences of our collective human tapestry.

As with other arts-based methods, audience members frequently report at least two (of many potential) categories of experience upon witnessing Métissage. First, as story-tellers speak, members of the audience are often able to see themselves reflected in the stories. This can allow for greater self-knowledge, as people’s experiences are either validated through the understanding that they are not alone, or, conversely, spectators might gain some awareness about the hurtful effect their behaviour could have on others. Second, stereotypes and assumptions become dismantled as we learn more about people’s life experiences (e.g. contesting preconceptions that social privilege precludes pain). People can feel greater compassion and empathy as the complexity of another person’s life unfolds before them. In this way, the Métissage moves from expressing individual stories to becoming “a means of conveying truths about the human condition” (Furman, 2006, p.138). These personal narratives are not didactic or necessarily intended to convey a particular message. Rather, as points of connection are made between the tellers and the audience, people can extract their own meaning and apply these ‘truths’ in their own contexts.

Though not a uniquely Canadian art form, the practice of Métissage has gained momentum in Western Canada over the past decade through the work of University of British Columbia and University of Lethbridge authors and educators (see Hasebe-Ludt, Chambers & Leggo, 2009), and at the University of Victoria through scholars Wanda Hurren, Antoinette Oberg, and Kathy Sanford, among others. I (Catherine) was first introduced to Métissage in 2009
by Sheila Simpkins, who, through her doctoral work, has been employing Métissage to promote peaceful dialogue between Kurdish and Arab students in Kurdistan, Northern Iraq (Simpkins, Forthcoming 2012). Sheila and fellow classmates introduced narrative Métissage to me as a simple, but surprisingly powerful arts-based method. I have since come to better appreciate the complex, decolonising worldview this method represents.

Why Métissage?

Barndt (2008) cautions that “there is always a danger of art-making processes being reduced to tools or techniques when using them as integral to qualitative research, making them devoid of meaning in relationship to the deeper purposes of the research” (p. 359). Though it could pass as a simple reading and writing exercise, the practice of Métissage is deeply rooted in an ontology of liminal, transformational spaces and creative, constructivist epistemologies. Chambers, Donald, and Hasebe-Ludt (2002) have suggested that Métissage “is a site for writing and surviving the interval between different cultures and languages; a way of merging and blurring genres, texts and identities; an active literary stance, political strategy and pedagogical praxis” (para. 1). Hasebe-Ludt and Jordan (2010) have further attested, “in our life writing, we are committed to promoting emancipatory projects of learning and teaching by attending to the ways that life writing constantly explores, contests, and negotiates the imaginative possibilities of knowing and being in the world” (p. 2). The ontological and epistemological stances these authors express support our choice to employ Métissage for this project.

The concept of Métissage is particularly meaningful in Canada in relation to the colonial history and ongoing multicultural agenda described earlier. Derived from the Latin word *mixtus*, meaning mixed, the word Métis originally refers to cloth woven from two different fibres
In the Canadian context, the term Métis specifically refers to people of a mixed Indigenous and European settler cultural heritage. While Métis peoples across Canada maintain a unique cultural identity and nation, the act of claiming Métis status cannot be separated from ongoing colonial intervention in family, identity, and historical records (Barman & Evans, 2009). The racial prejudice that historically accompanied the concept of Métis must also be understood as context for this work, including both fear of the ‘Other’ and fear of the ‘familiar-strange’ (Nishad Khanna, personal communication, Feb. 5, 2010/Dec. 14, 2011).

People of so-called mixed heritage have historically defied categorisation, never fully belonging to one cultural group or another. In recent years, the post-modern era has helped to reconceptualise in-between spaces as important and productive epistemological sites. As a result, diasporic, post-colonial, hyphenated, hybrid, and trans-national identities are increasingly celebrated (Anthias, 2002; Grewal & Kaplan, 1994; Ifekwunigwe, 1999).

This reclaiming of mixed identity harkens back to Greek mythology, where a Titaness named Metis was revered as a wise “figure of skill and craft, and of cunning, a trickster with powers of transformation who resisted notions of purity by weaving and blurring textiles” (Hasebe-Ludt & Jordan, 2010, p.2). As both a methodology and pedagogy, then, Métissage disrupts modernist ideals of linearity and rationality by weaving in “strands of place and space, memory and history, ancestry and (mixed) race, language and literacy, familiar and strange with strands of tradition, ambiguity, becoming, (re)creation, and renewal” (Chambers, et al., 2008, p. 152). Viewed as a response to colonial encounters, the practice of Métissage becomes a way of working with and through the experience of dislocation, and the ‘messiness’ of a reality that defies fixed categories.
In addition to cultural heritage, the juxtaposition of multiple narratives through Métissage promotes an intersectional analysis of identity, power, and privilege. Intersectionality is a concept that attempts to address the multiplicity of complex dynamics embedded in human relationships, organisations, and global social structures, as well as the oppressive or enabling circumstances to which these dynamics give rise. It is defined as “the interweaving of oppressions on the basis of multiple social identities as well as marginalization that [is] both relational and structural” (Moosa-Mitha, 2005, p.62). Proponents of intersectionality claim that no one element of identity or oppression can stand alone (e.g. sex or sexism; ‘race’ or racism); rather, these dimensions of difference are deeply interconnected and are expressed differently through individual people’s identities. The idea of intersectionality acknowledges that the human experience is complex and constantly in motion. While some attributes are seemingly fixed, others are more fluid. Our unique positions in axes of difference at any given time influence, though do not predetermine, both our experience of the world and our life chances.

With the theoretical and political underpinnings of Métissage outlined, the remainder of this chapter will focus specifically on employing this method as a strategy for promoting dialogue around diversity.

**Our process**

Métissage, like many arts-based media, is better understood when it is experienced, not simply described – indeed, this is why we urge readers to view the online video that accompanies this chapter. After discussing the possibility of facilitating this process with Grace and Will, I requested the assistance of three volunteers to help demonstrate what a Métissage performance could look like in practice. The four of us (two faculty colleagues, Will, and I) agreed to pilot a
simple performance that would serve as an experiential demonstration to others on the committee.

To begin, we sought a central organising theme for our story-writing and performance. The invitation my students had previously extended to me, and which had proven to be powerful in our context, was the phrase ‘standing outside’. In the interest of keeping this part of the process as simple as possible, we used this invitation again and each of us wrote a narrative of less than 300 words to describe experiences of being an outsider. For the purpose of this simple demonstration, this was an open invitation to write as personally or as superficially as we wished, and our stories of ‘standing outside’ could directly relate to academic experiences, or not. I explained that the piece could be written as one continuous story, or as a few shorter vignettes and asked the other story-tellers to remember that our narratives would be separated into segments and woven together with three others. Therefore we endeavoured to incorporate natural pauses or spaces for interruption. The four of us met once to read our stories aloud and determine the order in which we would share this initial Métissage with the rest of the committee at an upcoming meeting.

After hearing this pilot Métissage performance, committee members instantly agreed to move forward with the idea. Our narratives stimulated a range of responses, and through the conversation many individuals commented that they could see themselves in the stories we had presented; as suggested above and as is often the case, it was an empathy-building process. Encouraged to proceed, we began to consider how we could integrate Métissage into the larger structure of the diversity research forum.
The planning committee, which consisted of staff, faculty, and a few students, raised a number of concerns about employing Métissage with staff members. High among them was whether or not it was in fact appropriate or ethical to ask staff members to put themselves in a potentially vulnerable position by publicly sharing personal stories about challenges they may have encountered. We were fully aware that most community-driven arts-based practices encourage people to tell their own stories, in their own voices, and there are many examples of people feeling empowered through this process. Our reality, however, was that this was not a bottom-up process with staff members self-organising, or with a group coming forward and requesting to be heard. As organisers, we wanted to ensure that staff voices were part of the discussion around diversity on campus; yet, we also knew that Universities tend to have long memories. We found ourselves in a place of not wanting to reinscribe dominant norms that silence uncomfortable truths and experiences of oppression, while simultaneously recognising that it is not always safe or strategically wise to disclose too much personal information about the workplace within those same institutional walls.

Will was a doctoral candidate in the Department of Theatre at that time and was well connected to a network of local actors. He suggested that we consider breaking with the traditional Métissage format by finding actors to read the narratives, rather than ask staff members to read their own words in the public forum. We found this to be a useful innovation, and a good compromise for our particular circumstance, especially as Grace was able to allocate some funds to pay the actors. We brainstormed a few options for how we might incorporate Métissage into the forum, including whether we should send out a general call to see how many interested participants would come forward, or whether we should use a more intentional approach of eliciting stories from a known, purposive sample. We also debated whether we
ought to set this up as a performance with audience reflection and discussion afterwards, or make the workshop more interactive with audience members writing their own narratives and weaving them together with others.

We ultimately chose to invite specific individuals to participate and called upon actors to read the narratives as a performance. Grace was intentional in inviting participants who represented four campus unions and she sought a diversity of job position, ethnicity, and class within those groups. The four excerpts that open this chapter are part of the 300 word narratives written by a former Sessional Instructor and three participants from Administrative, Technical, and Custodial support services. Except for one narrative that was forwarded directly to me, we maintained a level of anonymity for the writers. To facilitate this, Grace initiated contact with the participants during the writing process and then sent the narratives to me without identifying the authors by name. I subsequently worked with these narratives, looking for vignettes, or natural breaks in the story, and collaborated with Will to weave them together. We sent the compiled (or woven) version to Grace, who forwarded the document to the participants for feedback and their final approval.

In the meantime, Will began recruiting actors who would read each of the four scripts. To maintain the integrity of the authors’ voices, he felt it was significant to involve actors who were willing, more or less, just to read the texts rather than feel the need to create characters. Certainly we asked that they ground the passages in authenticity and sincerity, and it was evident that they were committed to the vision of the work. However, as he explained to the actors during rehearsal, they would be standing in for real people, not fictional characters—people who may in fact be in attendance at the performance. The process required that the voice of the writer come
through as unimpeded as possible by an extra layer of an actor’s interpretation. Will had previously seen verbatim theatre in which the performers felt it necessary to make their characters dramatic, funny, or otherwise interesting as they tried to fill out the text. In our case, he believed that these layers would interfere with the purpose of the exercise. Drawing from his experience as a theatre director, he believed that this particular process required a simple reading by actors who were willing to serve as conduits for the writers’ words as neutrally as possible.

The actors met with Will and me for one rehearsal before the performance. We also extended an invitation to the writers to attend this rehearsal. By sending the woven version of the text to the writers for their input, and later inviting them to see the rehearsal (and to feel entitled during that preview to weigh in on what they felt ought to be adjusted before the actual performance), we were attempting to communicate this was an open process—that we were not just collecting data from them to use for our project. It turned out that none of the writers chose to take us up on the offer. Still, we felt it was important that the offer be made, and that it be made in good faith with a clearly communicated understanding that the writers were entitled to play a role as co-authors in the staging and reading of their words. The use of actors as stand-ins became an important part of our deliberate approach to maintain anonymity. Nevertheless, we attempted to honour the intent of the work, which was for individuals to share and control their own stories.

The final performance was offered as a plenary address on the second afternoon of the forum. We used minimal staging (four different chairs), and the actors did not wear costumes, per se, though they did dress in their own clothes appropriate to their roles. After an introduction
by Will and me, the actors read from the scripts, while a sign language interpreter simultaneously translated.

The performance was followed by a long period of conversation. Although the audience members had provided their consent to be video-recorded upon registration for the forum, due to the personal nature of the comments inspired by this performance, we decided not to place their conversation online. To ensure that people could hear each other in a large room, and also since the sessions were being recorded, we used microphones during this conversation period. Knowing that some people feel uncomfortable approaching a standing microphone, we chose instead to bring the microphones to people who indicated that they wanted to speak.

To add another layer to this conversation, we adapted an educational activity that incorporates yarn to literally weave connections between people. Will custom-built spools to fit around the microphone handles, and when people spoke we asked that they hold onto the yarn before the mic was carried on to the next speaker. By the end of the discussion, the yarn that connected one voice to the next created a colourfully woven web, tangibly displaying the interconnections among those in the room.

**Effects of arts-based communication in an academic setting**

The legacy of Cartesian dualism, positivism, and Enlightenment thinking encourages not just a split between mind and body within the academy, but an emphasis on developing the mind above the body, heart, and spirit. As a result, in our experience it is still rare to find academic spaces—particularly conferences—that intentionally seek to engage learners as whole beings. Barndt (2008) suggests that “the arts, when applied appropriately and facilitated sensitively, can
involve participants as full human beings, touching minds AND hearts, healing the body/mind split inherent in Western scientific research methods” (p. 359, emphasis in original). Based on our observation of the in-depth conversation that followed this Métissage performance, we believe that this plenary address had the hoped-for effect of touching hearts and minds. This was confirmed by anonymous feedback comments such as this: *I was particularly fascinated by the storytelling plenary and how it was able to voice individual stories while illustrating common themes experienced by the people who had come forward. It was very powerful and something I would like to be able to do in my work.* People also commented directly to us that the storytelling genre fit well with Indigenous oral histories, which opened a space to discuss the ongoing effects of colonisation.

We left plenty of time for conversation following the performance and many of the audience members were moved to share very personal, detailed accounts of their own experiences. Though spoken by actors, the staff members’ stories shared during the Métissage served as powerful catalysts that enabled people to speak from the heart. While we intentionally problematised the idea of a ‘safe’ space through both our choice to utilise actors and our introductory comments, one participant told us we had created a ‘brave space’, where the tone of discussion was accessible and supportive for those who wished to share their own hopes, challenges, and experiences. These individuals’ stories became symbolically interwoven with the staff members’ original stories and the conversation following the performance became part of the Métissage itself. To move beyond performance into deeper levels of analysis, empathy, and trust, this space for discussion is essential to the practice of narrative Métissage.

A critical question raised during the performance was the common concern about whether we were reaching the right audience at this kind of self-selected gathering. This
discussion led to Grace securing a spot for a follow up performance at a subsequent all-staff conference hosted by the University’s Office of Human Resources. Although I could not attend this performance, Grace and Will reported that it was also very well received, and that it created another place in the academy for equally rich, heart-centred conversation. Several participants chatted with Grace about how watching Métissage affected them and disclosed some of the experiences they have had on campus. For example, one staff member talked about her recent (and still raw) experience when someone in authority made a stereotypical assumption of who she is based on her cultural background.

While many speakers, panel presentations, or facilitated discussions can have the effect of generating dialogue, as practitioners of other community arts will attest, “the process of ‘thinking with our hands’ can short-circuit the censorship of the brain” (Jackson, 2002, p.xxiii). Similarly, a performance such as this one has the ability to touch people—not all people of course, but many—at an emotional level, thereby lowering defences, and enabling a different kind of conversation than the seemingly rational, intellectual engagement normally called for in academic settings. As one feedback respondent stated: [of all the sessions at the Diversity Forum,] the Métissage staff members touched me the most.

**Tying a knot**

In this chapter we have provided one example of narrative Métissage in practice. Through our experience we have learned that Métissage is a powerful method for fostering greater understanding and empathy between people of diverse backgrounds. When employed mindfully, methods such as this can provide unconventional opportunities to encourage heart-centred dialogue in academic settings such as meetings, workshops, conferences, classrooms or other
environments that aim to move beyond the simple transfer of information. In our contemporary global context where we might interact with people from a range of backgrounds on any given day, it behoves us to deconstruct stereotypes and learn more about the range of possible human experiences. In our context, we were fortunate that, under Grace’s leadership, members of the conference organising committee were supportive of arts-based methods. In sharing our story, we hope that others in your community will be equally supportive, and that you may be inspired to try Métissage yourself. In so doing, perhaps you will weave elements of our story into your own.

Notes
1 The term “First Peoples” here is the original author’s choice. Some readers may prefer terms such as Indigenous, First Nations, Aboriginal, or Indian. All of these terms are somewhat inadequate, however, as they generalise and homogenise vastly different nations, with people who speak various languages and hold diverse cultural traditions. Elsewhere in the narrative, this author problematises use of the term Aboriginal. This author self-identifies as Tlingit, a nation located in the Pacific Northwest Coast of what is now called the border of Canada and Alaska, U.S.

2 More information on the content of the Provost’s Diversity Research Forum, including a list of UVic sponsors, can be found online at: http://web.uvic.ca/vpac/diversity/forum2011/index.php
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