Book Review

Kim, E., & Aquino, K. C. (Eds.). (2017). *Disability as Diversity in Higher Education: Policies and Practices to Enhance Student Success***. New York, NY: Taylor & Francis. (244 pp., hardcover $51.95, e-copy $46.76).**

Karen E. Boger
University of Southern Mississippi

Within their work, *Disability as Diversity in Higher Education: Policies and Practices to Enhance Student Success*, Kim and Aquino (2017) highlight the unfortunate cultural and structural phenomenon of excluding disability representation from larger discourse regarding diversity initiatives within education. The authors strongly advocate against over-use of the medical model of disability, which frames disability as inherently deviant from the typical human experience that must be modified, treated, and/or cured. Instead, they advise exploring disability as a unique social experience facing similar stigmatization and oppression to the other widely explored facets of diversity literature: i.e., race, class, gender, sexuality, etc. Posited in response to current intersectional diversity discourse within higher education, this book serves as a valuable resource for Communication Center administrators to gain insight into accommodating current students with disabilities and proactively begin including disability in communication instruction and resource construction.

Section One discusses current disability studies' theoretical lenses and applications. Chapter One discusses the proposition of a new intersectional pedagogy, deemed Culturally Relevant Disability Pedagogy, to socially and academically support students with disclosed and non-disclosed disabilities through inclusive teacher instruction and training. These strategies embrace different identity experiences and collective empowerment with the guiding intention of creating a "positive, affirming environment" (p.4). These efforts increase awareness for able-bodied students and normalize disability. Chapter Two advocates challenging the norm of disability exclusion from diversity conversations to address "the most common institutional barriers" (p. 20) that leave disabled students institutionally segregated. An included study investigating diversity workers within six different American colleges identified wide-spread ableism and perpetuation of the medical model of disability as evidence of imperative, immediate need for diversity thought and policy reform. For Communication Center administrators, this calls for heavy self-examination about dialogues existing within Centers regarding appointments with disabled students. Center employee training should facilitate dialogue that counteracts ableist stereotypes that inhibit consultation productivity and comfort for both clients and tutors. Chapter Three uses disabled LGBTQ+ youth interviews to "re-imagine diversity beyond deficits" (p. 41) and examine the impact of language, especially labels, on identity acceptance perceptions in institutions, including Centers as hubs of student discourse and communication skill development.

Section Two explicitly addresses experiences of disabled students in higher education. Chapter Four explores the dissatisfaction many disabled students

endure with limited meaningful integration in academic spaces, referred to as the "Sense of Belonging Factor Score" (p. 52). This chapter contains anecdotes for Communication Center administrators to promote resources to social groups systematically denied resource access who would benefit from intentional, accommodating outreach. The need for disability diversity representation within and campus involvement from Centers becomes paramount after reviewing the negative experiences of disabled students. Chapter Five describes methods for working with students that make engagement accessible and contribute to greater perceptions of institutional investment in disabled student populations, which exemplify the ideals of Centers to foster communication skill and confidence. Tutoring settings from workshops to individual sessions could easily be altered to accommodate disabled students if tutors are trained in accordance with compassionate, accessible methods of collaboration. Chapter Six discusses disabled students as a distinct category of at-risk students whose transition experiences into higher education have been largely undocumented beyond the medical model until recently. Communication Centers, thus, occupy a unique role as fixtures of student support, guidance, and encouragement, which have the opportunity to serve as trendsetters for quality of service and social accommodation that disabled students require. Chapter Seven explores the use of a "spatial lens" (p. 85) which highlights physical and dialogical spatial inclusion to expand understandings of institutional diversity. Within Centers, however, training on acknowledging and overcoming implicit biases through this lens enables self-reflexivity for tutors interacting with diverse clients.

Section Three concerns potential administrative actions regarding disabled students. Chapter Eight identifies the need for faculty, staff, and students to engage in discourse surrounding their knowledge and attitudes regarding disability. The authors advocate for socially-conscious professional development encouraging orientations to develop flexible tutors equipped to overcome individual biases through open-mindedness that aids in creating a more welcoming environment. Chapter Nine focuses on benefits of embracing diverse student populations, in regard to increased socialization across labels through repeated exposure and meaningful interaction with diverse others. The authors argue that these developments encourage faculty "service to institutional transformation" (p. 129) that uses an "Accessibility, Climate, and Tenure [ACTion]" (p. 131) framework through constant institutional- and self-assessment, supporting existing Communication Center literature that focuses on constant re-invention alongside equity deficits. Chapter Ten reminds Centers that due to disability's omission from diversity training, undergraduate workers and professional staff report feeling underprepared to meet the needs of disabled students. Centers should examine this section's suggestions to ensure staff are prepared to work with disabled students, as institutions expect university representatives to possess competency to work with all students. Furthermore, Chapter Eleven describes ideal roles for disability accommodation and sensitivity training for administrators, students, and policies useful to growing Centers.

The final section identifies common institutional programs and initiatives. Chapter Twelve provides useful guides about what language, especially online, Centers should prioritize and avoid when speaking to and about disabled institutional members. The authors take a realist perspective in Chapter Thirteen, detailing

the ways in which institutional ideologies and policies may inhibit large-scale disability equity change, as the medical model is prioritized. Alternative, individual equitable actions are advised for encountering institutional barriers, which may prove useful to Centers that may not have great enough representation to enact substantial policy change on campus. Chapter Fourteen details how institutional language about principles and values can coordinate greater disability inclusion through restructuring systemic barriers. Chapter Fifteen compels readers to recognize demographics which dominate institutional narratives and ensure that institutional identities are shaped in progressive ways cultivating a positive culture of disability that Centers are poised to facilitate.

Overall, *Disability as Diversity in Higher Education: Policies and Practices to Enhance Student Success*, addresses disabled students' difficulties in higher learning institutions, which puts retention, degree progression, and social engagement in jeopardy. The book provides substantial, detailed accounts of the types of institution-wide dialogues that need to occur, in addition to individual action, for the equity of an institutional experience to be ensured. Kim and Aquino's conclusions about the implications of institutional student responsibility place an exigency on institutional services, such as Communication Centers, to use their unique positions of interacting directly with students to advocate for these often underrepresented groups and facilitate communication where limited or none existed prior.