

# **The President's Commission on Diversity and Community 2007 – 2008 Report**

**Co-Chairs: Dr. Monica Schneider and Dr. Heidi Levine  
Report Submitted by Dr. Monica Schneider**

## **Commission Members**

Susan Bailey; Dean of the College  
Irene Belyakov; Lecturer and ESL Coordinator  
James Bryant; Student  
Bobette Buchanan; Student  
Tabitha Buggie-Hunt; Assistant Dean for Disability Services  
Ralph Carrasquillo; Director of Residence Life  
Joyce Chen; Student  
Ulyses Colon; Student  
Celia Easton, Dean of Residential Living  
Cristina Geiger; Lecturer, Chemistry; Interim Director Teaching Learning Center  
Becky Glass; Executive Assistant to the President  
Patricia Gonzalez; Access Opportunity Programs  
David Gordon; Associate Provost  
Fatima Johnson, Coordinator of Multicultural Programs and Services  
Wendi Kinney; Coordinator of Greek Affairs & Off-Campus Living  
Megan Lee; Student  
Dana LePage; Student  
Heidi Levine; Director, Student Health and Counseling (co-chair)  
David Levy; Assistant Professor, Philosophy  
Seong-Bae Lim; Assistant Professor, Jones School of Business  
Maria Perpetua Socorro U. Liwanag; Assistant Professor, School of Education  
Gloria Lopez; Associate Director of Human Resources/Director of Affirmative Action  
Jeannette Molina; Director of Dual Diploma and ESL  
Susan Norman; Interim Director, Xerox Center for Multicultural Education  
Robert Owens; Professor, Communicative Disorders and Sciences  
Julie Rao, Director of Institutional Research  
Monica Schneider; Associate Professor, Psychology (co-chair)  
Kathy Trainor; Student and Campus Life  
Joe Van Remmen; University Police  
Robert Wayland-Smith; Geneseo Board

The following report represents the Commission members' hard work and dedication throughout the 2007-2008 academic year. It also marks the end of a two-year term with Dr. Heidi Levine and Dr. Monica Schneider as co-chairs of the Commission. Dr. Levine accepted a position as Dean of Students at Cornell College in Iowa in Summer of 2008. As co-chair of the Commission, Heidi demonstrated exceptional leadership and made significant contributions to SUNY Geneseo. She was a dedicated colleague, in addition to being a wonderful and caring individual. Her contributions to the College through her work on the Commission will continue to impact the college community for many years to come. She will be missed!

### **Overall Direction and Emphasis of the Commission's Work**

As noted in our 2007-2008 report, the goal of the Commission's work for the two-year term was to change its role on campus from a committee that primarily gathers information, identifies areas of diversity that need to be addressed, and makes recommendations for change to a committee that focuses on outreach and building community. In addition, the Commission made a commitment to "continue the conversations" important to the college community through programs such as Deliberative Dialogues.

Initially, four subcommittees were created to accomplish these goals: Deliberative Dialogues, Assessment, Engaging Community, and Student Outreach. Their activities and initial recommendations can be found in the 2006-2007 Commission report. In 2007-2008, the Engaging Community and Student Outreach subcommittees were merged to function as one integrated subcommittee. The PATH Awards Subcommittee was reinstated. In addition, a new subcommittee was formed at end of the academic year to discuss possible ways to provide faculty development training regarding diversity.

The complete 2007-2008 subcommittee reports can be found in the appendices. As noted in their reports, each of these subcommittees made significant strides in increasing its outreach to the college community by 1) facilitating dialogue between community members, 2) empowering students with the tools necessary for them to begin addressing issues they considered important, and/or 3) assessing students' needs and experiences regarding diversity. Moreover, each subcommittee increased its efforts to work in conjunction with other members of the College by directly involving students, faculty, and staff from all areas of the College in its functioning. Lastly, members of the Commission (as individuals) significantly contributed to the development and implementation of the presentations, programs, community dialogues, and teach-ins designed to help the community address important and controversial issues regarding diversity and community that emerged in the beginning of the academic year.

Below is a summary of their activities as well as a list of recommendations for the next academic year.

### **Summary of Activities: 2007-2008**

The Deliberative Dialogues Subcommittee ran three deliberative dialogues this past year. In Fall 2007, two sessions were conducted on how to best promote the Geneseo community. One of these sessions was conducted with only student leaders from various multicultural organizations. This session was in direct response to students' requests to have a facilitated dialogue with only other students. These students indicated that they saw DD as an important tool in promoting their own sense of community. In Spring 2008, the DD Subcommittee re-ran the "Engaging Diversity in the Classroom: What Should Educators Do?" dialogue to mirror the ongoing work of the Curriculum Review Task Force. The DD Subcommittee also increased its outreach by directly involving faculty, staff, and students outside of the Commission in its functioning. Lastly, the Subcommittee arranged to have the Director of the New England Center for Civic Life at Franklin Pierce conduct workshops to provide facilitator training to approximately 14

faculty, staff, and students. In addition, she provided a workshop to Commission members that addressed how to use deliberative dialogues to accomplish different goals.

In these respects, members of the college community have had a direct and indirect impact on the nature and direction of the community conversations occurring via Deliberative Dialogues. Moreover, the work of the DD Subcommittee has provided a mechanism that could potentially empower students, faculty, and staff with tools that could help them facilitate difficult dialogues and build community. For example, last year, several students who were trained as facilitators by the DD Subcommittee used DD techniques to facilitate dialogues in their residence halls. Next year, the Subcommittee plans on finding ways to use Deliberative Dialogues to benefit the community in other ways (e.g., developing ways to help faculty/staff incorporate deliberative dialogues in the classroom) and to expand the focus of the Deliberative Dialogue models to include action-oriented outcomes.

The Assessment Subcommittee reviewed and discussed the quantitative and qualitative information it had gathered in 2006-2007 regarding students' perceptions of diversity-related issues on our campus. In addition, they identified several possible dashboard indicators that could be used to provide supplementary data regarding campus diversity and climate issues on a regular basis. Members of this subcommittee presented their data to the Strategic Planning Group (SPG) to advocate for the development of a campus-wide diversity plan that could be added to the College's strategic plan. A campus-wide diversity plan would provide a mechanism for coordinating and integrating the various diversity initiatives that already exist at all levels of the College. The SPG accepted the proposal and added the development and implementation of a campus diversity plan as an objective under the larger goal of "recruiting, supporting, and fostering the development of a diverse community of outstanding students, faculty, and staff." Next year, the Subcommittee plans on developing a campus-wide diversity plan to be submitted to the SPG for consideration. The SPG will then discuss implementation of the plan.

The Student and Campus Engagement Subcommittee worked on two different but related initiatives based on data gathered by the Deliberative Dialogues Subcommittee, the Assessment Subcommittee and the Engaging Community Subcommittee in 2006-2007. The first initiative focused on addressing an identified need for students to have a greater opportunity to incorporate academic and service learning experiences related to diversity as central components of their education and personal development at SUNY Geneseo. The Subcommittee identified a college model developed by the National Conference for Community and Justice that may be modified to serve the needs of our college. This model incorporates a residential community experience, academic coursework, and service learning components related to diversity. The second initiative focused specifically on mentoring. The Subcommittee conducted several small scale assessments on students' needs regarding mentoring and analyzed alternatives used in the past. Based on these analyses, they proposed developing a virtual mentoring service where students would have access to information and support (both virtual and in person) as needed. Combined, both of these programs would help build community in meaningful ways and

would provide a mechanism for students, faculty, and staff to address diversity-related issues and concerns both formally and informally.

The PATH Awards Subcommittee selected three PATH Award winners from among the 11 individual and/or group nominations received by the committee. For several years now, a subcommittee of the Commission has had the responsibility of selecting the award winners. However, getting nominations from the college community has continued to be a challenge. To address this issue, the subcommittee recommends that the responsibility for selecting award winners be given back to the students in the hopes that ownership of the project would increase student commitment and interest in the award.

Data gathered from various sources (e.g., Dr. Schneider's research on college adjustment, FARI's research on race and campus climate, the work of the various Commission Subcommittees, informal discussions with ALANA students) emphasized the importance of faculty in creating a supportive climate related to diversity. This data also indicated a need for continued faculty development regarding these issues. At the end of the academic year, several Commission members formed a subcommittee to address this issue. They developed a tentative proposal for diversity training that could be incorporated into the first-year faculty orientation program that already exists. This subcommittee plans on continuing to develop this proposal in conjunction with members of the administration and the Teaching and Learning Center.

### **Recommendations for 2008 - 09**

The Commission met at the end of the year to discuss what had been accomplished and the direction the Commission and the specific subcommittees should take in the near future. In the first part of this section, I summarize the issues and recommendations that emerged regarding the role of the Commission as a whole. In the second section, I present the recommendations made by the specific subcommittees.

#### ***Overall Direction of the Commission***

1. The Commission should strive to take more of an active rather than reactive role in identifying diversity and community issues that are challenging to the college community. In addition, the Commission needs to continue to foster community dialogue about these issues in a meaningful way by supporting and encouraging these dialogues at all levels of the College. They should serve as "promoters" of people talking about ideas and issues. For example, the DD Subcommittee has identified many ways in which this could be done using DD. The Commission could hold open forums or meetings about specific issues or could meet with particular segments of the college community to find out their specific needs or concerns. In addition, Commission members felt that the Race and Campus Climate Teach-In was a great model that could be used.

2. The Commission should strive to become even more integrated in its functioning by:
  - including non-Commission members in the membership of the subcommittees
  - working in conjunction with already established committees, programs, and divisions at the College
  - co-sponsoring and supporting programs designed to address diversity and community related issues
  - examining ways in which the Commission could help integrate and coordinate the diversity-related efforts of the various areas of the College
  - serving as a resource and source of support to divisions, departments, and the larger community as a whole
  
3. The Commission should strive to gain more visibility so that the college community will come to see the Commission as a resource and touchstone for diversity and community related issues. To accomplish this goal, the Commission needs to clearly define its role and effectively communicate that role to the larger college community. This may include: creating a web link on the diversity webpage for the Commission, marketing the Commission by communicating to the community how the Commission may help them accomplish their goals, using already existing forms of communication (e.g., GSTV, allstaff-l) to invite input and to provide information about the Commission's current activities, and providing annual updates to the College Senate and the Student Association about the Commission's activities.
  
4. The Commission should increase its efforts to invite, include, and reach out to members of the college community in ways that help support individuals and groups who are feeling alienated and unsupported in the community.

### *Specific Recommendations for the Subcommittees*

**Deliberative Dialogue** – We strongly recommend continuing the Deliberative Dialogue (DD) program, which has become a strong, central component of the Commission's outreach to the Geneseo community. An exciting plan for the coming year is to modify the DD process in ways that support different community goals (e.g., DD in the classroom, DD focused on action outcomes). Some issues to be addressed this year regarding Deliberative Dialogue are as follows:

- *Sustainability of DD* – The DD Subcommittee has identified three major factors that currently affect the sustainability of DD.
  1. *Need for Comprehensive DD Coordination*: Having a coordinator who oversees the function and implementation of DD activities is crucial to the maintenance and sustainability of DD. We recommend that a rotating position for a faculty or staff member to coordinate the DD program be established on a more permanent basis. Modeled after the directorship of the Teaching and Learning Center, this position would involve a 2-3 year obligation, releasing the coordinator from most or all of her/his normal responsibilities. Such a position would reflect the level of commitment and work needed to not only maintain the DD program but help more fully integrate this highly effective model more fully into the College’s discourse and life.
  2. *Facilitator Recruitment and Training*: The DD Subcommittee needs to continue pursuing avenues for recruiting and training faculty, staff, and student facilitators. We recommend that the DD Subcommittee seek ways to implement a mechanism that will ensure continual availability of facilitators. Some models may include: providing the INTD course on DD for students on a continual basis, providing internships for students with possible course credit, providing workshops through the TLC, and providing off-site training at the New England Center as part of professional development.
  3. *Pursuit of Development of a Center*: DD is likely to be sustainable over time if DD function was somehow integrated into the institutional structure. Other institutions have accomplished this goal by developing a center for DD activity. Although we acknowledge the economic challenges currently faced by the College, we recommend that the Commission consider pursuing the development of a center where DD activity would be integrated into the functioning of the College. (Note: The TLC is a good model for this).
  
- *Synthesis and Dissemination of Issues Emerging in DDs*: Since its inception, the DD Subcommittee has strived to foster and sustain community dialogue regarding important community issues. This subcommittee has accomplished these goals by identifying important topics, developing new guides, and conducting different DDs with students, faculty, and staff at the College. In order to continue the conversation, it is important that the DD Subcommittee find a way to provide information about the issues, concerns, points of common ground, and recommendations that emerge from the DD process to the college community. Therefore, we recommend that the DD Subcommittee develop a strategy for synthesizing and disseminating this information to the DD participants, the Commission, and the larger college community.

- *Focus of Future Dialogues:* The DD Subcommittee has identified several ways to shift its functioning to accomplish the goals of outreach and community building. First, the DD Subcommittee should run smaller topic-based dialogues with specific segments of the college community in addition to the larger dialogues which include students, faculty, and staff from the various areas of the College. Second, the DD Subcommittee should work in conjunction with Residence Life, the TLC, and other divisions to determine how DD may be used to support students, faculty, and staff in their work. Third, the DD Subcommittee should explore ways to modify the dialogues to meet action-oriented goals.

**Assessment** – In the coming year, the Assessment Subcommittee should focus on developing a campus-wide diversity plan to be submitted to the Strategic Planning Group for consideration by the end of the academic year. In order to accomplish this goal, the chair of the Assessment Subcommittee should meet with President Dahl to identify key non-Commission members who should serve on the Subcommittee. In addition, the Subcommittee should work closely with other relevant departments, divisions, and committees throughout the development of the plan.

**Student and Campus Engagement** – Last year, the Student and Campus Engagement Subcommittee worked on two initiatives designed to increase outreach and build community. We recommend that this subcommittee continue developing those initiatives with the goal of implementing the programs during the 2009-2010 academic year. Below are specific recommendations regarding the two initiatives.

- *A Diversity-Related Learning Community Program for Students:* Last academic year, this subcommittee proposed a program that would provide students with experiential, academic, and service learning experiences related to diversity. This program was based on a college model developed by the National Conference for Community and Justice. In the coming year, the Student and Campus Engagement Subcommittee should continue to develop this program, examining ways to incorporate the current curriculum options and service learning opportunities available to students. In addition, the subcommittee needs to identify interested faculty, staff, and students to support the program and find ways to provide them with the necessary training. The goal would be to have a pilot program ready to run by the beginning of the 2009-2010 academic year.
- *Mentorship Program:* Initial data collected by the Student and Campus Engagement Subcommittee revealed a strong student interest and need for some form of mentorship. This subcommittee should continue to develop a mentorship model that would best serve the needs of the students. To accomplish this goal, the subcommittee will need to collect more quantitative and qualitative data from a larger, more representative sample of students. Once this program is developed, this subcommittee should be responsible for overseeing its implementation.

**PATH Awards** – The PATH Awards Subcommittee recommends that the responsibility for choosing award winners should go back to the students, with a Commission member serving as an advisor to the committee.

**Faculty Development** - The Faculty Development Subcommittee should continue developing a mechanism for providing faculty with professional development opportunities related to diversity. This Subcommittee should work in conjunction with the Provost's Office and the TLC to identify the most effective way to provide these opportunities.

### **Overall Summary and Conclusions**

Overall, the Commission has taken significant steps toward addressing important community issues and involving members of the larger college community in the process. Moreover, the Commission has played a major role in facilitating and fostering community through Deliberative Dialogues. As the Commission continues to make its transition toward outreach, the subcommittees will need to continue to involve the larger community as they try to implement the various projects and programs proposed in this report. Furthermore, the Commission will need to continue to reach out to the community by becoming actively involved in the various projects associated with the College's theme of community and change.

We would like to take this opportunity to thank all of the members of the Commission for all of their hard work and dedication, especially the chairs of the various subcommittees who have provided such effective leadership in the process. Many of the Commission members served on more than one subcommittee this past year, with several members serving on three or four subcommittees. In addition, many of the members (as individuals) significantly contributed to the development and implementation of the presentations, programs, community dialogues, and a teach-in designed to help the community address important and controversial issues regarding diversity and community that emerged throughout the 2007-2008 academic year. It is both a pleasure and a privilege to work with a group of individuals who are so committed to making a positive difference in our community.

We would also like to thank the students, faculty, staff, and administration in the larger community who contributed their ideas, concerns, and resources during the various meetings and focus groups conducted throughout the year. Without their contributions, the Commission could not do its work.



## Appendices

- I. Deliberative Dialogues
- II. Assessment
- III. Student and Campus Engagement
- IV. PATH Awards
- V. Faculty Development Regarding Diversity

## DELIBERATIVE DIALOGUES SUBCOMMITTEE 2007-2008 Report

Submitted by: David Levy, Assistant Professor of Philosophy

Committee Members: Irene Belyakov, Ulyses Colon, Ben Delozier, Cristina Geiger, Meredith Harrigan, David Levy (Chair), Becky Lewis, Doug MacKenzie, Christina Miller, Jeannette Molina, Robert Owens, Therese Riordan, Kathy Trainor

### **Overview of Activities:**

The subcommittee met four times during the fall semester (October 10 and 24, November 7 and 28). In addition, smaller groups met to debrief after the two iterations of the Dialogue, “The Geneseo Community: How is it Best Promoted?” during the fall semester. Moreover, a working group convened toward the end of the fall semester in order to revise the “Engaging Diversity in the Classroom” discussion guide in advance of the spring running of that Dialogue.

During the spring, the entire subcommittee convened only once, in order to debrief the spring Dialogue. Most of the remainder of the work during the spring involved preparations for a two-day training workshop run by Joni Doherty of the New England Center for Civic Life.

### *The Fall Dialogues*

The Deliberative Dialogue, “The Geneseo Community: How is it Best Promoted?” was run twice during the opening month of the semester. On September 8, it was run for approximately 30 student leaders, at the Campus House; Meredith Harrigan, David Levy, Beth McCoy, and Joe Van Remmen served as facilitators/recorders. On September 20, it was run for approximately 60 faculty, staff, and students in the College Union; Ralph Carrasquillo, Ben Delozier, Meredith Harrigan, David Levy, Terry Riordan, and Joe Van Remmen served as facilitators/recorders. In each case, Cristina Geiger and Que Palacz from the Teaching & Learning Center provided tremendous logistical support, and the Office of the President provided catering and assistance with mailings.

The September 8 offering of this Dialogue was a direct response to a request that emerged when we first offered this Dialogue during the Spring 2007 semester. At that time, some of the students expressed a desire to participate in this Dialogue with only other students; specifically, some student leaders from various multicultural organizations anticipated that it would be meaningful to discuss this topic with other leaders from similar organizations. Their hope, they told us, was that the experience of having this discussion would enable/empower them to work together to promote their own sense of community more effectively than if each group worked in isolation from the rest.

We invited student leaders from the following organizations to participate in this Dialogue: Black Student Union (BSU), Geneseo Chinese Culture Club (GCCC), Hillel,

Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship (IVCF), Japanese Culture Club (JCC), Korean American Student Association (KASA), Latino Student Association (LSA), Men of Action in Change (MAC), Muslim Student Association (MSA), National Organization of Women (NOW), Pride Alliance, Shakti, Womyn's Action Coalition (WAC), Lamron, GSTV, WGSU, SA Executive Board, IGC, College Democrats, College Republicans, Newman Community, Progressive Student Coalition, and Wesley Foundation.

Three of the facilitators/recorders for this Dialogue met (with Cristina Geiger) on September 12 to debrief. The reports conveyed rather different experiences in the two small groups: in one group, participants reported that they find the community at Geneseo to be healthy (though some of these students noted that, as leaders who have obviously “found” their place in the community, perhaps they are not the most reliable source on this issue of overall climate); in the other group, there was a greater sense of the community’s being unhealthy, with some participants even citing specific examples. For example, there was a sense of the College’s commitment to diversity and community as amounting to “empty rhetoric”—they don’t see any genuine *action* to follow through on the claim that the College embraces these values. They respect the ways in which the College acts on the value of diversity (by, e.g., supporting a wide variety of groups), but they worry that the way in which this is implemented reinforces the lack of appreciation for difference insofar as each group is regarded as “walking parallel lines”; they would rather see much greater “integration.”

The overall “theme” of wishing to see *action* arise from the College’s commitment to these values carried over to the perception of DD itself. As has been the case in the past, some worry that the practice of DD is just one more way for the College to convey the appearance of a commitment to diversity/community without ever getting around to *doing anything* with the “results”. There is an interest in learning what previous Dialogues have “accomplished.”

Two of the facilitators/recorders reported one especially troubling datum: during the lunch after the small groups completed their work, some students from a particular ethnic minority reported that they went along with the characterization of Geneseo as a “healthy” community because they did not want to be perceived as confrontational, or as typifying a stereotype of always being the ones to make an issue of these things. We wondered if there is some interesting connection between this datum and the “theme” described in the preceding paragraph: to the extent the Dialogue participants view a particular DD as “just an hour of talk,” they are not willing to expose themselves to criticism. This is troubling in many ways, not the least of which is that it challenges the “authenticity” of the findings of any particular DD. [Note: it is interesting that the results of the post-Dialogue questionnaire administered on this occasion do not convey a different picture. For example, in response to the claim, “Geneseo currently has a strong and healthy community,” four respondents indicated that they “Strongly Agree,” 18 that they “Somewhat Agree,” three that they “Somewhat Disagree,” zero that they “Strongly Disagree,” and one “Not Sure.” In other words, even the “anonymity” provided by the instrument did not inspire respondents to express more strongly negative attitudes.]

We considered that we might begin to address this issue in two ways: (1) add something to the opening comments about how talk is action, as a way of encouraging participants to see value/significance in the discussion itself; (2) work harder to link each DD to outcomes (even if only sustained dialogue).

As a final note about this running of the Dialogue, some action-oriented suggestions did emerge. Some students recognized the value of food in community-building, and conveyed disappointment about the ways in which CAS provides obstacles to this. (To be somewhat more specific, this issue was pursued during the DD most forcefully by Jewish students who wish that there were easier ways to obtain and prepare Kosher foods on campus.) The other area in which participants saw the need for action to support the College's professed commitment to diversity and community was in programs designed to ease the transition to Geneseo for students enrolling at non-standard times (e.g., new students and transfer students who first attend Geneseo during the Spring).

The September 20 running of this Dialogue included a more "traditional" invitation list, though with a somewhat greater focus on faculty and staff. This running of the Dialogue was debriefed during the October 10 meeting of the Deliberative Dialogue subcommittee.

As emerged during the September 8 running of the same Dialogue, the September 20 Dialogue's participants demonstrated a desire to see the experience of the conversation result in action-oriented steps. We reviewed some of the action-oriented steps that various Dialogue participants themselves offered: explore channels for expanding the range of foods offered by CAS (e.g., Kosher food); develop a community garden; introduce "mentor" programs to offer "role models" to new students, etc. As part of the debriefing, Cristina Geiger shared results from the post-Dialogue questionnaire. Of note was the rather low overall response rate: approximately 60 people participated in the Dialogue on September 20, but only 32 completed the questionnaire. A suggestion was that we explore different ways of administering the post-Dialogue questionnaire (e.g., post it on the Web, and send out e-mail reminders after the Dialogue to encourage participants to complete it); we also wondered if we might increase our response rate if we reduce the number of items to which we ask them to respond. Finally, the consensus among those in attendance was that it would be good to generate a "report" that summarizes the conclusions (and other interesting findings) of the two Dialogues this fall, and that would be shared (electronically) with all those who participated in them. The report would highlight the action-oriented suggestions that emerged during the discussions, would "challenge" participants to reflect on what they are doing currently to contribute to community-building at Geneseo, and would remind them of pre-existing opportunities. [This report was shared with the full Commission during the October 22 meeting of the Commission.] It was also suggested that we set something up through MyCourses to serve as a "portal" to information about community-building opportunities, and to serve as a "virtual venue" for (something like) sustained dialogue among the participants.

### The Spring Dialogue

In light of the ongoing work of the Curriculum Review Task Force, we thought it appropriate to re-run the very first Dialogue we ever used, “Engaging Diversity in the Classroom: What Should Educators Do?” during the spring semester. Meredith Harrigan, Becky Lewis, and David Levy revised the original discussion guide toward the end of the fall semester; the Dialogue was then run in the College Union Ballroom on February 7. Once again, we thank Cristina Geiger and Que Palacz for logistical support, and the Office of the President for catering and mailings.

Despite our efforts to include a large student presence during this Dialogue, very few students participated. Moreover, many of the faculty who participated seemed to have come only in order to pursue their own favored agenda. In these ways, the facilitators and recorders reported, the Dialogue was not as successful as we had wished it would be.

Still, a few interesting points of “common ground” were reported. First, there was a recognition of a connection between engaging diversity in the classroom and encouraging critical thinking (something that crosses all disciplines). Second, there was a desire to be provided with opportunities to develop a “tool box” of strategies for dealing with difficult issues/discussions in class. Several faculty expressed an interest in participating in “brown-bag” discussions (perhaps facilitated by the Teaching & Learning Center) around the “how to” issues. Finally, some groups reported an interest in offering a “Diversity 101” course, though details concerning the nature of such a course (including whether it would be a curricular addition for students or a part of new faculty orientation) were lacking.

Beyond these observations, many of the facilitators and recorders for this Dialogue reported a sense of frustration among (faculty) participants: several of the faculty who participated in this Dialogue had also participated when it was first run several years ago, and they expressed disappointment that “nothing has been done” in the interim.

### The Training

Joni Doherty, the Director of the New England Center for Civic Life at Franklin Pierce University, came to Geneseo April 11-12 to conduct two training workshops. We are very grateful to her for continuing to assist Geneseo in its ongoing efforts to use Deliberative Dialogues, and we thank the Office of the President for paying for her visit.

The April 12 workshop was provided to those interested in receiving facilitator training. Fourteen students, faculty, and staff participated; each left the training prepared to facilitate and record. These are:

*Students:* Jesse Parent, Christina Miller, Francesca McCool, Brian Hartle,  
Roxanne Kohilakis

*Faculty:* Meredith Harrigan, Doug MacKenzie

*Staff:* Garry Morgan, Ben Delozier, Kim Bilinski, Heidi Levine, Becky Lewis, Fatima Johnson, Kimberly Harvey

We are very excited to have these new facilitators and recorders on board!

The April 11 workshop focused on broader issues and strategies pertaining to our use of Deliberative Dialogues. Eleven faculty and staff participated in this workshop: David Levy, Heidi Levine, Monica Schneider, Robert Owens, Joe VanRemmen, Beth McCoy, Irene Belyakov, Meredith Harrigan, Therese Riordan, Becky Lewis, and Fatima Johnson.

As has been noted above several times, and as was even noted in last year's subcommittee report, we are concerned about losing interest in the DD process as a result of the perception of DD as "all talk, no action." We shared this concern with Joni when we invited her to come to Geneseo this spring, and she offered to discuss with us what they call an "Action Forum." Although a portion of the April 11 workshop did concern Action Forums, Joni led us there through a much more comprehensive picture.

She began by asking us why we are using DD at Geneseo; what do we hope to get out of them? Three different categories of responses emerged:

- (1) Community Building: we hope that the process of participating in a DD itself contributes to a healthy sense of community, as people who otherwise might not talk to each other now have the chance to do so.
- (2) Education: we hope that participants come to understand the complexity of the issues at the core of a particular topic; we hope that through their participation, their deliberative skills are strengthened.
- (3) Action: we hope to identify initiatives that have broad-based support, and that are actually actionable.

Joni led us to see that it is possible to link any particular dialogue to any one (or several) of these, but that the choice of objective affects how the forum is designed in every way: who gets invited, where the event is held, who moderates, how the discussion guide is developed, etc. For example, a forum being held simply for educational purposes might be worked into a course syllabus; students within the class might be asked to develop the discussion guide, or the instructor might require that the students purchase a National Issues Forums Institute guide as a course text; the instructor for the class might ask a colleague to facilitate the discussion, etc. The insight provided here is that there are many ways to use DD, and that part of the success of any particular Dialogue—and of DD as a whole—is a product of thoughtful design and planning, including offering intentional statements to participants about the intended objectives of the Dialogue.

In summary form, here are other items the participants took away from the workshop:

- (1) As we seek to develop a model for using DD in the classroom, encourage faculty to use NIFI guides as required course texts; also encourage faculty to

develop “issue framing” assignments, especially in courses in which there is a heavy research component.

- (2) As we seek to encourage interest in DD among a broader base, we should look to co-sponsor forums with relevant groups.
- (3) As we seek to move away from the “big event” appearance of each forum, we should schedule more frequent events, each of which would have a smaller invitation list. For example, rather than running one forum per semester, with each forum involving five small groups (ranging in size from 14 to 20) and a group dinner in the Ballroom, we should hold four or five forums per semester, with each forum involving one group (of approximately 15) and dinner during the discussion.

This last item was regarded as likely to be particularly effective in sustaining interest in DD, as well as complementing our desire to move from talk to action. The remainder of this section addresses these points, and offers some recommendations about how we can best move in these directions.

Joni suggested that we set the year’s schedule of forums over the summer, perhaps as early as June. Once the schedule is set, it should be shared with the College community. Faculty should be encouraged to incorporate topics covered by the forums into their syllabus; staff (e.g., Residence Life) should be encouraged to schedule related discussions among relevant constituency groups. In advance of the semester’s first forum, we should issue a statement, describing our objectives and addressing why the topic has been selected; we should encourage campus media to pick up the story. Next, after each forum is held, we should issue a report about it; this report should include information gleaned from the Pre- and Post-Dialogue questionnaires. (Note: Joni recommended looking at the Public Agenda site regarding such reporting of results.) In essence, the hope is that the entire community is reminded about the ongoing commitment to DD, and in this way is kept interested.

In addition, there is a way to connect this regular stream of information about DD forums to actionable outcomes. If we initiate a series of Dialogues intending to identify actions that our community will undertake, then the focus of the report issued after each forum should be on those actions that had broad-based support within the group. After a semester of such forums and reports, a new discussion guide would then be produced, with each approach capturing some action for which there is already support. The focus of the deliberation during the subsequent forum would be questions of resource availability and public will. (Note: Joni recommended that the participants in this subsequent forum should be those who already participated in one of the previous forums, the results of which are now being deliberated.) At the conclusion of this forum, teams can be established from among the participants and charged with implementing one of the actions selected.

This model excited those who participated in the workshop; it simply makes sense to simplify the logistics of the events by scaling down the size and increasing the frequency. In addition, by holding the forums on different days/at different times, we can include

people whose schedules don't allow them to attend, for example, on a Wednesday evening.

For all of this to work to maximum effect, however, Joni stressed that there needs to be administrative buy-in from the start. This includes a commitment of resources to support the pursuit of action steps that emerge from the series of forums. It also includes incentives for those charged with overseeing the entire process. As mentioned above, the intended outcomes of any particular dialogue, or series of dialogues, affect every part of the planning, including the writing of the discussion guide. A series of forums conducted in order to identify actionable actions must begin with an intentionally designed discussion guide, and must also include a new guide produced after the initial forums are conducted. This involves a great deal of work! We fear that our current structure simply will not allow for this work to be done.

Joni encouraged us to pursue funding for a Center dedicated to deliberation; she suggested applying for such funding from the Kettering Foundation. The director of any such Center would be charged with overseeing all of the scheduling and logistics related to conducting forums, organizing the writing and revising of discussion guides, producing regular reports, communicating with campus and community media, conducting training workshops, and coordinating faculty efforts to integrate DD into the classroom. (Note: Joni mentioned that at Franklin Pierce, faculty who facilitate a discussion in a colleague's class receive a small stipend to recognize their service; this struck many of those who participated in the April 11 workshop as an idea worth pursuing at Geneseo.) Such duties, it seems, would require significant release time from other duties.

With the approval of the President and the support of the Commission, we would like to pursue the development of a Center dedicated to deliberation during the 2008-2009 academic year. We see this as a necessary step if we are to keep the use of DD vibrant. As we pursue this, we also plan to run a trial series of dialogues (topic still to be determined), rather than one "big" dialogue.



**Report of the Assessment Committee  
President's Commission on Diversity and Community  
Spring, 2008**

**Committee Members**

Tabitha Buggie-Hunt, Disability Services  
Celia Easton, Student and Campus Life  
David Gordon, Office of the Provost (Chair)  
Seong Lim, School of Business  
Gloria Lopez, Human Resources  
Julie Rao, Institutional Research  
Joe Van Remmen, Campus Police

**Committee Activities**

In 2007-2008 the Assessment Committee reviewed and discussed the information that it had assembled and the diversity indicators it had developed in 2006-2007. The Committee was reluctant to move ahead until this information had been considered and discussed by the full Diversity Commission, and because of the Commission's full agenda, this discussion did not occur until late in the year.

The assessment information raised several important questions that should be investigated further:

- 1) What is behind the NSSE results that indicate better diversity outcomes for first-year students than for seniors? Although absolute scores for seniors have increased each of the last three times the NSSE has been administered, they also have been lower than scores for the first-year students each time.
- 2) Why does Geneseo score relatively low on the Student Opinion Survey question about racial harmony while it scores relatively high on other questions related to campus community? Although absolute scores on this measure have increased each of the last three times the SOS has been administered, Geneseo's ranking among SUNY comprehensives on this question has gone from #4 to #10. The College also ranks #10 on the question, Understanding & appreciating ethnic/cultural diversity & individual differences.
- 3) Why does there appear to be a decline in retention and graduation rates for minority students over the last three years? At the same time, there has been an increase in structural (compositional) diversity at the College.

The Committee also revised the diversity indicators that it had begun developing in 2006-2007. The final version is attached as an Excel file.

## Committee Proposal

The College is a charter member of a new organization, the National Association of Diversity Officers in Higher Education. Dave Gordon and Gloria Lopez attended the second annual meeting of the organization, where they heard discussions about the importance of placing diversity at the center of institutional planning and activities. Their proposal, which the Committee supported, was to add the development of a campus-wide diversity plan to the College's strategic plan. The Diversity Commission could be responsible for developing the plan, assessing results, and issuing progress reports to the campus community. The Commission endorsed this proposal, and Dave Gordon presented it at the May 1<sup>st</sup> meeting of the Strategic Planning Group.

A campus diversity plan would enable the College to move toward unifying the many diversity initiatives that already exist, point to areas that may need to be developed, and provide goals and objectives that can be assessed to measure progress. The diversity indicators that the Committee has already developed may or may not all be included in the final plan, but they provide an example of what can be developed.

The SPG accepted the proposal as an objective under Goal 2, "Recruit, support, and foster the development of a diverse community of outstanding students, faculty, and staff."

The new objective reads, *Develop and implement a campus diversity plan that will identify diversity goals and objectives, performance indicators, and a means of assessing progress on an annual basis.*

The SPG decided that the President's Commission on Diversity and Community should be charged with developing the plan by May, 2009. The SPG will discuss implementation once the plan is developed.

*Submitted by David Gordon*

**Indicators**

	% Minority Undergraduate		% Minority Faculty		% Minority Prof Staff	
<b>Structure</b>	Fall 2007	11.70%	Fall 2007	15.85%	Fall 2007	12.20%
	Fall 2006	11.16%	Fall 2006	14.29%	Fall 2006	11.30%
	Fall 2005	10.09%	Fall 2005	12.40%	Fall 2005	10.02%
	<b>Minority Retention Rate</b>		<b>6 Yr Minority Grad Rate</b>		<b>Understanding other backgrounds*</b>	
<b>Outcomes</b>	2006 Cohort	81.77%	2001 Cohort	56.16%	Spring 2006	2.40
	2005 Cohort	85.51%	2000 Cohort	61.49%	Spring 2003	2.13
	2004 Cohort	81.94%	1999 Cohort	60.18%	Spring 2002	2.17
					1=very little, 4=very much	
				NSSE Results: Seniors		
<b>Climate</b>	<b>Conversations w/ Different Race#</b>		<b>Institutional Environment\$</b>		<b>Satisfaction w/Racial Harmony</b>	
	Spring 2006	2.53	Spring 2006	2.27	Spring 2006	3.70
	Spring 2003	2.49	Spring 2003	2.01	Spring 2003	3.64
	Spring 2002	2.46	Spring 2002	1.94	Spring 2000	3.45
				1=disagree, 5=agree		
				Student Opinion Survey Results		

## **Student and Campus Engagement Subcommittee**

### **2007-08 Report**

Submitted by Susan Norman and Fatima Rodriguez Johnson

Co-chairs: Susan Norman (co-chair), Fatima Rodriguez Johnson, (co-chair)

Members:

Susan Bailey; Dean of the College

Bobette Buchanan; Student

Ralph Carrasquillo; Director of Residence Life

Patricia Gonzalez; Access Opportunity Programs

Wendi Kinney; Coordinator of Greek Affairs & Off-Campus Living

Megan Lee, Dana LePage, and Joyce Chen, Students

Maria Perpetua Socorro U. Liwanag; Assistant Professor, School of Education

The Student and Campus Engagement Subcommittee consisted of 11 members. Member attendance was very sporadic; however, different portions of the group met each week to investigate two predominant topics. During the fall 2007 semester, the SACES took on the discussion of the feasibility of offering a three part program that would help students encounter their own personal biases during an experiential portion of the program, then elect to take a multicultural course of their own choosing, and next engage in an appropriate service learning to apply their understanding of diversity. During the Spring 2008 semester, the SACES continued the discussion of the need for mentoring on campus. Over several weeks we tried to determine the viability of such a program, how it would fit the needs of current students in terms of delivery, and who should be mentored on campus.

The Student and Campus Engagement Subcommittee utilized the events of the Fall semester to discuss how we could have a meaningful impact on student experiences and interactions across difference. The students who served on the committee voiced strong recommendations for a experiential program that could provide a foundation for every student on Geneseo's campus. With this in mind, Fatima Rodriguez Johnson shared information about a experiential high school program she lead called, Anytown. This experiential program provided students the opportunity to live in a diverse community, examine their attitudes of one another and to engage in meaningful "change" opportunities.

There is a college model that was lead by the National Conference for Community and Justice. The committee reached out to colleagues in Rhode Island who lead the college initiative with both Johnson and Wales and Arizona State University. Robert Jones served as a consultant to the committee and conference call meetings were held to review the program and its applicability to SUNY Geneseo.

In general, the program had three parts: a six day residential experience, course work, and application (service learning). The course integrates the rigors of academic inquiry with the skills to effectively apply this knowledge in a meaningful and useful way. Numerous courses teach human relations and social justice issues. The key to this course is to work toward application that does not lose sight of the basic principles that were taught. Therefore, this

course demands a continued cycle of self-reflection and self-assessment to insure course integrity.

This must start at the top. The instructors for the course must be able to model what they wish their students to achieve. It is strongly encouraged that co-instructors demonstrate the ability to work across differences in race, gender, age, etc. Co-instructors must model respect for each other, for students involved in the work, and for potential beneficiaries of the service learning.

Instructors must also have the capacity to model self-reflection, learning and growth. While they can demonstrate mastery of content, it is important that they utilize a coping model in representing their own growth. Additionally, instructors can not ask the students to do anything they are unwilling to do. In this course, while being mindful of role and responsibility, the teacher is truly also the student.

Students are expected to participate fully in both academic and experiential aspects of the course. Attendance at the retreats and classes is essential to successfully complete the class. It cannot be learned from the text.

One of the major differences between this class and many other classes offered in the university setting is the necessity for both cognitive and affective learning components to achieve the desired learning objectives. A high level of trust must be established among participants and instructors to allow for personal growth and understanding. This is initiated by having all participants develop a shared standard of behavior and expectations for the class (norms) that are observed to insure a safe, productive learning environment. The six day residential component provides the foundation for such an environment.

To prepare for their service learning practicums, students are expected to be observant of human relations and social justice issues on campus.

Ultimately, in the development of their practicums, students will be guided to insure that no effort causes harm. They will be asked to assess potential risk before implementing any projects – both those that occur through commission and those that occur through omission. For example, “Consider what happens at the end of the semester when you leave. What will happen if you implement something and then it is gone?” The importance of respect for humans, therefore, is a critical consideration to this course.

The behaviors by both staff and students are expected to reflect the overarching goals of this course, to create a better, more inclusive world for all of us, not just some, and to do it in action.

The project with Johnson & Wales and Arizona State University became known as, “The Diversity and Leadership in Action Institute” (appendix 1). After several focus groups with the students, faculty, employees as well as the faculty of several other Rhode Island academic institutions, a program that encompassed the passion of service learning along with the the University’s commitment to making their university more inclusive allowed the project to move to forward.

Arizona State University and Johnson & Wales did not want to design another Diversity 101 course. They wanted a course that moved beyond personal self-assessment and into the roles, risks and responsibilities of a leader to create change. The National Conference for Community

& Justice (NCCJ) has a strong record in experiential programming and the relationship with Johnson & Wales gave us the foundation to design along with the Arizona region and our National Programming office a course that addresses the need for better understanding of the issues a multicultural university faces and link that understanding to the problem solving and decision making our future leaders must make in their future capacity as leaders.

The course calls for class instruction, guest speakers and retreats. The two retreats will take place off campus in an isolated setting.

In this century, we have the opportunity to prepare our future leaders with the skills necessary to create a more just and inclusive society. The unification of academic theory and experiential learning is not new, yet it is often not the approach taken when dealing with the issues of inclusion and diversity. The students will be given the chance to put their new understanding of diversity and leadership into action by designing strategic action plans to support the university's goals of creating a more just and inclusive campus by examining what is in place, what is working and what additional action can take place.

Critical success factors include:

- Adequate funding for instruction, retreats and project implementation
- Continued university commitment to this course – including dedicated staff time, in-kind support and continued academic credit
- Strong university/NCCJ curriculum collaboration – recognizing and building on the strengths that each bring to the table

The subcommittee was interested in experiencing the 6-day residential program. Robert Jones and associates would lead and develop the program for a group of twenty-five faculty whose course would easily be aligned to the institute, students, and staff. The cost was a major factor and a second opportunity emerged, a small team could be sent to Rhode Island to experience the high school program (June 27-30) with an additional track that would allow for translating the experience to the college level. Susan Preston Norman and Becky Glass developed a list of individuals to approach. The cost would be \$300 per person which, would include food, lodging and consultation. Transportation was not included but, carpooling was strongly recommended. The Xerox Center originally volunteered to support the initiative but, with budgetary decisions not finalized and poor response, we will not be able to send a Geneso team.

During the Spring 2008, the subcommittee took on the discussion of whether a student mentoring program was needed on campus. Since three of the members of the subcommittee were also a part of the discussion the previous year, we began our inquiry based on our understanding of mentoring programs that are currently on campus and those that have ended or were discontinued because of funding.

Some of the basic questions we discussed as a group concerned who needed mentoring on campus? We addressed these questions two fold. One, we used the small sampling of three student subcommittee members as well as a small sample survey that was given to students attending a Xerox Seminar and students attending an ALANA monthly mentoring meeting (Appendix II).

In our discussions we noted the three types of mentoring that could be available on campus. One could target a specific student group, i.e. ALANA. Another type of student mentoring would be available to a larger cohort such as the entire freshman class i.e. Stacey Edgar's mentoring project with freshmen. And finally, mentoring that would be available to any student on campus that needs it.

Biweekly meetings with sporadic attendance comprised a group of 11 people. The general consensus within the subcommittee was that students attending the meeting, Dana LePage, Megan Lee and Joyce Chen as well as professional staff Fatima Rodriguez Johnson, Wendi Kinney, Patricia Gonzalez felt that mentoring is needed on campus for students who are somewhat isolated from mainstream students because they feel like an "other". We further refined our discussion by noting that any student at any age could feel like an outsider depending on their own situation. A senior student on our subcommittee noted that she felt more like an outsider during her junior and senior years than when she was a freshman or sophomore where there were lots of programs geared towards her orientation to the college. This sentiment is supported by the assessment subcommittee of the President's Diversity Commission which reported on diversity-related items on survey results from the Cooperative Institutional Research Program, the 2006 National Survey of Student Engagement, the 2006 Student Opinion Survey, the 2005 College of New Jersey Diversity and Inclusiveness Survey and the 2004 Geneseo Campus Climate Survey. In comparison to other similar college students, Dave Gordon shared with our group regarding the unique perception by Geneseo students that they feel underprepared by the college in their understanding of diversity as a senior in college as opposed to their experience with diversity when they enter college.

Mentoring proposal : Students should have the option of consulting a mentor or accessing a mentor during the academic year to discuss campus climate issues or other personal issues other than those that might be better addressed by the Health and Counseling Center.

Our subcommittee believes that a mentoring program should be available for any student who feels they are "otherwise" isolated—this could be periodically during their college career and may not be needed continuously. This also goes along with the sentiment that current students are "independently motivated" regarding their ability to access the services that they need as long as they know about it.

- Students do not necessarily define mentoring programs in the same way that a generation ago defined it. They may not feel like they have time for a regular mentor, but more on an "as needed" basis. They just want information when they need it.
- Might be interested in a user friendly interface for peer mentoring limited counseling type experience or questions---students could decide to meet or just chat on line
- Link virtual mentoring service off the Diversity Commission Web page to bring more awareness of issues and let the student engagement or another subcommittee have oversight of the service. This would ensure "that the committees take an active role in creating deliberate and on-going liaison relationship with the student organizations of under-represented groups."

Using the ideas about mentoring, we asked two separate groups of students who had no overlap what they thought about different types of mentoring. One group was tied to ethnic groups on campus, while the other was mostly School of Education majors who were primarily white. While the sample was small, only twenty-six students, we believe the results indicate a desire for mentoring on campus for some students who otherwise would not have that opportunity on campus. The results of the surveys that the assessment subcommittee analyzed seemed to indicate that our upperclassman do not feel that they get a diverse enough experience at Geneseo. The results of the survey along with the student reactions to the "Black Face" incident during the Fall 2007 seemed to the committee to be a compelling reason to start planning for a mentoring option. However, in discussion with Becky Glass, in order to get a better sampling of the students across campus, the next step would be to formalize a survey about mentoring on campus, have it go through the process of being approved by the IRB and distribute it to students across campus.



## Appendix 1

**Course Title: Diversity and Leadership in Action: Creating Institutional Change! Part 1****Course # LD 1005****Credit Hours: 3.5****Prerequisites: N/A****Course Description:**

This course focuses on issues of social identity, social and cultural diversity, and societal manifestations of oppression. It draws upon interdisciplinary perspectives of diversity, social identity development, social learning theory and analyses of power and privilege within broad social contexts. Some issues of leadership development, change management, strategic planning, and organizing which leads to creating institutional change will also be covered.

Experiential activities, cultural discussions and selected reading materials will be used to analyze social identity formation, social group differences and intergroup relations as well as leadership styles. Levels and types of oppression based on race, gender, sexual orientation, class, age, religion and ability status will be explored. Change management and diversity will be an integral part of the discussions. An action plan for institutional change will also be developed.

**Course Objectives:**

1. To establish a knowledge base about the dynamics and manifestations of societal oppression
2. To raise understanding and awareness of bias, prejudice, and discrimination and systemic manifestation of these behaviors
3. To define the role of leadership as it relates to change management
4. To establish a firm foundation for creating institutional change at Johnson & Wales University and beyond

**Course Outline:****A. Forms of Oppression**

1. Personal, Cultural, and Institutional

**B. Social Identity**

1. Mental, Physical, Emotional Disabilities
2. Religious
3. Socioeconomic class
4. Age and physical appearance
5. Sexual Orientation
6. Race

**C. Relationship between Leadership and Diversity**

1. What is Leadership?
2. Communication Skills
3. Methods of Negotiation

4. Conflict Resolution
5. Change Management
6. Power and Privilege

**D. Preparation for Internship**

1. Identification of research tools and methods
2. Creating a strategic plan for institutional (departmental) change

**Evaluative Criteria:**

Completion of all assigned readings from the text as well as additional articles and journal entries as assigned – 30%

Midterm – 15%

Final exam – 15%

Class participation – 30%

Oral report – 10%

**Assignments:**

Keep a weekly journal responding to class readings and discussions

Plan and present a formal oral presentation on the changes the individual would like to see on the Johnson and Wales campus

**Required Textbook:**

Readings from Diversity and Social Justice: An Anthology on Racism, Anti-Semitism, Sexism, Heterosexism, Ableism and Classism. Routledge, 2000.

Editors –Adams, Zunega.

Readings from Our Stories: The Experiences of Black Professionals on Predominantly White Campuses. The John D. O'Bryant National Think Tank for Black Professionals in Higher Education on Predominantly White Campuses, 2002

Edited by Dr. Mordean Taylor-Archer and Dr. Sherwood Smith

**H-Option:**

N/A

**Community Service Option:**

N/A

**Attendance Policy:**

Students must attend all classes. Please remember that class participation is an integral part of this course and attendance at each session is important and expected.

All students enrolled in this class are expected to respect the rights of everyone with regard to freedom of expression. Students will conduct themselves in a manner that is appropriate, professional, and non-discriminatory.

Johnson and Wales is committed to its Outcomes Assessment initiative. Therefore if there is any student in need of note taking or any other accommodations, we encourage them to see the

instructor. All faculty and staff are part of our on-going study to determine and refine the effectiveness of instruction and learning. Students' names will not be used when reporting results.

## Multicultural Mentoring Survey Results p.2

If you answered "yes" or "other" to the above experience, please give a description of the experience.

1. It was very good and still is. It is nice to have someone to peak to about a variety of issues
2. Yes my mother - because she is strong and always gives advice when needed
3. Counselors, parents, church family and friends
4. Teacher mentor - club advisor
5. My grandfather always helped me with what I needed
6. I was mentored in High School - it was very supportive and easy going
7. Went through the Xerox Center training for the Summer 2007 "CSI" RYSAG Program

No Answer	22
-----------	----

Would you be interested in having a mentor or being a mentor?

Yes I would like to have a mentor	5
Yes I would like to be a mentor	8
Yes I would like to be a mentor and have a mentor	6
No I wouldn't like to be a mentor or to have a mentor	14

If you answered "yes" to being a mentor, which of the following would suit you best?

Monthly training sessions	7
Bi-weekly training sessions	3
One training session at the beginning	3
Whatever training was required is fine with me	4

No Answer	15
-----------	----

## **Path Awards Subcommittee**

Subcommittee Members: Robert Owens, Tabitha Buggie Hunt, Wendi Kinney, Cristina Geiger, Julie Rao, Dana LaPage, Joe Van Remmen (Chair)

During the spring of 2008 the PATH Awards subcommittee convened to look at nominations for this years award.

The following individuals and groups were nominations for the award:

The History Project a student group was nominated by Assoc. Professor Emilye Crosby.

Director Charles Matthews and Coordinator Suzanne Sharp were nominated by Asst. Director Carey Backman.

Sorority Sigma Psi Zeta was nominated by student Vivian Cheung.

Asst. Professor David Levy was nominated by Assoc. Professor Ted Everett.

Student Jasmine Montgomery was nominated by Assoc. Professor Emilye Crosby and Professor Beth McCoy.

The Geneseo Anthropological Association was nominated by Asst. Professor Barb Welker.

Assoc. Professor Monica Schneider was nominated by Director Heidi Levine and Asst. Professor Jennifer Katz.

Student Catherine Urban was nominated by Assoc. Professor Linda Ware.

Assoc. Professor Rose McEwen was nominated by student Mercedes Piatt.

Student Vivian Cheung was nominated by student Betty Chan.

Each individual and/or group nomination was discussed individually. The committee was unanimous in awarding the 2008 PATH Award to the following:

### **Jasmine Montgomery**

Ms. Montgomery received nominations for her tremendous work in helping to plan and execute the Race and Campus Teach-In. She chose a majority of the group reading assignments for the Teach In, and facilitated small group discussions in both the Fall of 2007 and Spring of 2008.

Ms. Montgomery provided a superb and moving address at the March 9<sup>th</sup> Teach In.

### **Catherine Urban**

After sustaining an injury, Ms. Urban found getting around the Geneseo campus to be a real hardship. For the last two years Ms. Urban has been urging the college to consider ways to improve facilities and be more welcoming to those who have mobility challenges. Out of her efforts a new student group known as SEAA (Students Educating About Ableism) will continue the work, so that limited mobility does not preclude someone from considering Geneseo.

### **Dr. Monica Schneider**

Dr. Schneider has provided leadership by Co-Chairing the President's Commission on Diversity and Community. Professor Schneider is a part of the core group that brought Deliberative

Dialogue to our campus. Recently, Dr. Schneider shared with the community her research into stereotyping and prejudice and its effect on student self esteem and adjustment.

-----  
As Chair of the subcommittee, I would like to make the following recommendation; that the awards nomination be put back into the hands of the students. A group of students from the numerous student groups on our campus could be involved in gathering and deciding on the award nominations and recipients. The Chair could be a rotating person from the groups mentioned above. This involvement would put the onus back on the students rather than it being a task of the Diversity Commission. Hopefully with ownership of the process would come interest in the project. A Diversity Commission Advisor could be assigned to assist the group.

## **Faculty Development Proposed Diversity Training for New Faculty**

Submitted by Robert Owens, Professor of Communicative Disorders and Sciences

Committee Members: Cristina Geiger, Jeannette Molina, Susan Norman, Robert Owens (Chair), Kathy Trainor

We propose that each new faculty member as part of her/his first year faculty orientation attend 3 hours (2 sessions) centering on issues of diversity. This training would be run by interested and trained faculty members. A proposed outline is below.

What is diversity? What is community? Why both are important?

Discuss '98-'99 President's Commission' Report Opening Statement

College Statement

Why should we care?

Racism and White Privilege

Other Privileged Groups

Using language to lessen the power differential

Diversity among students, staff, and faculty

Never assume

Brrrrr, that chilly (campus) climate

Establishing your own welcoming climate

Addressing diversity in the classroom

Integrating diversity into each course

Dealing with difficult issues

Classroom rules for discussion

How NOT to single out students

Language and dialectal differences

What are reasonable adjustments?

Resources available (Handout)

Reading list

Campus resources

Using co-curricular activities to enhance the classroom experience

Is there a place for service learning?

Given the limited time available for the training, many topics will only be introduced briefly or included in readings. We do not have a book for the new faculty to read as an introduction to the topic and would appreciate suggestions.

One topic which was removed from the outline, alternative learning and teaching styles will be covered in other places in the overall training so is not included in our proposal.

Because we are just introducing some topics, it is our goal to present follow-on programs for all faculty through the TLC. Obviously, there is much work to be accomplished and we recommend that a committee of the Commission work on this next year and provide training to new faculty in coordination with the TLC.