

# **The President's Commission on Diversity and Community 2010 – 2011 Report**

**Submitted by: Monica Schneider and Irene Belyakov**

## **Commission Members**

Sadie Baker; student  
Irene Belyakov; Lecturer and ESL Coordinator (co-chair)  
Donte Bothel; student  
Alexandra Carlo; Staff Psychologist, Student Health and Counseling  
Michelle Costello; Reference and Instruction Librarian, Milne Library  
Kevin Felter; student  
Becky Glass; Executive Assistant to the President  
David Gordon; Associate Provost  
Scott Hemer; Coach, Department of Athletics and Recreation  
Ann Marie Lauricella; Assistant Professor, School of Education  
Maria Perpetua Socorro U. Liwanag; Assistant Professor, School of Education  
Nikisha John; student  
Gloria Lopez; Associate Director, Human Resources/Director of Affirmative Action  
Kathy Mapes; Associate Professor, History  
Garry Morgan; Residence Director, Allegany Hall  
David Murray; student  
Susan Norman; Director, Xerox Center for Multicultural Education  
Gina Ottolia; student  
Robert Owens; Professor, Communicative Disorders and Sciences  
Tracy Paradis; Reference and Instruction Librarian, Milne Library  
David Parfitt; Director, Teaching and Learning Center  
Visha Patel; student  
Polly Radosh; Dean of the College  
Jennifer Rogalsky; Assistant Professor, Geography  
Julie Rao, Director, Institutional Research  
Fatima Rodriguez-Johnson; Coordinator, Multicultural Programs and Services  
Monica Schneider; Associate Professor, Psychology (co-chair)  
Farooq Sheikh; Assistant Professor, School of Business  
Isaiah Tolbert; Residence Director, Jones Hall  
Kathy Trainor; Student and Campus Life  
Annmarie Urso; Assistant Professor, School of Education  
Joseph VanRemmen; Inspector, University Police  
Michael Venturiello; student  
Linda Ware; Associate Professor, School of Education  
Robert Wayland-Smith; Geneseo Board  
Peggy Wirth; Nurse Practitioner, Student Health and Counseling

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

For the past two years, the Commission has been focused on identifying the most effective ways of providing outreach and building community, with an emphasis on action-oriented outcomes. The Commission is currently in the process of undergoing several major transitions regarding the implementation of programs and initiatives developed by the Commission to accomplish these goals. Specifically, the Real World Geneseo (RWG) program has now been conducted on three separate occasions since its inception in January 2010, with the coordinators of that program seeking ways to streamline and institutionalize the process. For example, the coordinators of the RWG program have found several ways to directly link the program with the Bringing Theory to Practice initiative of the College. The Assessment and Diversity Plan subcommittee submitted the Diversity Plan they developed to the Strategic Planning Group with the hopes of identifying the best way to implement and assess the Plan at the institutional level. The Professional Development subcommittee developed a program designed to bring together faculty and students to examine “cultural diversity and cultural awareness linked to pedagogy and practices within the Geneseo context.” This subcommittee submitted a grant proposal for this project to the Consortium on High Achievement and Success (CHAS). In addition, this subcommittee has identified other programs and workshops that could be implemented in conjunction with the Teaching and Learning Center.

Below is a summary of the activities of each subcommittee as well as a list of recommendations for the next academic year regarding these programs and initiatives. The complete 2010 – 2011 subcommittee reports can be found in the appendices.

### **Summary of Activities: 2010-2011**

***The Student and Campus Engagement Subcommittee:*** The Student and Campus Engagement subcommittee (SACES) focused its energy primarily on the Real World Geneseo program, a program designed to provide students with a “transformative diversity experience.” This program emerged in response to 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. This program was first conducted in spring 2010, with students participating in a retreat in January 2010, followed by participation in one of a series of predetermined courses addressing important diversity-related issues and a 1 credit reflective seminar with other members in the RWG program. Initial quantitative and qualitative assessment of the program suggested that students were greatly benefiting from the RWG program. This past year, SACES conducted a second RWG program in October 2010, coordinated training for SUNY Geneseo faculty and staff to serve as facilitators in December 2010, and conducted a third RWG program in January 2011. It is important to note that the RWG3 retreat was the first to be completely facilitated by SUNY Geneseo faculty and staff, thus moving toward increased ownership and institutionalization of the RWG program.

Quantitative data was collected before and after the retreat for both the RWG2 and the RWG3 program to assess the potential benefits of the program across different samples of students. Analyses conducted on the quantitative data collected before and after the RWG2 program replicated the results found for students who participated in the initial RWG1 program. The RWG assessment team is currently in the process of analyzing the data obtained before and after the RWG3 program.

Implementation of the RWG program has required a significant amount of dedication and commitment on the part of SACES members. The amount of time that they have dedicated to the training of facilitators and the implementation of the various RWG programs is extraordinary. They have worked diligently in coordination with students, faculty, and staff throughout various divisions within the College to secure funding, to recruit students for the program, to conduct both the retreat and reflective seminar sections of the program, and to coordinate assessment of the program. In addition, they have already developed a mechanism for implementing a revised version of the program this coming year and have secured grant funding for that project. Members of the assessment team associated with this project have also devoted a significant amount of their time in developing, conducting, and analyzing the data collected before and after each program. If this program is to be sustainable over time and expanded to include more members of the campus community, the College is going to have to find a way to institutionalize the program and provide the necessary resources and support for its success. Members of the SACES subcommittee and the co-chairs of the Commission have met with Provost Long and Associate Provost David Gordon to discuss possible ways to increase the sustainability of the program long term.

***The Assessment and Diversity Plan Subcommittee:*** At the end of the 2007-2008 academic year, the Assessment Subcommittee met with 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. 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." In 2010-2011, the Diversity Plan subcommittee developed a campus-wide diversity plan that included goals, objectives, and some potential action steps related to diversity. In addition, they developed a proposal outlining the process for implementing the plan. The Diversity Plan was presented to the Strategic Planning Group in fall 2010. The Assessment subcommittee and the Diversity Plan subcommittee were integrated in the hopes that an assessment plan for the goals and objectives listed in the Diversity Plan could be developed. Unfortunately, there was a delay in getting the Diversity Plan through the SPG, making it difficult for this subcommittee to develop an assessment plan. The challenge for this subcommittee in this coming year will be to work in conjunction with the SPG in formulating a plan for presenting the Diversity Plan to the college community in a way that engages them in a meaningful discussion regarding the implementation and assessment of the goals and objectives incorporated in the Plan.

***The Professional Development Subcommittee:*** The Professional Development subcommittee submitted a grant to the Consortium on High Achievement and Success (CHAS) for a project designed to encourage dialogue and collaboration between junior and senior faculty members as well as students surrounding the issue of diversity and inclusive pedagogies. This program involved the development of collaborate research projects between faculty and students surrounding these issues. Although the project was not funded this year, it received positive feedback from CHAS with an encouragement to resubmit a proposal this coming fall semester. In addition, the subcommittee identified several other workshops/programs that may be conducted in conjunction with the Teaching and Learning Center to address faculty development issues regarding diversity in teaching as well as issues associated with ableism.

### **Recommendations for 2011-2012**

The Commission co-chairs met with the subcommittees' chairs 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, we summarize the issues and recommendations that emerged regarding the role of the Commission as a whole. In the second section, we present the recommendations made by the specific subcommittees.

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

1. The Commission should continue to strive to take an active role in identifying diversity and community issues that are challenging to the college community. The Commission also believes that it can play an important role in actively promoting community participation and implementation of programs that support the Bringing Theory to Practice initiatives currently being developed by the College.
2. The Commission should continue to 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 continue to identify ways in which the College could most effectively utilize the resources and support available through the Consortium on High Achievement and Success (CHAS).
4. The Commission should continue gaining 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: supporting the 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.
5. 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*

**Student and Campus Engagement Committee**, Real World Geneseo project and Path awards:

The Diversity Commission should assist this subcommittee in providing sustainability of the RWG project, which includes where the project will be housed and its continued financial support.

Recommendations for the future SACES subcommittee should be as follows:

- (1) Duties of the SACES committee members could be organized around subgroups responsible for the different SACES activities: a) RWG retreat trainers and facilitators, b) RWG curriculum development, c) RWG focus group and service learning follow-up, d) RWG assessment, e) RWG grant writing, and f) PATH awards.
- (2) The retreat facilitators should work on conducting the RWG trainer program for faculty, staff, and student leaders. This should take place preferably in October or some other convenient time during the fall 2011 for people interested in facilitating the retreat. The retreat facilitators should also facilitate the next retreat along with those who were newly trained.

- (3) The curriculum development group should meet to create a template for the Extreme Learning Course that would combine three elements: transformational experience, academic coursework, and service learning. The template should be sent to the college faculty senate for deliberation and approval during the 2011-2012 academic year. When approved, the 1-4 credit Extreme Learning Course will be offered to students during the fall 2012.
- (4) The RWG focus group and service learning follow-up subgroup should arrange for the focus group meetings and service learning for RWG participants.
- (5) The RWG assessment group should continue to collect baseline and post-retreat data of the RWG programs that are conducted as well as continuing to analyze and present the data collected on the RWG programs conducted in previous years.
- (6) RWG grant writers should meet during the year to write grants to fund future RWG programming.
- (7) The PATH award group should meet regularly to work on strengthening the award program and soliciting nominations.

Recommendation for the institution: One of the challenges of this subcommittee has been finding faculty willing to participate in the RWG activities. Faculty members are reluctant to become involved with RWG because of the time commitment involved. The institution could help our committee by legitimizing the work of RWG so that faculty members feel that their work will count as they lead into tenure or promotion decisions. If the institution could help by endorsing the RWG work as valuable towards faculty and staff career goals, this would help this subcommittee recruit and retain active members.

### **The Assessment & Diversity Plan Subcommittee:**

In the coming year, the Assessment and Diversity Plan subcommittees should continue to function as one subcommittee. Many of the Assessment committee members were involved in developing the Diversity Plan. These same people can be recruited to help develop the assessment measures for the plan.

Second, it is necessary to set a firm date for the launch of the Diversity Plan as soon as possible. The Assessment and Diversity Plan subcommittee needs to work closely with the Strategic Planning Group to determine the most feasible date. Once the date has been selected, the Assessment and Diversity Plan subcommittee could then develop the assessments for the plan by launch date.

Third, it has also been suggested that the presentation of the Diversity Plan be thoughtfully framed. Otherwise, it would be easy for the Diversity Plan to be perceived as just another item on the to-do list, instead of truly institutionalizing the College's

commitment to diversity and community. Commission members and members of the Assessment and Diversity subcommittee could serve as presenters of the Diversity Plan to different departments to help promote its adoption.

The subcommittee should continue researching the question: *Why does there appear to be a decline in retention and graduation rate for minority students over the past three years?* The Office of Institutional Research has started looking at outcomes for cohorts on a unit record basis and has made use of the Student Clearinghouse Services to obtain information on students' transfer patterns. These unit record files, stripped of identifying information, were shared with Professors Edward Drachman and Monica Schneider who have worked with students to analyze the data and presented their results to the Committee on Inclusive Excellence. This Subcommittee will use some of their results to structure its work in the coming year.

### **The Professional Development Subcommittee:**

We recommend that this subcommittee continue developing a mechanism for providing ALL faculty members 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. Specifically, the Professional Development Subcommittee should:

- (1) explore mechanisms for developing more comprehensive programs for faculty similar to the RWG program implemented with students. This may include an experiential retreat that provides faculty with the opportunity to address diversity-related issues both on personal and academic levels.
- (2) Re-submit the grant proposal to CHAS. This project would encourage collaboration between faculty and students in researching important diversity-related issues faced by the campus community.
- (3) Work in conjunction with the TLC on workshops specifically designed to support faculty development regarding universal design and other diversity-related teaching endeavors.

Following up on expressed students' concern about the lack of integration of diversity within the curriculum where issues of race, class, gender and disability appear to be limited to specific courses ("ghettoized"), it is recommended that curriculum support be advanced through planning with the college on a "design for all" strategy (Universal Design for Learning) that takes into account the need for varied approaches to pedagogy augmented by sophisticated technology usage. Members of this subcommittee

plan to present a workshop series working with the TLC that will begin with an example from an integrative approach at Temple University curriculum work and universal design. They will promote examples of curriculum-based diversity concerns as one of several core features of a campus committed to capitalizing on diversity.

The Professional Development subcommittee recommended that the curriculum be assessed to ensure that alternative perspectives and paradigms are considered in equal measure—contemporary approaches to the curriculum are often the consequence of explicit efforts to be inclusive of diverse knowledge sets. However, this issue will probably be addressed by the Assessment and Diversity Plan (ADP) subcommittee as part of their work. Thus, we encourage members of the Professional Development subcommittee who are interested in this issue to collaborate with members of the ADP subcommittee.

- (4) Identify other diversity-related issues that are relevant for the campus and develop workshops designed to facilitate communication (e.g., ableism, race, gender, sexual orientation, etc.)
  
- (5) As a way to support faculty, identify the patterns of selecting speakers for campus events and link them to existing coursework for full impact. Specifically, this subcommittee should create a list of faculty that describes their interest and efforts to integrate diversity into their courses. If these names are readily available, we can contact these faculty members when certain speakers are on campus and help them to connect them to their course work.
  
- (6) Identify faculty who embed diversity in their courses as exemplars of the strength of diversity — and highlight their efforts (e.g., in the Lamron). These faculty members could potentially serve as resources for other faculty members who wish to incorporate diversity in their courses.

### **Overall Summary and Conclusions**

Overall, in spite of a difficult year, the Commission continued to take significant steps toward addressing important community issues and involving members of the larger college community in the process. 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. 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. Student and Campus Engagement
- II. Assessment and Diversity Plan
- III. Professional Development

## **Report of the Student and Campus Engagement Subcommittee: Real World Geneseo project and PATH awards**

Submitted by Susan Norman and Fatima Rodriguez Johnson

### **Committee Members:**

Donte Bothel, Student

Nikisha John, Student

Garry Morgan, Area Coordinator, Residence Life

Susan Preston Norman, Xerox Center for Multicultural Teacher Education

Gina Ottolia, Student

Robert Owens, Dept. of Communicative Disorders

Vishal Patel, Student

Fatima Rodriguez Johnson, Office of Multicultural Programs & Services

Isaiah Tolbert, Resident Director, Residence Life

Annmarie Urso, School of Education

### **RWG Assessment Researchers:**

Monica Schneider

Julie Rao

Diantha Watts

SUNY Geneseo staff and faculty co-facilitated the RWG 2 retreat for 14 students during the October break, October 9-October 12, 2010. The retreat was similar in content to RWG 1 with the addition of an outdoor low ropes course to do trust and team building activities. During December 15-17 2010, SUNY Geneseo held a train the trainer conference whereby Robert Jones trained 8 faculty and staff in the Diversity curriculum for the RWG retreats. With this training three SUNY Geneseo staff and faculty led the first all Geneseo facilitated retreat for RWG 3 that took place January 13-16, 2011. The retreat for RWG 2 and RWG 3 consisted of thirty- eight dedicated contact hours of interactive workshops on racism, sexism, religious bias, classism and ableism. The RWG 3 retreat was offered to 24 students and 3 Geneseo staff/faculty participant observers. All student participants were assessed using pre-retreat and post retreat on-line surveys. Students also documented their journeys during the retreat by making video diaries. Both retreats were followed up by diversity focused connecting course and group meetings about the impact of RWG retreat. Focus group discussions from RWG 2 reveal the following benefits (1) students report being transformed/enlightened by their RWG retreat experience (2) reflective lab has allowed students to stay close to their cohort and experience emotional support from their peers (3) students report speaking up/out in connecting courses and being praised for sharing diverse attitudes and insights with non-RWG peers.

During the Spring 2011, the SACES members met to consider the Path nominations from across campus. 5 awards were given, three to students and two faculty/staff members: Fiona Harvey, Statsia Monteiro, Rejoyce Owusu, Nicole McCawthan, and Linda Ware.

During the Spring 2011, Susan Norman and Fatima Rodriguez wrote for another SUNY Provost award that was funded for 10,000.00. An adjustment was made to the previous proposal that aligns with the future plans of the college to offer RWG as an Extreme Learning course. RWG 4 for 30 students will be offered during the winter break prior to the Spring 2012 as part of recognizing the work of Dr. Martin Luther King.

Future recommendations for the future SACES subcommittee could be as follows:

- (1) Duties of the SACES committee members could be split between several other subcommittees 1) RWG retreat trainers and facilitators, 2) RWG focus group and service learning follow-up 3) RWG assessment 4) PATH award subcommittee and 5) RWG curriculum developing 6) RWG grant writing.
- (2) The curriculum developers can meet to create a template for the Extreme Learning Course that would combine three elements, transformational experience, academic coursework and service learning. The template should be sent to the college faculty senate for deliberation and approval during the 2011-2012 academic year. When approved, the 1-4 credit Extreme Learning Course will be offered to students during the fall 2012.
- (3) The RWG focus group and service learning subcommittee can also arrange for the focus group meetings and service learning for RWG participants.
- (4) The retreat facilitators should work on training the RWG trainer program for faculty, staff, and student leaders. This should take place preferably in October or some other convenient time during the fall 2011 for people interested in facilitating the retreat. The retreat facilitators also facilitate the next retreat along with those that were newly trained.
- (5) The assessment committee should continue to “rock on” with their excellent analysis of RWG data.
- (6) RWG grant writers should meet during the year to write grants to fund future RWG programming.
- (7) The PATH award subcommittee should meet regularly to work on strengthening the award program and soliciting for nominations.

Future recommendations for the institution:

Faculty members are reluctant to become involved with RWG because of the time commitment involved. The institution could help our committee by legitimizing the work of RWG so that faculty feels that their work will count as they lead into tenure or promotion decisions. If the institution could help by endorsing the RWG work as valuable towards faculty and staff career goals, this would help us recruit and retain active members.

## **Report of the Assessment & Diversity Plan Committees President's Commission on Diversity & Community**

Submitted by Julie Rao

### **Committee members:**

Alexandra Carlo, Health & Counseling  
Celia Easton, Dean of Residence Life  
A. Scott Hemer, Head Women's Basketball Coach  
Harry Howe, Professor of Accounting  
Gloria Lopez, Director of Affirmative Action  
Polly Radosh, Dean of the College  
Julie Rao, Director of Institutional Research  
Farooq Sheikh, Assistant Professor, School of Business  
Kathy Trainor, Staff Associate, Student & Campus Life  
Julie Rao, Co-chair  
David Gordon, Co-chair

### **Committee Activities:**

The Diversity Plan was presented to the Strategic Planning Group (SPG) late last academic year. The SPG added reviewing the Diversity to its agenda for this academic year. SPG finished its review of the Diversity Plan in the spring semester. The intended goal of the Assessment Committee was to develop the assessment outcomes for the Diversity Plan. With the delay in getting the plan through the SPG, the Assessment Committee never met.

The Diversity Indicators were updated and are included with this report.

Our suggestions for next year's agenda would be to combine the Assessment and Diversity Plan committees. Many of the Assessment committee members were involved in developing the Diversity Plan. These same people can be recruited to help develop the assessment measures for the plan.

Another idea for next year is to set a firm date for the launch of the Diversity Plan. The Assessment subcommittee would then have to develop the assessments for the plan by launch date. It has also been suggested that the presentation of the Diversity Plan be thoughtfully framed. It would be easy for the Diversity Plan to be perceived as just another item on the to-do list, instead of operationalizing the College's commitment to diversity and community. Commission members and members of the Diversity/Assessment subcommittees could serve as presenters of the Diversity Plan to different departments to help promote its perception.

*Why does there appear to be a decline in retention and graduation rate for minority students over the past three years?*

The Office of Institutional Research has starting looking at outcomes for cohorts on a unit record basis. They have made use of the Student Clearinghouse Services to obtain information on students' transfer patterns. These unit record files, stripped of identifying information, were shared with Professors Edward Drachman and Monica Schneider. They have worked with students to analyze the data and presented their results to the Committee on Inclusive Excellence. The Committee will use some of their results to structure their work in the coming year.

## Report of the Professional Development Subcommittee

Submitted by Linda Ware

### Committee Members:

Michelle Costello, Reference and Instruction Librarian

Tracy Paradis, Reference and Instruction Librarian

Linda Ware, Associate Professor, School of Education (Chair)

### Summary 2010-2011

The subcommittee revisited the goals outlined in the 2010 report and considered how we might continue and extend efforts towards those stated ends—specifically, goal #3

*The Commission needs to continue to foster community dialogue about diversity issues in a meaningful way by supporting, encouraging, and providing feedback on these dialogues at all levels of the College. They should serve as “promoters” of people talking about ideas and issues and giving community members an opportunity to see the outcomes of their dialogues.*

Our subcommittee prepared *Critical Incidents, Critical Conversations & Inclusive Pedagogies* (CiCCiP) in response to a RFP from CHAS. (See attached proposal with Executive Summary). Our proposal was not funded, but we received positive feedback and were encouraged to pursue funding during fall 2011. The CiCCiP discussion led to consider diversity challenges in these areas 1) Campus Representations of Diversity, 2) Diversity in Community contexts, and 3) Curriculum (see CiCCiP).

#### Campus Representations of Diversity

Following the submission of CiCCiP the subcommittee was less active in the wake of faculty, staff and program cuts. Although the CHAS grant was not funded it encapsulated the intended goals for continued discussion to feature diversity as a “value added” component of the College as defined by President Dahl in our mission statement. In discussion it was noted that too few visible markers across campus support the notion of a “value-added” position. Given that one goal for the Diversity commission 2009-2010 was to secure the “commitment of resources and support from the Commission and the College”—that goal must be revisited in light of the above discussion.

Efforts to convey the power of visual representations associated with positive portrayals of diversity this issue was addressed by students in anticipation of providing a specific example for the next submission to CHAS, students in WMST 201 (Spring 2011 taught by Linda Ware). Students independently surveyed the campus walking through each academic building, office (as permitted) and the sports facility to chronicle how diversity “appeared” on our campus. Visible minorities (race & ethnicity) were typically positioned in product placement style (aka Hollywood style: as a prop), women were positioned “fashionista” style, and representations of LGBT and disabled students were

completely erased from the campus despite the active student leadership by Pride Alliance and Students Educating Against Ableism (SEAA).

### Diversity in Community contexts

There exist several female community members who as dairy farmers offer local examples of empowering representations of women in our community; there exist women who join their husbands as laborers in the fields and on dairy farms; there are several women in business in Livingston County who merit recognition along with those who represent the strength of all forms of diversity that typically fall outside the venues for recognition on our campus.

### **Recommendations 2011-2012**

- Action: Curriculum integration

This follows on the point that students continue to stress their awareness of the lack of integration of diversity concerns within the curriculum. An integrative approach to curriculum planning that accounts for race, class, gender and disability appears to be limited to specific courses.

- Action: Design for All

Curriculum support could be advanced through planning with the college on a “design for all” strategy (Universal Design for Learning) that takes into account varied pedagogical approaches augmented by sophisticated technology usage. A “Design for All” framework (universal design) invites serious consideration of the question, “Who is excluded by our instruction?” We will present a workshop coordinated by the Teaching and Learning Center based on an integrative approach at Temple University with curriculum and universal design applications. As a campus committed to characterizing and capitalizing on diversity we must consider the need to carefully assess the curriculum to ensure that alternative perspectives and paradigms are considered in equal measure. Typically such approaches make explicit efforts to be inclusive of diverse knowledge sets. We hope to link faculty willing to consider current social, economic and political challenges similar to those raised by the “Kindle Reading Group” organized by Provost Long (summer 2011). The group discussed Parker Palmer’s, The Heart of Higher Education which framed by the question: “*How can higher education become a more multidimensional enterprise, one that draws on the full range of human capacities for knowing, teaching, and learning; that bridges the gaps between the disciplines; that forges stronger links between known the world and living creatively in it, in solitude and community?*” (p. 2). Palmer suggested that we bypass the search for one monolithic solution, and instead explore “multiple threads of inquiry and experimentation that might come together in a larger and more coherent tapestry of insight and practice” (2).

- Action: Interface with existing campus committees

The Diversity Commission must make their mission more central to the work of various campus committees to avoid being “ghettoized” as the site that takes up diversity

while the work of others on campus proceeds as if diversity concerns were “optional”—the work for some, but not all.

•Action: *Access This!*

We hope to advance diversity as a measure of human wealth. Simply put, Geneseo would be a less interesting place were it not for the opportunity to mine multiple forms of diversity needed on our campus. *Access This!* was submitted for funding through the Faculty Project Initiation Grants but it was not funded. The project evolved from the discussion of diversity representation presented above, but *Access This!* narrowed the focus to disability in an effort to propose a manageable idea to the Research Council. However, the project merits a second look with revision that would address diversity writ large across the campus.

•Action: Normative accounting of exclusion.

Utilize existing evaluation data (Julie Rao) to map diversity and cultural concerns to identify the following:

1) Visual markers that represent disability across campus (*Access This!*);  
2) Identify faculty who have attempted to embed diversity in their courses as exemplars of the strength of diversity writ large—and HIGHLIGHT their efforts perhaps in the Lamron or from a webpage with a link to something catchy like “Diversity Does It” or “Contextualizing Diversity”—just a few examples to consider.

3) Identify the number of students who graduate without taking any targeted courses—or just one “M” course. *Find out why!*

4) Carefully consider the composition of faculty assignments on committee work. Are the same individuals selected for participation on major committees? Have faculty who identify as representative of diversity included in the conversations that then shape key decisions on campus? Or are they merely rolled out to accomplish “diversity window dressing”? In addition to gender, race, class (several faculty are first generation college graduates, a well known marker of class in HE) and given that we want to be clear about the meaning of diversity recognized at Geneseo these individuals should be featured as potentially strong mentors to all students. In addition, those voices need to have a representative impact when college decisions are made—we have the data to count the pockets of strengths and needs to indicate this.

5) Identify the patterns of selecting speakers for campus events—are the events supported by the College with a “special” allocation of funds to support race, class, gender and disability content intended to link to existing coursework for full impact? For example, 2010-2011 Fatima Johnson worked with the student organization Students Educating Against Ableism (SEAA) to co-sponsor two events on campus. One included a presentation by Liat Ben-Moshe, a sociologist and disability studies scholar from Syracuse University. As a wheelchair user, Dr. Ben-Moshe spoke from a perspective informed by not only by sociological analyses of disability policy, but of her experience as a doctoral student at Syracuse who navigated various physical barriers to her participation on campus. It would have been useful to tie her visit into other course work with which she held expertise (i.e., international policy).

6) Finding and naming our strength—were a list of faculty become readily available that listed their interest and efforts to integrate diversity into their courses,

contacts could have been made and Dr. Ben-Moshe's time on campus would not be limited to a single issue presentation. This was accomplished in the second event supported by Fatima Johnson's office when Eli Clare, a Vermont based poet and disability/queer activist was invited to present during Cultural Harmony week. This recommendation came from a Women's Studies student who encountered her work in a textbook for a course and from a documentary screened in a WS 100 course. During his stay Eli presented to three sections of CURR 320, and to a combined class with Professors Katz and Blood, in addition to his lecture/workshop on embodiment in the example of the queer, disabled body that filled Newton 201.

## COPY OF GRANT SUBMITTED TO CHAS

Executive Summary *Critical Incidents, Critical Conversations & Inclusive Pedagogies* (CiCCiP).

This grant was submitted in October 2010, but was not funded, however we received positive feedback on the concept and design and we were encouraged to pursue funding during fall 2011. The grant was designed to address the 2010-11 diversity commission report (goal #3)

*The Commission needs to continue to foster community dialogue about diversity issues in a meaningful way by supporting, encouraging, and providing feedback on these dialogues at all levels of the College. They should serve as “promoters” of people talking about ideas and issues and giving community members an opportunity to see the outcomes of their dialogues.*

In dialogue, interested participants would identify campus-based critical incidents linked to diversity. The grant was designed to bring faculty together with second year students in focused engagement with the goal of probing cultural diversity and cultural awareness linked to pedagogy and practices within the Geneseo context. Working in teams, students and faculty would consider the merit of inclusive pedagogies commonly associated with the promotion of cognitive development, perspective-taking, critical thinking skills, and problem-solving skills as each impacts academic achievement. In this example, *achievement* was intended to include both students and faculty. That is, junior faculty who likely encountered inclusive pedagogies in graduate school would be targeted to participate in this project alongside senior faculty whose graduate experience may have lacked exposure to such diversity considerations. The intention would be to share in an *inverted mentorship* the expertise of the junior faculty with their more senior colleagues. For students, *achievement* would be through similar mentorship with their lived experience, interest, and expertise in collaboration with faculty to design research projects with a focus on diversity themed research for submission to GREAT DAY and at other research venues as appropriate, including, of course, a presentation at a future CHAS meeting. Subsequent discussion proposed identifying a specific diversity strand at GREAT DAY that might provide the impetus for such projects.

---

**Title:** Critical Incidents, Critical Conversations & Inclusive Pedagogies (CiCCiP)

**Brief Description:** This project will bring faculty together with second year students in focused engagement session with the goal of probing cultural diversity awareness pedagogy. Working in teams, students and faculty will consider the merit of inclusive pedagogies commonly associated with the promotion of cognitive development, perspective-taking, critical thinking skills, and problem solving skills, as each impacts academic achievement. CiCCiP will provide opportunities for mentorship and leadership through the recruitment of minority faculty and recent hires who will work

collaboratively with students who have completed Real World Geneseo (RWG<sup>1</sup>). For this project, RWG students will be afforded leadership opportunities working with faculty who have convened over the years in similar interrogations of privilege and power teaching on a campus that historically has a white majority among students, faculty and administrators<sup>2</sup>. These overlapping experiences will be examined to address local concerns in a context that is informed by broader understanding to sustain and promote cultural diversity at Geneseo. In addition, senior faculty who address cultural diversity in their teaching and their scholarship or are interested in broadening their knowledge about these issues will be encouraged to participate. In sum, we aim to structure more than an “amorphous, homogenized construction of whiteness” (Simon, 153) as the problem, but at the same time, we seek to probe beneath the academic “nod to diversity” (Ware, 2009).

**Project design:** CiCCiP will support monthly workshops with student/faculty teams who will examine attitudes, assumptions and practices linked to instructional vignettes that challenge non-mainstream perspectives specific to race/ethnicity, gender, ability, religious and socioeconomic differences. “Critical incidents” (Tripp, 1993) linked to classroom practice have been discussed among the members of the President’s Commission on Diversity and the College who have undertaken action to address race and sexual assault training campus wide. CiCCiP will seek greater articulation of cultural difference in the safe space that faculty who are prepared in advance can provide through the use of “inclusive pedagogies” in the classroom (Adams, et. al, 2007). Participants in the first meeting will identify “critical incidents” they have experienced at Geneseo as the springboard for the development of collaborative research to delineate inclusive pedagogies and a shared response to oppressive and exploitative social relations. These vignettes will be co-authored by faculty and student teaching assistants who will work closely with faculty to complete directed study research framed within the Geneseo context. Junior faculty of color and those with lived diversity experience who are new to campus will be recruited to participate as it has been reported that “teaching against the grain” (Simon, 1992) and their efforts to challenge the status quo curriculum can result in a sense of isolation that is akin to that experienced by students. These faculty members are likely to have encountered inclusive pedagogies in graduate school, and as a consequence, they often offer course work that closely aligns with this proposal. The collaborative research projects produced through this project with students who are

---

<sup>1</sup> This weekend-long transformative retreat brings together a diverse group of students to explore personal issues of privilege, power, class, race, gender identity, and “ableism” as each affects academic and co-curricular life on campus. RWG has become a keystone in the development of a structural response to promote campus diversity in collaboration with Academic Affairs faculty and staff and Student and Campus Life staff.

<sup>2</sup> The college has two active committees organized through the national network of Bringing Theory to Practice that include several faculty who authored this proposal. In addition, the campus has organized two campus teach-in days that entail a year of study on a given topic in advance of a full day teach-in. In 2007-2008, we addressed Race and presently we are participating in discussion of issues related to sexual violence that will culminate in a Sexual Assault Training teach-in in 2011. Faculty members associated with this project are active members in both initiatives.

under-represented in the production of academic research will be featured at Geneseo's GREAT DAY symposium and at other research venues as appropriate, including, of course, a presentation at a future CHAS meeting.

## II. Budget

\$800.00	Light refreshments for retreat meetings on campus (6 meetings in the academic year, 2 during the summer months)
\$200.00	Promotional materials (posters, pens, etc.)
\$300.00	Office supplies (duplication, paper, printer supplies, etc.)
\$1000.00	Resources to support student/faculty presentations (films, books, etc.)
\$1200.00	Travel to present at conferences
\$3,000	Faculty stipends for mentorship of faculty and/or students specific to CiCCiP.

Total \$6,500

## III. Summary background

Authorship of this project involved individuals who serve on the President's Commission on Diversity & Community and those who are active participants in initiatives that address the promotion of inclusion and diversity across the campus, and those who produce scholarship and/or research on multiculturalism. The students participating as co-teachers and research assistants successfully completed Real World Geneseo (RWG) and thus, will bring to this project a unique skill set. Likewise, the faculty members who supported the development of RWG are members of the subcommittee that developed the CiCCiP project.

## References

- Adams, M. Bell, L. & Griffin, P. (2007) Teaching for diversity and social justice (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition). New York: Routledge.*
- Adams, M., Blumenfeld, W., Castaneda, R., Hackan, H. Peters, M. & Zuniqua, X. (2010). Readings for Diversity and Social Justice (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition). New York: Routledge.*
- Simon, R (1992). Teaching Against the Grain. New York: Bergin & Garvey.*
- Tripp D (1993) Critical Incidents in Teaching: Developing Professional Judgement. New York & London: Routledge.*
- Ware, L. (2009). The hegemonic impulse for health and well-being: A saga of the less well and the less worthy. In Diversity & Multiculturalism: A reader, Shirley R. Steinberg (Ed.), 363-376. New York: Peter Lang.*