

2003-2004 Report of the President's Commission on Diversity and Community

Contents:

- I. Co-chairs' message
 - II. Campus Climate Subcommittee report
 - III. Continuing the Conversation Subcommittee report
 - IV. Recruit/Retain Subcommittee report
-

I. Co-chairs' message

What follows is a report of the activities of the 2003-2004 President's Commission on Diversity and Community. Dr. Beth McCoy and Dr. Lenny Sancilio co-chaired the Commission during the Fall 2003 semester, with Dr. Sancilio chairing the Commission in the Spring while Dr. McCoy was on sabbatical.

In finalizing the charge to the 2002-2003 Commission, on September 16, 2003 the College Senate passed a second reading supporting the College's Statement on Community and Diversity. On October 10, 2003 the Statement was formally approved and accepted by President Christopher C. Dahl. It reads:

Statement on Community and Diversity

Geneseo holds among its core values the ideals of community and diversity.

Our community is defined as a group of faculty, students and staff who live and work together at Geneseo because they share common goals that are based on the ideals of higher education rooted in the liberal arts.

Although they share common goals, the members of the Geneseo community also differ in many ways. Diversity at Geneseo is defined in part as differences in individuals that are manifested in their race, ethnicity, national origin, language heritage, world-view, religion, gender, sexual orientation, class, physical ability, learning style, geographic background, mental health, age, and relationship status.

Geneseo recognizes that the individuals who make up our community bring to it unique perspectives and knowledge that contribute to its richness and vibrancy.

Because Geneseo also holds educational excellence among its core values, it recognizes that its progress as a community toward such excellence is predicated on its ability to embrace both the diversity of its members and the vigorous exchange of their ideas.

Geneseo calls all members of our community to share responsibility for the ongoing work of continually recreating a sense of inclusion, belonging, and empowerment, so that together we will achieve our individual and collective aims, and experience the intellectual liberation that is at the heart of the educational enterprise.

Dr. Dahl charged the 2003-2004 Commission with “Getting out the word.” Given the legal landscape of the time, the Statement was not as widely disseminated as members of the Commission would have hoped. While presentations to the College Council and Central Council of the Student Association were beneficial, as were promoting the statement at Orientation, among other venues, additional educational presentation, promotion and discussion, within guidelines provided by SUNY Legal Counsel and System Administration should continue to be explored. Additionally, it is recommended that the Commission not be primarily involved in the public relations work of promoting the Statement. Instead, already established mechanisms for promotion be utilized.

This past year continued to lay the foundation for raising people’s awareness and consciousness about diversity and campus climate. First, the Campus Climate subcommittee, chaired by Dr. Heidi Levine, carried on the research begun by Drs. Chierici and Zhao in examining campus climate and attitudes toward inclusion and assimilation. This past year saw significant progress in addressing the establishment of procedures for regularly measuring campus climate; in understanding the campus as perceived by people from diverse backgrounds; in determining the instruments needed to measure climate for students and employees; and for finding “dashboard indicators” by which we can track campus climate over time. Over fifteen hundred students, faculty and staff completed this past year’s campus climate survey. Unfortunately due to staffing changes in the Office of Institutional Research data analysis has not yet been completed. Analysis of data should be a priority for the upcoming year. Additionally, creating a committee to review the viability of utilizing the suggested “dashboard indicators”, as well as a mechanism to track campus climate through such indicators needs to be established. Further, procedures for future qualitative analyses need to be formulated. (For a full report from the Campus Climate Subcommittee, see the Section II.) Second, the Continuing the Conversation subcommittee, chaired by Joe Van Remmen, explored the feasibility of using a “deliberative dialogue” model to foster discussion and understanding of diversity and diversity-related issues. In April 2004 a proposal to send a Geneseo contingent to Montgomery College in Rockville, MD was accepted by Dr. Dahl. Ten facilitators, comprising students, faculty, and staff were trained this past June in the “deliberative dialogue” process, with the goal of expanding the dialogue to others on the campus through a facilitated discussion in September. Continuing the Conversation, specifically as it relates to engaging diversity in the classroom, should be a focal point in the upcoming year, with the goal of weaving the process into the fabric of

the College, including the College's Mission and Goals. . (For a full report from the Continuing the Conversation Subcommittee, see the Section III.)

The last subcommittee charged by President Dahl was that of "Recruitment and Retention of Students from Traditionally Under-represented Groups", chaired by Dr, Mike Schinski. This subcommittee continued to work with Admissions to understand better how the admissions process works, and to explore ways in which members of the College community might assist in recruiting students of color and students from other traditionally under-represented groups. This past year seems to be an excellent year for increasing the diversity of our student body, but we cannot be satisfied. A review of this past year's recruitment process, with special attention paid to successes and failures should be completed. Additionally, recommendations made by this sub-committee should be reviewed and implemented, as appropriate. (For a full report from the Recruitment and Retention Subcommittee, see the Section IV.)

In addition to the aforementioned review and recommendations, three additional projects should be undertaken. First, based on the federal Hate and Bias Reporting Act of 1990, and the New York State Hate Crimes Act of 2000, New York State Education Law - Article 129A was passed. Among other things, this law mandates that campuses should provide incoming students (freshmen and transfers) with educational programs on bias-related crime prevention. Ms. Kelly Clark, Mr. Joe VanRemmen, and Dr. Monica Schneider took primary responsibility for Geneseo's program, specifically as it relates to the spirit, as well as the letter, of the law. A thorough review of the program should be completed. Second, this passed year was a difficult one in terms of student-of-color comfort on campus; this was due in large part to a series of anonymous, seemingly random messages. President Dahl called together the executive boards of selected student groups to open dialogue and mend relationships. He is to be commended for this, and he should continue these meeting. Specifically, it is recommended that he plan (at least) a once-a-semester meeting with student group executive boards to maintain the relationship and lay the groundwork for further work. Additionally, the executive boards of each group should be encouraged to appoint one organization member to regularly attend Commission meetings and report back to their groups. Third, in order to know where we really are, we need to know where we have been. In this vein, the President, either through the Commission, or through a special appointment (e.g., Dr. Tom Greenfield), should conduct a thorough review of the Commission reports of the last few years to determine which recommendations have been acted upon, fulfilled, in progress, or not touched. It is often said that "nothing ever changes" or "nothing is ever done." Let us determine if the data supports the contentions.

Active, working members of the Commission should be commended and thanked for their work this past year. Much was accomplished, but more needs to be done. In this

light, a kick-off retreat should be scheduled for the beginning of the Fall semester. Progress is being made; let's keep the momentum going.

II. CAMPUS CLIMATE SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT: 2003-2004

Submitted by: Dr. Heidi Levine

President Dahl's 2003-04 charge to the Commission on Diversity and Community included addressing issues related to campus climate. More specifically, the president identified the following objectives related to campus climate:

- 1) Establish procedures for regularly measuring campus climate;
- 2) Understand the campus as perceived by people from diverse backgrounds;
- 3) Determine instruments to measure campus climate for students and employees; and
- 4) Find "dashboard indicators" by which we can track campus climate over time.

Our subcommittee has made significant progress in addressing each of these objectives. Following is a summary of our work and recommendations.

Procedures for Regularly Measuring Campus Climate

During AY 2000-01 Professors Zhiming Zhao and Rosemarie Chierici conducted an extensive assessment of the climate at Geneseo related to diversity issues. This study included both quantitative and qualitative components. At that time Professors Zhao and Chierici recommended that their study be replicated every three years in order to gain a picture of change over time. They particularly noted that this timeframe would enable comparisons to be made of students' perspectives as freshmen and seniors.

The subcommittee recommends the following modification of this plan. We agree that formal campus climate assessment should be conducted every three years. However, we recommend that this regular assessment be confined to quantitative surveys of the students, faculty and staff, and that qualitative studies be incorporated into the assessment process every two to three cycles. Because the subcommittee conducted a quantitative assessment this year, if our recommendation is followed, the next quantitative studies should be carried out in AY 2006-07 and 2009-10, with a qualitative component added to one of those two assessments.

Instruments and Current Climate

With the assistance of Assistant Vice President for Human Resources, Edna Chun, and Director of Institutional Research, Deborah Suzzane, the subcommittee identified instruments and resources for assessing climate related to diversity. We decided to conduct a quantitative assessment this year utilizing the instrument developed by Zhao and Chierici. This allowed us to gather data that could be used to make the type of freshman to senior comparison described above. Prior to the next assessment cycle a

review of instruments available should be conducted in order to determine whether to continue using the Zhao-Chierici survey versus another instrument.

The Zhao-Chierici survey consists of 40 questions plus a demographic section. The first 34 items are identical for all three sample groups, and are broken into the following categories: Social Environment (e.g., “SUNY Geneseo is a welcoming community for people of diverse backgrounds.” “The campus climate does not encourage me to move outside of my comfort-zone and get to know people who are different from me.”), Community-Building (e.g., “Compared to society as a whole, this is a caring community where the wellbeing of each member is supported and service to others is encouraged.”), Curriculum Development (e.g., “Diversity contributes to the vitality of this community as a learning center.” “I would like to see more study-abroad opportunities available on campus.”), and Individual Growth (e.g., “Exposure to diversity is irrelevant in preparing me for the future success of my life/career.” “Learning to work with people who are different is essential to leadership abilities.”). The final section of the survey contains questions specific to each subject group (e.g., Student: “SUNY Geneseo provides co-curricular activities that meet the interest of students from different backgrounds.” Faculty: “Diversity has no place in my courses.” Staff: “I wish I had received more on-job training in diversity awareness.”).

The survey was conducted during the Spring 2004 semester, using the College’s Websurvey tool. Following approval from Geneseo’s Institutional Review Board, a description of the project and invitation to participate was sent from the President’s office via e-mail to every student, faculty and staff member. The e-mail included an embedded link to the appropriate version of the survey. A reminder was sent two weeks after the initial e-mail, and data collection was closed two weeks later.

A total of 1,237 students, 142 faculty and 181 staff members completed the survey. Among the students, 147 identified as individuals of color, 67 as gay/lesbian/bisexual (GLB), and 925 female. The subcommittee identified the following areas for further data analysis:

1. Differences in responses between the 2001 and 2004 administrations, specifically targeting areas of weakness identified in the 2001 report;
2. Comparisons between the three sample groups (students, faculty, staff)
3. Inter-group differences among the following student groups:
 - a. Students of color – White students
 - b. GLB – heterosexual students
 - c. Male – female students
 - d. Academic class, specifically looking at differences between first-year and senior students

A plan for carrying out these analyses is currently being reviewed, with the goal of completing this data analysis prior to the end of the Fall 2004 semester.

Dashboard Indicators

With input from Deborah Suzzane, the subcommittee defined “dashboard indicators” as indirect measures or reflections of the campus’s climate related to diversity. The subcommittee identified the following indicators as possible bases of additional campus climate assessment:

- Reports of bias-related incidents
- Current percentage-levels of faculty/staff/students from “minority” groups
- Tracking implementation of new courses addressing diversity-related topics
- Numbers of speakers/forums/programs on diversity-related topics
- Personnel and Admissions data on numbers of minority applications and yields
- Senior survey data

After determining whether these, or other, indicators are appropriate measures of Geneseo’s climate, collaborative efforts with the various departments involved must be undertaken in order to collect the relevant data. These data should then be shared with the Commission on Diversity and Community.

In closing I wish to recognize the dedication and hard work of the other members of this subcommittee: Tabitha Buggie-Hunt, Marie Henry, Zhiming Zhao, and our student representative, Leigh Miller. Without the high level of commitment of each of these individuals we would not have been able to complete the amount of work we did this year, going beyond President Dahl’s charge to actually undertake an assessment of our current students, faculty and staff.

I welcome your comments and suggestions, and look forward to continuing to address these important issues in the coming year.

III. CONTINUING THE CONVERSATION SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT: 2003-2004

Submitted by: Mr. Joe Van Remmen

Committee Members: Irene Belyakov, Kelly Clark, Ralph Carrasquillo (Volunteer Facilitator) Cindy Durand, Becky Glass (representing the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning), Cristina Geiger, Dave Geiger (Volunteer Facilitator), Savi Iyer (Volunteer Facilitator), Maria Lima, Bob Owens, Kate Steinnagel, Joe Van Remmen (Chair),

Note:

Much of this subcommittees activities have already been documented in a Proposal submitted to President Dahl through Dr. Sancilio on March 30th 2004, and approved by the President on April 12th 2004. This proposal explained the committees' recommendation that the use of a dialogue would be a strong addition to improving communication and building community on the SUNY Geneseo campus. This proposal also recommended that the college send community members to be trained to facilitate dialogue. The proposal is an addendum to this report.

On November 20th 2003 the President gave the Diversity Commission specific charges to look into for the Spring 2004 semester. A subcommittee was formed in January 2004 and the charges were reviewed.

The Charges are as follows: (underlining mine)

“As we have already seen, conversations about race, ethnicity, and practical issues involving diversity are sometimes difficult, but they are vital to strengthening our academic community and building a more inclusive College.

In the coming year, I charge the Commission to work with the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning to organize a series of interdepartmental faculty roundtables about the rewards and challenges of engaging diversity in the classroom. As further means of continuing the conversation, I suggest that the commission also explore using the AAHE's "Seven Principles of Good Practice in Undergraduate Education" as a springboard for discussion and that they also consider making use of the process of "Deliberative Dialogue" to foster discussion and understanding. Exploration and possible use of "Deliberative Dialogue" might also be connected with Geneseo's participation in AASCU's American Democracy Project, which has the further benefit of being a joint initiative between Academic Affairs and Student and Campus Life.”

Due to the specificity of the charges our subcommittee invited the Director of the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL) to join us. With the Director of CETL we started by looking into methods communities use to communicate on issues important to them.

We read, reviewed and discussed several documents focusing on Deliberative Dialogue and also watched a video on the Deliberative Dialogue process that we received from Franklin Pierce College. We read through web sites involving Dialogue the most prominent of those being the Study Circles web site at www.studycircles.org and the National Issues Forum Institute web site at www.nifi.org.

Throughout our work during the semester as members found related topics to Dialogue they brought them forth for sharing with the group.

The subcommittee then looked at the charges and broke them down into two individual pieces.

The President's charges:

- 1. I charge the commission to work with the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning to organize a series of interdepartmental faculty roundtables about the rewards and challenges of engaging diversity in the classroom.*
- 2. As further means of continuing the conversation, I suggest that the commission also explore using the AAHE's "Seven Principles of Good Practice in Undergraduate education" as a springboard for discussion and that they also consider making use of the process of "Deliberative Dialogue" to foster discussion and understanding.*

After discussions and review of pertinent information the committee felt that "dialogue" offered a communication tool that would seem to be effective in providing us the means to not only answer Charge 1 from the President but as a method for the community to discuss issues of interest to it.

So often when talking about an issue only those from specific formally outlined viewpoints show up to defend their position. The ability to use dialogue (communication intended to offer a variety of viewpoints in a non-confrontational non-debate format) seems to offer the widest net in capturing members with diverse opinions and making them feel comfortable to express themselves without getting locked in early to "positions".

The subcommittee felt dialogue offered the unique ability opportunity for different members to share their feelings and thoughts in a non-combative rather than debate

format and offer all members, faculty, staff, students, an equal opportunity to speak and be heard.

Students, Faculty and Staff should be invited to partake in dialogue so that the widest possible views can be explored. The inclusion of the community as a whole provides us with the opportunity to incorporate the, “Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education” mentioned by President Dahl.

Specifically these three:

1. *Good Practice encourages student-faculty contact,*
2. *Good practice encourages active learning,*
3. *Good practice respects diverse talents and ways of learning.*

The committee in embracing “dialogue” views the faculty roundtable around the theme of “Engaging Diversity in the Classroom” as an initial introduction of the dialogue process. It is the committees’ hope that dialogue becomes a standard option for communicating at the college.

The committee notes that the use of “Dialogue” would seem to support many parts of the colleges’ Mission, Values, and Planning Goals:

Mission

“...The entire college community works together to develop socially responsible citizens with skills and values important to the pursuit of an enriched life and success in the world.”

Values

“...The College realizes this through a spirit of cooperation and collaboration among all members of the community.”

“Geneseo

Values:

Excellence, and upholds high standards for intellectual inquiry and scholarly achievement;

Innovation, and affirms a spirit of exploration that fosters continued excellence;

Community, and embraces the educational aspirations and interests that its members share;

Diversity, and respects the unique contributions of each individual to the campus community;

Integrity, and promotes the development of ethical citizens; Service to society, and models the qualities it seeks to develop in its students;

Planning Goals

- 1. Provide every student the highest quality education through a rigorous, challenging, and active learning experience in close working relationships with faculty and staff that encourages intellectual engagement and personal growth.*
- 2. Recruit, support, and foster the development of a diverse community of outstanding students, faculty, and staff.*
- 3. Enrich the collegiate experience by strengthening the integration between curricular and co-curricular programs.*

During the course of the semester the subcommittee had a visit from interim-Provost Dave Gordon who is also co-chairing a committee on The American Democracy Project. Dr. Gordon explained the project and we explained what we were working on. This has led to “Dialogue” receiving support from both the Provosts’ Office and the American Democracy Project.

In June 2004, members of our college drove to Maryland and participated in a 2-day workshop designed to train people to facilitate dialogues. The participants from SUNY Geneseo included: 2 students, 3 staff and 5 faculty. During the workshop the participants learned about the dialogue process as well as attaining a level of skill by facilitating groups in mock dialogues. Participants also worked recording the Dialogues as well as giving critiques of each other facilitation’s. The group learned much and came away more confident and more convinced that “Dialogue” could be an important part of community building improved communication on our campus.

Addendum

Report and Proposal
by the
President's Commission on Community and Diversity
Subcommittee on
"Continuing the Conversation"
March 2004

Committee Members: Joe Van Remmen (chair), Cristina Geiger, Bob Owens, Maria Lima, Kelly Clark, students Kate Steinnagel and Cindy Durand, Becky Glass (adjunct member representing the Teaching and Learning Center)

The President's Charge to the subcommittee:

As we have already seen, conversations about race, ethnicity, and practical issues involving diversity are sometimes difficult, but they are vital to strengthening our academic community and building a more inclusive College. In the coming year, I charge the Commission to work with the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning to organize a series of interdepartmental faculty roundtables about the rewards and challenges of engaging diversity in the classroom. As further means of continuing the conversation, I suggest that the commission also explore using the AAHE's "Seven Principles of Good Practice in Undergraduate Education" as a springboard for discussion and that they also consider making use of the process of "Deliberative Dialogue" to foster discussion and understanding. Exploration and possible use of "Deliberative Dialogue" might also be connected with Geneseo's participation in ASCU's American Democracy Project, which has the further benefit of being a joint initiative between Academic Affairs and Student and Campus Life.

The Groundwork

The subcommittee members spent the first few weeks of the semester educating themselves about the process of "deliberative dialogue." In addition to exploring web sites, members viewed a video produced by Franklin Pierce College (Rindge, NH) and talked with Joni Doherty, the Director of the New England Center for Civic Life at Franklin Pierce College.

"Deliberative Dialogue" frames an issue to provide 3-4 "choices" or viewpoints that the trained facilitator provides to the group in the course of a 1 1/2 to 2 hour session. The group discusses each choice using a process that moves from a "statement of the approach" through "what should be done" to "drawbacks, dangers, trade-offs" so that each viewpoint is processed using the same framework. We learned that a goal of deliberative dialogue is to find common ground on which people who hold different

viewpoints can agree with others in the group. This goal is different than compromise, which implies that people move from their original positions.

Franklin Pierce College makes a distinction between deliberative dialogue, which it sees as a one-time discussion, and sustained dialogue, which is an on-going discussion that develops *from* a deliberative dialogue. Participants in a sustained dialogue progress “from personal experience through examining all points of view to consideration of strategies for action and change” (Topsfield Foundation, 2003).

Overview of the Proposal

The subcommittee proposes that SUNY-Geneseo engage in both deliberative and sustained dialogue, to begin Fall 2004. We propose that five interdisciplinary Dialogue Groups of faculty, staff, and students be constituted. Given the value of diversity (in its many forms) to the college, the community, and the education of students, the charge to the Dialogue Groups is that they explore the many meanings of diversity within the classroom and develop recommendations for engaging diversity in classrooms by November 1, 2004. This work should be framed in the context of the Middle States expectation that Geneseo will have made progress toward its diversity goals by 2006. The recommendations of the Dialogue Groups are not expected to be “one size fits all” but are expected to take into account that “engaging diversity in the classroom” varies by discipline or area.

The Dialogue Groups would gather for a half-day retreat the week before the Fall 04 semester begins, and engage in deliberative dialogue on the issue of diversity in the classroom using SUNY-Geneseo faculty and staff facilitators who have been trained in moderating deliberative dialogue. The facilitators could present the 7 principles of best educational practice (see attached) as a tool to guide the discussions for the how and why to engage diversity in the classroom

Each Dialogue Group would then meet every two weeks for three sessions in September and October 2004, to develop their recommendations through sustained dialogue (following up their deliberative dialogue experiences). The recommendation reports from the original groups would be submitted to President Dahl, the Commission on Community and Diversity, and to Dean Susan Bailey (who is heading the mid-term report to the Middle States Accreditation Team).

A fourth session would re-arrange the Dialogue Group members so that participants from similar disciplines (e.g., natural scientists, social scientists, Humanities representatives) would meet one time to share with each other the ideas that each of their original groups had developed.

In the section below, the subcommittee suggests mechanisms for insuring that the kinds of dialogue described in the project above will be continued long term.

Detailed Proposal

The Dialogue Groups

The subcommittee proposes that each Dialogue Group consist of about 12 members – 8 faculty and staff, and 4 students. We suggest that each Dialogue Group include untenured and tenured faculty from an array of departments, as well as staff from Student and Campus Life and other appropriate divisions. We suggest that students be included because they are able to provide fresh ideas and give grounding to the proposals made by faculty and staff about engaging diversity in the classroom.

The subcommittee believes it will be most effective for President Dahl to issue invitations to the faculty and staff members to participate in the Dialogue Groups. The subcommittee will propose a list of names that will include at least some chairs of departments. We consider it important for department chairs to be involved in the dialogue, so there is support for faculty who actively embrace the recommendations that the Dialogue Groups propose.

Ideally, we propose 5 Dialogue Groups for a total of 40 faculty and staff and 20 students.

The Facilitators

According to our research on deliberative dialogue, facilitators need specific training in deliberative dialogue for this process to be effective. Because deliberative and sustained dialogues differ from other kinds of discussions in that the participants do not attempt to “win” each other over, promote their viewpoint over all others, or be “in the right,” facilitators must be well-trained to remind participants of the “rules” of the dialogue, ask probing questions to keep the discussion moving through the process of exploring each of the three or four approaches to the issue, remain neutral and reinforce the value of deliberating all approaches to the topic, and leave time for the group to reflect at the end of the dialogue.

The subcommittee proposes that a team of eight faculty and staff, plus two students, be trained in deliberative dialogue during the summer preceding Fall 04. We have located a training within driving distance that will be held June 10-11, 2004 through the Office for Equity and Diversity, Montgomery College, Rockville, MD. (A budget for this training is attached.)

The ten trained facilitators would moderate in pairs the opening deliberative dialogues at the retreat, and the sustained dialogues of the five Dialogue Groups throughout September and October. Beyond this semester commitment, the trained facilitators will be expected to provide training to others on campus to fulfill the subcommittee’s long

term goal of offering regular opportunities for deliberative and sustained dialogues as an on-going part of Geneseo's commitment to embrace diversity.

Student facilitators would train other students, such as RAs and Student Association members, who could then introduce deliberative dialogues as a component of their regular activities. The subcommittee proposes that student facilitator training be integrated with the GOLD Leadership Program; we have talked with Tom Matthews who is interested in this proposal.

Short-term Goals

The members of the five interdisciplinary Dialogue Groups will, through deliberative dialogue at their initial retreat, reach a common ground that will allow them to carry on a productive sustained dialogue about how to engage diversity in classrooms of all disciplines. This dialogue will result in specific recommendations by November 1, 2004 of practices that the group members have identified as feasible, which may be adopted by the individual group members and their department colleagues in their classrooms, and may be used in Geneseo's mid-term report to the Middle States Accreditation Team.

Long-term Goals

The subcommittee thinks continuing the conversation is one of the most important facets of the proposal. We propose that deliberative and sustained dialogues on race and ethnicity (and possibly other topics) become a regular facet of the Geneseo experience. Community members could connect with a dialogue through many avenues. For example, an opportunity for deliberative dialogues might be included in the first-year experience, possibly through the Intd 101 one-credit courses. Another avenue might be for new faculty to engage in a deliberative dialogue in their second semester at Geneseo.

Every semester, Franklin Pierce College offers deliberative dialogues on the subject of "Improving Race and Ethnic Relations on Campus" as well as others, including one about "Who Owns Democracy" (which would fit particularly well with our American Democracy Project). The subcommittee suggests that this is a model that Geneseo should consider adopting

In short, the subcommittee envisions a cascading effort in which the original facilitators train other facilitators while also conducting the Dialogue Groups. These "second generation" facilitators would, in turn, conduct deliberative and sustained dialogues within departments and other administrative units. For example, Residence Life staff could conduct dialogues in student living units. Faculty could give more attention to diversity issues in their curriculum through the use of deliberative dialogue. First - year seminar instructors could incorporate a dialogue into the first year experience. The dialogues are not meant as a one-time endeavor but more as a way of continuing to fulfill

our educational mission. As such, the dialogues should continue and be reinvigorated with each new class of students and each new crop of faculty.

Meeting Geneseo's Mission and Goals

We believe this proposal is in keeping with Geneseo's values and with the mission of the college. The introduction and use of deliberative and sustained dialogues specifically address the following three of the college's planning goals:

- “1. Provide every student the highest quality education through a rigorous, challenging, and active learning experience in close working relationships with faculty and staff that encourages intellectual engagement and personal growth.*
- 2. Recruit, support, and foster the development of a diverse community of outstanding students, faculty, and staff.*
- 3. Enrich the collegiate experience by strengthening the integration between curricular and co-curricular programs. “*

7 Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education

1. Good practice encourages student-faculty contact

Frequent student-faculty contact in and out of classes is the most important factor in student motivation and involvement.

2. Good practice encourages cooperation among students

Good learning, like good work, is collaborative and social, not competitive and isolated.

3. Good practice encourages active learning

Students must talk about what they are learning, write about it, relate it to past experiences, and apply it to their daily lives.

4. Good practice gives prompt feedback

Knowing what you know and don't know focuses learning. Students need frequent opportunities to perform and receive suggestions for improvement.

5. Good practice emphasizes time on task

Time plus energy equals learning. Allocating realistic amounts of time means effective learning.

6. Good practice communicates high expectations

High expectations are important for everyone, for the poorly prepared, the unmotivated, and for the motivated.

7. Good practice respects diverse talents and ways of learning

Students need the opportunity to show their talents and learn in ways that work for them.

AAHE Bulletin

**BUDGET FOR DELIBERATIVE DIALOGUE FACILITATOR TRAINING
FOR 10 FACULTY, STAFF, AND STUDENTS**

Office of Equity and Diversity, Montgomery College, Rockville, MD, June 10-11, 2004

Funding for ten trainees is requested because this proposal calls for five Dialogue Groups, and ten trained facilitators would permit us to use two facilitators per group.

Further, the proposal calls for those facilitators trained for the Fall 04 Dialogue Groups to train others on campus, so the greater number who receive the original training, the greater the “cascade effect” to the “second generation” of facilitators.

Two student members of the subcommittee, who are looking forward to training other students in deliberative dialogue as well as helping to facilitate the Dialogue Groups in Fall04, both live in the New York City area and plan to drive together to the training in Maryland.

Those who have volunteered to be facilitators are: Bob Owens, Cristina Geiger, Joe Van Remmen, Kelly Clark, Becky Glass, and students Katie Steinnagel, Cindy Durand

Those who may be willing to be facilitators include: Irene Belyakov, Rose Marie Chierici, Beth McCoy, Monica Schneider. Lenny Sancilio, David Geiger, Gene Griffing

EXPENSE	PER PERSON	TOTAL
Registration Fee	\$195 includes meals	\$1950
Lodging (Quality Inn Suites)		
\$116/night/2 beds	\$116 for 2 nights	\$ 580
Transportation		
8 passenger van for F/S	\$40 + .30/mile/330 miles	\$ 139
mileage for 2 students driving from NYC	.36/mile/235 miles	\$ 84
TOTAL		\$2753 (or \$275/facilitator)

IV. RECRUIT/RETAIN SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT: 2003-2004

Submitted by: Dr. Michael Schinski

Members: George Anselme, Charles Batey, Ralph Carrasquillo, Calvin Gantt, Corrine Grinapol, Debbie Hill, Angela Jackson, Don Marozas, Ashley Poole, Michael Schinski (chair), Monica Schnieder, Kristine Shay, Dan Strang

Charge from President Dahl: The Recruit/Retain Subcommittee was charged with continuing to work with Admissions to better understand how the admissions process works and explore ways in which members of the College community might assist in recruiting and retaining students of color and other traditionally under-represented groups. These efforts should work in tandem with our campus's efforts to recruit and retain employees from traditionally under-represented groups, coordinated by the Assistant Vice President for Human Resources.

During the 2003/2004 academic year, the Recruit/Retain Subcommittee focused on issues regarding the recruitment and retention of students and faculty and staff who contribute significantly to the development of a diverse community. The subcommittee worked closely with representatives from the Admissions Office and Human Resources to understand what the College is currently doing and to explore ways in which faculty, staff, students, and alumni can be involved in supporting the process.

I. Recruitment and Retention of Students from Traditionally Under-Represented Groups

Kris Shay and George Anselme from the Admissions office reported to the Recruit/Retain Subcommittee about current recruitment practices. George reported on increased efforts to recruit students from traditionally under-represented groups. These included efforts such as recruiting trips to New York City, a bus trip from the New York city area, and a New York City fly in where students were made aware of a cheap flight into Rochester and admissions representatives would meet them at the airport and take them to and from campus. Kris Shay reported that we have a pretty solid pool of ALANA students that have been accepted for admission, but the challenge is to get them to commit to attend Geneseo. It is a very competitive marketplace with many other schools offering these students significantly more financial aid than Geneseo. The college's yield rate for the ALANA students is only 9% compared to the overall yield rate of 27%. There was discussion regarding how students, faculty and staff involvement is important in the outreach, recruitment, and retention of ALANA students. Specifically, it was suggested that phone calls from faculty and students to accepted ALANA students could help to improve the yield rate.

With regards to retention of students from traditionally under-represented groups, a couple of primary issues were identified. First of all, it was recognized that a more

diverse faculty would provide a variety of role models and mentoring systems crucial in successfully retaining and graduating a more diverse student body. Secondly, it was pointed out that certain personal care products are not available in Geneseo and some of our ALANA students and faculty must go to Rochester to purchase them. While this may seem a small point, it is just another obstacle to overcome in acclimating to a new and different community.

The subcommittee makes the following recommendations regarding the recruitment and retention of students from traditionally under-represented groups.

1. The college should pursue targeted fundraising for both scholarships for ALANA students and more aggressive recruitment for ALANA students.
2. A scholarship fund for ALANA students should be set up within the Geneseo Foundation to which faculty and staff could contribute.
3. Continued College support of efforts to increase the diversity of the pool of applicants and the yield rate of ALANA students including such things as the recruiting at urban centers, the NYC bus trip, fly ins, and personal phone calls.
4. A representative from the college should meet with the store manager at the Geneseo Walmart and Wegmans to discuss stocking some specific personal care products for the College's ALANA students, faculty and staff.
5. Continued College support for the TOP program.
6. Admissions should continue to expand efforts to use faculty, staff, students, and alumni in helping to recruit ALANA students.
7. The college should find ways to reward faculty and staff for giving their time and energy to help to recruit and retain students from traditionally under-represented groups.

II. Recruitment and Retention of Faculty and Staff from Traditionally Under-Groups.

This spring, Charles Batey, the College's new Assistant Director of Affirmative Action and Employment was added as a member of the subcommittee. Charles updated the subcommittee on the current practices being employed by the College to recruit, hire, and retain faculty and staff from traditionally under-represented groups. He shared his plans to take an aggressive, proactive approach in recruiting a more diverse faculty and staff. This involves encouraging departments to look beyond the traditional pools and sources for potential new hires. There was also discussion about how a diverse faculty and staff is a critical component in being able to attract and retain a diverse student body.

The subcommittee makes the following recommendations regarding the recruitment and retention of faculty and staff from traditionally under-represented groups.

1. The college should develop new recruitment materials, and should do so specifically considering the goal of building a more diverse faculty and staff.
2. The college should investigate the possibility of a faculty exchange with historically ALANA colleges to increase ALANA faculty presence on campus and to develop relationships with these institutions.
3. The college should support an aggressive, proactive approach to recruiting ALANA faculty and staff as outlined by Dr. Batey.