

The President's Commission on Diversity and Community 2009 – 2010 Report

Submitted by: Monica Schneider and Irene Belyakov

Commission Members

Irene Belyakov; Lecturer and ESL Coordinator (co-chair)
Khadija Campbell; student
Alexandra Carlo; Staff Psychologist, Student Health and Counseling
Ben Delozier; Residence Director, Onondaga Hall
Celia Easton, Dean of Residential Living
Taimur Gibson; student
Becky Glass; Executive Assistant to the President
David Gordon; Associate Provost
Ashley Guarino; student
Kim Harvey; Coordinator of Residential Living
Scott Hemer; Coach, Department of Athletics and Recreation
Harry Howe; Professor, School of Business
Wendi Kinney; Coordinator, Greek Affairs & Off-Campus Living
David Levy; Assistant Professor, Philosophy
Maria Perpetua Socorro U. Liwanag; Assistant Professor, School of Education
Gloria Lopez; Associate Director, Human Resources/Director of Affirmative Action
Jeannette Molina; Director, Dual Diploma and ESL
Garry Morgan; Residence Director, Allegany Hall
Susan Norman; Director, Xerox Center for Multicultural Education
Robert Owens; Professor, Communicative Disorders and Sciences
David Parfitt; Director, Teaching and Learning Center
Steve Radi; Interim Director, Student Health and Counseling
Polly Radosh; Dean of the College
Julie Rao, Director, Institutional Research
Malissa Rivera; Student
Fatima Rodriguez-Johnson; Coordinator, Multicultural Programs and Services
Monica Schneider; Associate Professor, Psychology (co-chair)
Sherry Schwartz; Associate Professor, School of Education
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
Linda Ware; Associate Professor, School of Education
Robert Wayland-Smith; Geneseo Board
Lindsey Wiltse; Student
Peggy Wirth; Nurse Practitioner, Student Health and Counseling

Overall Direction and Emphasis of the Commission's Work

In 2007-2008, the Commission set a goal 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. To accomplish these goals, changes were made to the structure and function of the various subcommittees. Specifically, the subcommittees were redesigned to work in a more integrated fashion with each other and to include non-Commission members. In addition, all subcommittees were charged with identifying the most effective ways of providing outreach and building community, with an emphasis on action-oriented outcomes.

Over the past three years, the Commission has made significant strides in accomplishing its mission and goals. The Commission now includes more members of the college community than ever before, with approximately 37 Commission members and 11 non-Commission members serving on various subcommittees. In addition, the Deliberative Dialogues subcommittee has continued to play a major role in building community by identifying relevant topics, fostering dialogue among community members, and offering facilitator training in conjunction with other programs on campus (e.g., Teaching and Learning Center, GOLD Leadership Program). Most importantly, several Commission subcommittees have developed programs and initiatives that have the potential to build campus community on a larger scale and to significantly enhance the functioning of the College related to diversity issues. Most notable among these are the Real World Geneseo program and the Campus Diversity Plan.

Below is a summary of the activities of each subcommittee as well as a list of recommendations for the next academic year. The complete 2009 – 2010 subcommittee reports can be found in the appendices.

Summary of Activities: 2009-2010

The Student and Campus Engagement Subcommittee: This past year, two separate subcommittees were formed: the Real World Geneseo subcommittee (RWG) and the Student and Campus Engagement subcommittee (SACES). However, due to the overlapping membership and challenges of implementing a new program, the two subcommittees functioned essentially as one subcommittee. Specifically, SACES implemented the Real World at Geneseo program, a pilot 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. In fall 2009, 40 second and third-year students were selected to participate in the program. In spring 2010, a total of 26 students participated in a 4-day experiential residential retreat, completed one of a series of predetermined courses addressing important diversity-related issues, and participated in a 1 credit reflective seminar with other members in the RWG program. In

addition, these students completed video diaries, surveys, and interviews designed to provide both quantitative and qualitative assessments of the program. The data are currently being analyzed by three different faculty research teams. Moreover, SACES is in the process of finalizing plans to implement a revised version of this program, entitled Real World at Geneseo II to be conducted in 2010-2011.

Implementation of the RWG program (both the pilot program and RWGII) has required a significant amount of dedication and commitment on the part of SACES members. The amount of time that they have dedicated to this project 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. 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.

The 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." This subcommittee was formed to develop a campus-wide diversity plan to be submitted to the SPG for consideration. The Diversity Plan Subcommittee worked diligently to finalize their proposal of a campus-wide diversity plan that includes 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 discussed and approved by the Commission. This subcommittee will present their Diversity Plan to the Strategic Planning Group in the fall.

The Assessment Subcommittee: The Assessment Subcommittee continued to examine dashboard indicators of students' perceptions of diversity and community with an emphasis on diversity as it is related to race and ethnicity. Specifically, the Assessment Subcommittee updated the diversity indicators that they used to examine the retention rates of students of color and the current proportion of students, faculty, and staff of color at SUNY Geneseo. With the completion of the proposed Diversity Plan, the Assessment Subcommittee is now prepared to work in conjunction with the Diversity Plan Subcommittee in developing measurable outcomes for assessing the goals and objectives outlined in the plan.

The Deliberative Dialogues Subcommittee: The Deliberative Dialogues Subcommittee continued to seek innovative ways to increase its outreach and “continue the conversations.” For example, members of the DD Subcommittee trained students to be facilitators as part of the GOLD Leadership Program and the Xerox Multicultural Center. In response to feedback received from the campus community, the DD Subcommittee moved away from conducting two or three larger forums a year to running smaller, more frequent Deliberative Dialogue sessions on issues currently being addressed by the campus community. More specifically, the DD Subcommittee facilitated a dialogue on the “Six Big Ideas” in fall 2009 for 27 participants. In addition, they have been working with the organizers of the Sexual Assault Teach-In on possible dialogues that could be conducted in conjunction with the Teach-In next year.

Recommendations for 2009 -2010

Overall Direction of the Commission

1. The Commission needs to become more organized and structured given the increase in membership and the overlap in functioning between the subcommittees. To accomplish this goal, the Commission chairs should establish a pre-determined meeting time and schedule for the Commission as a whole as well as for the subcommittees. This schedule should be communicated to all members as early as possible.
2. The Commission has developed several programs and initiatives that address diversity-related needs identified by the campus community. In order for these programs and initiatives to succeed, they are going to require a commitment of resources and support from the Commission and the College. Therefore, the Commission should now be more action-oriented and focus its resources on the implementation of these projects.
3. In addition, 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.
4. 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. This can be done through the Commission as a whole and/or by its subcommittees.

5. 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
6. The Commission should continue gaining more visibility so that the college community will 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: continuing to support 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, faculty-l, 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.
7. The Commission should continue its efforts to invite, include, and reach out to members of the college community in ways that help support individuals and groups who may be feeling alienated and unsupported in the community.

Specific Recommendations for the Subcommittees

The Real World at Geneseo Program Subcommittee: This subcommittee should focus on the implementation and assessment of the RWG program by:

- Implementing the RWG II program – an expanded and revised version of the RWG pilot program conducted last year.
- Continuing to work in conjunction with the individuals involved in assessing the the RWG program to systematically gauge the effectiveness of the RWG program.

- Developing a strategy plan of where the project should be housed with staff support and resources – as part of an effort to sustain RWG.

The Student and Campus Engagement Subcommittee: Given the time and resources needed to implement the new RWG program last year, SACES did not have the resources to accomplish its other goals related to outreach and mentorship outside of this program. Therefore, it is recommended that SACES should be re-instituted as a separate subcommittee designed to focus on increasing outreach and building community with a diverse body of students.

- **Outreach:** We recommend that this subcommittee reach out to various student groups and organizations by attending their meetings in the hopes of identifying community and diversity-related issues that are currently relevant to the students. In addition, these interactions could serve as a mechanism for increasing the Commission's visibility as a viable resource.
- **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:** We recommend that the SACES subcommittee take over the PATH Awards using the process outlined in the SACES subcommittee annual report (see appendix).

The Diversity Plan Subcommittee:

- This subcommittee is ready to present the proposed campus diversity plan to the Strategic Planning Group and should work in conjunction with the Strategic Planning Group on developing a process for implementing the campus diversity plan.
- In order for the college community to fully accept the diversity plan, it is important to provide faculty, staff, and students with the opportunity to give feedback regarding the proposed recommendations. We recommend that the Diversity Plan Subcommittee play a major role in this process.
- This subcommittee needs to work in conjunction with the Assessment Subcommittee on developing an assessment plan.

The Assessment Subcommittee:

- This subcommittee should work in conjunction with the Diversity Plan Subcommittee on identifying measurable outcomes that can be used to assess the College's progress regarding the goals and objectives outlined in the Diversity Plan.
- In addition to providing support to the Diversity Plan Subcommittee, this subcommittee should continue to analyze the existing student data regarding diversity-related issues that are already being collected by the College. This includes:
 - Continuing to develop and administer the incoming student survey every year (to have direct access to information pertaining to diversity among the entering students).
 - Developing and presenting a report on the incoming class profile for the Faculty Senate and SA.
 - Identifying items on the senior survey that could be used to gauge campus climate issues related to diversity and developing additional items for this purpose.

Deliberative Dialogues Subcommittee:

Although the Deliberative Dialogues have been an effective component of the Commission's outreach to the SUNY Geneseo community in the past, this year it has become evident that there is a lack of interest in participating in Deliberative Dialogues in their present form. Therefore, we recommend that the DD Subcommittee:

- Discontinue campus-wide dialogues each semester in *their present form*. Instead, they should offer campus-wide dialogues only when relevant issues of wide-spread interest are identified on campus (e.g., in conjunction with the Sexual Assault Teach-in).
- Find ways to have sustained dialogues that are more directly integrated with specific issues of interest for various campus groups and divisions, possibly in residence halls or learning communities. Perhaps the DD Subcommittee could work with SACES in identifying what those issues might be for students.
- Examine different ways to engage people in the process of deliberative dialogues. For example, in the past, the DD subcommittee has been responsible for creating the DD approaches used in the dialogues. This process has been found to be time-consuming and ineffective in engaging participants. Perhaps the process of identifying possible perspectives on

an issue could be incorporated into the process of the actual dialogue. In this way, the interested community members will feel empowered to create their own approaches and be encouraged to examine the possible perspectives surrounding the issues and find solutions based on the common ground.

- Put more emphasis on student training in conjunction with already existing programs (e.g., GOLD Leadership workshops, teacher training through Xerox Center workshops).
- Put more emphasis on classroom use of Deliberative Dialogues:
 - New faculty training as part of incoming faculty orientation
 - Conduct workshops through the TLC
 - Help faculty design and run Deliberative Dialogues in their classes
- Increase student involvement by:
 - Offering dialogues in residence halls
 - Offering a dialogue for in-coming students as part of their orientation
 - Including topics of current student interest
- Systematically document the course and the recommendations of each dialogue and make this information accessible via MyCourses DD page already developed by the past subcommittees
- Examine possible ways to institutionalize Deliberative Dialogues. One possible solution is to house Deliberative Dialogues in the Teaching and Learning Center

The Faculty Development Subcommittee:

Originally, this subcommittee was charged with creating professional development opportunities for incoming faculty. However, due to the hiring freeze, focusing solely on the incoming faculty may not be an efficient way of changing the campus climate to be more sensitive to diversity issues. Therefore, we recommend that this subcommittee develop 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 Faculty Development Subcommittee should:

- 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.
- meet with the Provost with a model for faculty development

- make firm plans to initiate new faculty development as soon as the hiring freeze is lifted
- coordinate plans to offer the training to returning faculty via the Teaching and Learning Center

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, in spite of the difficulties the DD Subcommittee faced during the past school year. 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 programs and initiatives proposed in this report.

We would like to take this opportunity to thank the members of the Commission for their hard work and dedication. This past year, the Commission had the greatest number of members since its inception, reflecting the commitment of the SUNY Geneseo students, faculty, and staff toward issues of diversity and community. The amount of work accomplished and the quality of the programs and proposals developed by the subcommittees are remarkable. 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 outside of the Commission who contributed their ideas, concerns, and resources throughout the year. Many of the programs and proposals presented in this report are a direct result of the collaborations that emerged between Commission members and non-Commission members. Their continued support plays an invaluable role in the Commission's functioning.

Appendices

- I. Student and Campus Engagement
- II. Diversity Plan
- III. Assessment
- IV. Deliberative Dialogues

The Student and Campus Engagement Subcommittee
Annual Report 2009-2010

Committee Members:

Adele Costa, Student
Malissa Rivera, Student
Garry Morgan, Area Coordinator, Residence Life
Isaiah Tolbert, Resident Director, Residence Life
Patricia Gonzalez, AOP
Prof. Annmarie Urso, School of Education
Prof. Robert Owens, Dept. of Communicative Disorders
Susan Preston Norman, Xerox Center for Multicultural Teacher Education
Fatima Rodriguez Johnson, Office of Multicultural Programs & Services

RWG Assessment Researchers:

Monica Schneider
Julie Rao
Diantha Watts
Annmarie Urso
Elaine Cleaton

Real World Geneseo

During Fall semester, forty students (primarily sophomores and juniors) were accepted as participants for Real World Geneseo, a three phase project (experiential retreat, connecting courses and service learning). A total of twenty-six students participated in the experiential retreat on Thursday, January 14th-Sunday, January 17. Fifty-five percent of the students were female and 45% were male with 45% identifying as students of color and 55% identifying as Caucasian. The students were primarily middle class with 25% of the participants being born outside of the United States (Peru, Ghana, Japan, Trinidad, Korea, and India). In addition, 15% of the student identified themselves as Gay, Lesbian, or Bisexual.

We were very excited to have Prof. Robert Owens, Fatima Rodriguez Johnson, Katie Rogers and Susan Norman as full participants in the retreat with Beck Glass, Garry Morgan, and Isaiah Tolbert as visiting observers throughout the experience. Some cohorts of students will began their connecting courses on Tuesday, January 19th and all participants were involved in a weekly learning community where they continued their self-introspection, utilize readings and course work to create related service learning projects and working with diverse students.

There were approximately seventy-six dedicated contact hours of interactive workshops on racism, sexism, religious bias, classism and ableism were offered to the 26 participants and 4 Geneseo staff/faculty at the RWG retreat. Student video diaries, surveys, and post conference interviews have been assessed by three faculty research teams with IRB approvals to measure RWG impact on improving cultural competency.

Through participating in the 1 credit reflective lab, diversity focused connecting course, and 8 weeks of classroom discussion it was revealed that (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. Service learning proposals will be implemented during the summer and fall of 2010.

This pilot would not have been possible without the support of the President's Commission on Diversity and Community, the Bringing Theory to Practice Committee, and SUNY's Office of Equity and Diversity. The Student and Campus Engagement Subcommittee is planning for RWG II with a second \$10,000 grant from the State University of New York's Office of Equity and Diversity.

Real World Geneseo II

Phase I In July 2010, announcements of the program will be sent to all sophomore students linking to available on line applications with instructions for submission prior to September 15, 2010. Through this application process a diverse pool of sophomore students will be recruited to participate in a fall weekend retreat, October 9-12, 2010. During the retreat, a high level of trust will be established among participants and instructors to allow for personal growth and understanding. All participants are encouraged to develop a shared standard of behavior and expectations that are observed to insure a safe, productive small learning community. For the retreat, students will be transported to Camp Stella Maris located along scenic Conesus Lake. This facility will offer meeting space for the large and small discussion groups as well as appropriate living quarters. Modules include: Building Community and Cultural Sharing; Identity, Worldview, Race, Power and Privilege; Cycle of Socialization, Racial Identity Theory; Gender Bias, and Homophobia; Anti-Semitism and Xenophobia; Classism, Understanding Process, Cycle of Liberation; Becoming an Ally; Diversity and Inclusion; and Strategic planning. During the day, students will produce videodiaries, reflecting on the process and how they are feeling about the topics. Students will also keep journals of their experiences at the retreat. This retreat will be led by professional facilitators and overseen by onsite faculty and staff to ensure a safe and meaningful experience.

Phase II of the project begins with bi-weekly focus group meetings in the residence halls in preparation for coursework that the students will take together in the Spring 2010. Students follow up on their experiences post retreat and support each other efforts to integrate discussions of sensitive issues in their coursework and personal lives. The bi-weekly sessions will be guided by trained peer facilitators. In addition to nurturing and supporting the cultural development of students through self-reflective activities.

Phase III (Academic Excellence- infusing diversity creating academic excellence in all the courses a student takes)-

A new three-credit Spring semester course, INTD 288, is being designed specifically for this group of students. The course will further explore issues that were the focus of the retreat. These issues include but are not limited to: social and cultural diversity; societal manifestations of oppression; examination of dominant ideologies; dynamics of power relationships and poverty; social exchange and equity; social justice in America;

interrelated issues of race, class, work, public power, family and sexuality; and social institutions and social systems. The students will be expected to participate in a service learning activity as part of the INTD 288 course, which helps students explore how diversity issues manifest within and outside the academic setting.

PATH Awards

It has been suggested that the Student and Campus Subcommittee oversee the PATH awards as a part of its role within the commission. The PATH awards were created in academic year 1998-1999 to support Geneseo's commitment to: "Recruiting, supporting, and fostering the development of a diverse community of outstanding students, faculty and staff; respecting the unique contributions of each individual to the campus community; and developing socially responsible citizens with skills and values important to the pursuit of an enriched life and success in the world."

The SACES met with Joe Van Remmen who has served on the PATH committee in previous years. In consultation with Joe Van Remmen, the following process will be utilized next year as the SACES committee takes over this additional assignment.

1. A request for nominations will be sent out to all staff and all students
2. A working committee will be formed to review at nominations
3. The SACES will develop criteria for judging the nominations
4. There will be an acknowledgement of receipt for nominations.
5. The working committee will determine awardees.
6. The awards will be ordered and will be presented at the annual leadership awards ceremony.
7. The awardees will also be highlighted with a photo and description on the commission's website.

Recommendations:

1. The structure of the committee could benefit from having an additional working group dedicated to addressing boarder student and campus engagement initiatives.
2. In an effort to sustain RWG, a strategy plan should be developed as to where the project should be housed with staff support and resources.
3. To incorporate the PATH Awards into the Student and Campus Engagement committee responsibilities.

The SACES has enjoyed a productive year and looks forward to the 2010-2011 academic year.

Respectfully submitted by,

Susan Preston Norman, Co-chair
Fatima Rodriguez Johnson, Co-chair

**Report of the Diversity Plan Subcommittee
President's Commission on Diversity and Community
Spring, 2010**

Members

Khadija Campbell, Student (fall)
Alex Carlo, Student Health and Counseling
David Gordon, Office of the Provost (Chair)
Calvin Gantt, AOP (fall)
Ashley Guarino, Student
Scott Hemer, Athletics and Recreation
Harry Howe, School of Business
Gloria Lopez, Human Resources
Jeannette Molina, ESOL & Dual Degree Programs (fall)
Farooq Sheikh, School of Business
Kathy Trainor, Student and Campus Life

Activity

In 2008-2009, the Diversity Plan Committee developed an introduction to the diversity plan and five diversity goals. The 2009-2010 committee revised both the introduction and the goals, which now are stated as follows:

- 1) [Recruit, support, and retain a diverse student body](#) .
- 2) [Recruit, support, and retain a diverse faculty, staff, and administration](#) .
- 3) [Make international learning, experiences, and perspectives, important components of a Geneseo education](#) .
- 4) [Create and maintain an inclusive campus community where all members flourish and feel valued](#) .
- 5) [Increase student knowledge and appreciation of diverse populations and cultures](#) .

The committee also developed objectives for each of the five goals and some suggested action steps for each objective. Finally, the committee proposed a process for implementing the plan. These components of the plan were all developed on a wiki and can be found on the Diversity Plan wiki site (<https://wiki.geneseo.edu:8443/x/R4pLAW>).

In May, 2010, the Diversity Plan was discussed and approved by the full Diversity Commission. In fall, 2010, the Diversity Plan will be presented to the Strategic Planning Group for approval and to discuss implementation.

Recommendations for 2010-2011

The major work of the Diversity Plan committee has been completed, but it may be helpful to have the committee coordinate campus discussion of the plan in fall, 2010 and consult with the Assessment committee as it begins working on an assessment plan.

Submitted by David Gordon

**Report of the Assessment Committee
President's Commission on Diversity & Community
Spring 2010**

Committee members:

Alexandra Carlo, Staff Psychologist, Health & Counseling
Celia Easton, Dean of Residence Life
Harry Howe, Professor of Accounting
Gloria Lopez, Director of Affirmative Action
Polly Radosh, Dean of the College
Julie Rao, Director of Institutional Research

Committee Activities:

The Committee updated the diversity indicators developed previously with demographic and Student Opinion Survey information. The updated diversity indicators are attached. They show an increase in the proportion of students of color. This past fall, 20% of the entering class were students of color. Unfortunately, the percentage of faculty and staff of color has reduced slightly from 2008. Although our graduation rate for students of color continues to decline, the fall to fall retention rate for students of color increased from previous years. In fact, students of color returned to Geneseo at a higher rate than white students in 2010. Next fall, the results from the National Survey of Student Engagement will be added from the spring 2010 administration.

We attempted to address one of the questions from last year, in terms of the declining graduation rate for students of color. Cohort data were sent the National Student Clearinghouse (NSC) to see if students who left actually transferred to another school. The data do show that many students of color, in particular Latinos, do transfer. The Director of Institutional Research shared the identity stripped cohort information with Professors Edward Drachman and Monica Schneider who organized a research team of students to investigate personal and high school factors contributing to graduation. The results of their research were presented at GREAT Day and will be shared with the Commission and other interested committees in the fall.

Next year, the work of the committee will focus on developing measurable outcomes of the newly developed Diversity Plan. As a first step, a question was added to the Senior Survey about the number of M/, Multicultural courses, graduating students had taken beyond the M core requirement. An entering student survey was created to obtain demographic information on students which may serve as a baseline and source of data for the Diversity Plan assessment.

Major Issues/Challenges:

Many regular committee members were involved in the creation of the Diversity Plan and were not able to be a part of the Assessment Subcommittee. With the development of the Diversity Plan, the work of the Assessment Subcommittee will turn to producing the outcomes for the Diversity Plan. We hope that this task will draw members back to the committee.

The Director of Institutional Research took over as chair of the subcommittee so the former chair could lead the team to the Diversity Plan team. The Director of Institutional Research is a vital member of the Assessment subcommittee as she controls much of the data and information the subcommittee uses. She did find it challenging to adequately support the subcommittee with data and information and organize and lead the meetings.

Recommendations:

Consider having someone besides the Director of Institutional Research chair the subcommittee. A co-chair ship may be able to be a workable solution if no one feels comfortable becoming chair.

Continue to share data with Drs. Drachman and Schneider to support their research project

Encourage those who developed the Diversity Plan to join the Assessment subcommittee to aid in developing the measurable outcomes for the Diversity Plan

Submitted by Julie Rao

Deliberative Dialogue Subcommittee

2009-2010 Annual Report

Committee Members:

Meredith Harrigan
Kimberly Harvey
Doug Mackenzie
David Parfitt
Margueriete Wirth
Wendi Kinney
Robert Owens

2009-2010 Accomplishments:

The Deliberative Dialogue Committee met three times and completed the following projects during the 2009-2010 academic year:

- Fall Deliberative Dialogue on 6 Big Ideas for 27 participants
- GOLD program facilitator training for 9 students
- Xerox Center facilitator training and classroom model for 18 students
- Preparation of a powerpoint for classroom model training (Attachment)
- Discussion with Sexual Assault Teach-in organizers to run a companion dialogue

Other programs, such as faculty training and a spring dialogue, had too few attendees to be significant.

Deliberative Dialogue Proposals

On Thursday, April 29, nine faculty and staff representing both Deliberative Dialogue Facilitators and Committee members met to discuss the future of Deliberative Dialogues. Five individuals who could not attend participated via email. The recommendations from this meeting were reviewed by all Deliberative Dialogue Facilitators and Committee members and are given below.

When a novelty on campus, Deliberative Dialogues were attended by 80-120 participants at semiannual gatherings. While these numbers were impressive, they were the result of personal invitations from President Dahl to targeted individuals to attend both the dialogue and an accompanying dinner. Budget constraints have limited the ability to continue to fund dialogues to this extent. Attendance this year was much less with the most successful dialogue being attended by only 27 individuals.

Clearly, the direction of dialogues needs to change. The Deliberative Dialogue Committee and facilitators suggest the following:

- Discontinue campus-wide dialogues each semester
- Offer campus-wide dialogues when relevant issues of widespread interest are identified on campus, such as the Sexual Assault Teach-in next Spring or continuing issues of student misconduct and accountability in which students have a stake
- Consider the following topics for campus-wide dialogues:
 - Sexual Assault
 - What is Civic Responsibility?
- Find a way to have sustained dialogues, possibly in residence halls or learning communities
- Offer additional off-campus training retreats both for facilitators who wish to continue and for new facilitators as a way of energizing the facilitator pool
- Put more emphasis on classroom use of Deliberative Dialogues
 - New faculty training as part of incoming faculty orientation
 - Workshops through the TLC
 - Help faculty design and run Deliberative Dialogues in class through student involvement and training in order to run their own dialogue
- Put more emphasis on student training
 - Continue GOLD Leadership workshops
 - Continue teacher training through Xerox Center workshops
- Increase student involvement
 - Offer dialogues in residence halls
 - Offer a dialogue for entering students as part of their orientation
 - Include topics of current student interest
- House Deliberative Dialogues in the Teaching and Learning Center
 - Organize facilitators into two committees, one to write dialogues and the other to adapt the model for classroom use and train faculty in its use