

COMMON GROUND COMMISSION

FINAL REPORT & RECOMMENDATIONS

June 2004



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Letter from the Coordinator of the Commission.....	1
Introduction & Methodology.....	2
Goals, Recommendations & Strategies from the Commission.....	5
Subcommittee Executive Summaries	
Introduction & Charge of Subcommittees.....	10
Campus Culture Subcommittee.....	11
Recruitment & Retention Subcommittee.....	15
Curricula/Co-curricula Subcommittee.....	18
External Communities Subcommittee.....	21
Third Party Resources – Executive Summaries	
Dr. Terrence Roberts.....	23
Visions, Inc.....	24
Conclusion.....	27
Implementation Plan.....	Attachment A

The appendixes referenced in this report and the complete version of *Past, Present and Future: Communicating Diversity To and From the University of Richmond*, submitted by Dr. Archana Bhatt’s RHCS 312 class, are contained in supplemental documents.

Common Ground Commission Report

LETTER FROM THE COORDINATOR OF CGC

Dear President Cooper and Provost Aprille,

I would like to thank you on behalf of the Common Ground Commission (CGC) for the opportunity to take part in this timely and crucial diversity initiative. My desire is that the goals and strategies recommended in this report, when implemented, become the tools for making the University a better place for those here as well as those to come.

The CGC found its task to identify concrete goals with the potential to transform the culture at UR both rewarding and challenging. We have learned much about the University -- positive and negative. There were moments of pride as well as shame. There was frustration with the realization of the prevalence of distrust and fear that exists among employees at all levels, but there was great encouragement as we learned about the many ongoing diversity events/activities taking place throughout the University community. The Commission also discovered new things about ourselves, including our ability to deal with the messiness that is inevitable when managing human differences. This report reflects our hopes and dreams as well as some of our concerns.

Members of the community at all levels were afforded opportunities for input and participation. These attempts to engage all members of the community included: subcommittee participation, hearings, focus groups, diversity training, surveys, a town hall meeting, invitations to meet with the CGC as a group or individually, plus an anonymous email address and voice mailbox. Nevertheless, there will be those who are critical and defensive with regard to the Commission's findings; however, I would like all to remember the words of James Baldwin:
“Not everything that is faced can be changed. But nothing can be changed until it is faced.”

For this reason, it is vital that we acknowledge all that makes UR what it is – the good, the bad, and the ugly. Failure to do so makes it impossible to move forward. I further believe that leadership must be willing to trust that the Commission has fulfilled its mandate to “develop appropriate goals for the University of Richmond that will allow all members of the institution to take full advantage of the rich benefits of working and learning in a community made up of individuals from varied backgrounds.” The CGC asks that the President and Provost take the bold step of implementing the goals as recommended by the Commission.

Respectfully,

Shirley A. Woods
Coordinator, Common Ground Commission

Common Ground Commission Report

**To
University of Richmond Community
May 30, 2004**

Commission Members: Shirley Woods, Coordinator, Robins School of Business, Professional Development Program Director; Archana Bhatt, Assistant Professor of Rhetoric & Communication Studies; Pat Chandler, Employment Coordinator, Human Resources; Bettie Clarke, Assistant Director, Dining Services; John Douglass, Associate Professor of Law; Len Goldberg, Vice President for Student Affairs; Ray Hilliard, Professor of English; Robb Moore, Associate Chaplain; Teresa Williams, Associate Dean, Jepson School of Leadership Studies; Lori Bailey, Student; Kristen Bandura, Student; T.R. Straub, Student; Martha Pittaway, Administrative Support; *Ex Officio*, President Bill Cooper and Provost June Aprille

INTRODUCTION

In June of 2003, President Cooper and Provost Aprille invited a consultant to campus to facilitate a dialogue amongst administrators and faculty for the purpose of assessing where the community was regarding the issue of diversity, and to determine readiness for transformational change relative to differences within the University community -- change that would benefit those now among us and those to come. That event, along with significant discussion between the President and Provost over the summer of 2003, resulted in the appointment of the Common Ground Commission (CGC), and on August 14, 2003 during University Colloquy, the CGC was officially charged, by the President and Provost, to “develop a prioritized list of up to five concrete goals/recommendations that have the potential to transform institutional culture in ways that will enhance Richmond’s ability to attract and support faculty, students, and staff who seek a dynamically diverse community in which to teach, learn, and work.” (See APPENDIX A for complete charge.)

The CGC had its inaugural meeting on September 4th 2003. During that meeting, the Commission identified a structure, context, and process for fulfilling the charge. This included identifying ways to engage the larger University community (students, faculty, staff and administration), since effectiveness of the Commission mandated that it remain relatively small.

To provide focus, the initial steps in a strategic plan (see APPENDIX B) were developed to ensure a common focus and to establish some common values to guide the work, practices, and community relations of the CGC. In addition, the Commission participated in a “Centering Activity” to enable its members to model the behavior (openness, honesty, vulnerability, and willingness to ask the hard questions) it wanted to inspire and foster in the University community. Hope in the Cities was selected to facilitate the day-long activity. The Commission then proceeded to work towards developing broad goals to recommend to the Provost and President, which are addressed in the following section titled, “Methodology.”

Because of the huge volume of information contained in the report, it is organized to provide a broad overview of how the Commission went about its work; the six major goals, with strategies for meeting these goals; an implementation plan for the given goals; brief overviews of the subcommittees’ reports with their broad recommendations; the Commission’s conclusions; and appendices that provide summary documents, which can stand alone, as well as the full reports from the subcommittees and third party facilitators.

METHODOLOGY

The CGC employed multiple techniques for gaining input from the broader community (both externally and internally). From the beginning all parties concerned thought it important to examine the history of the institution, while gaining insight through the perspectives from various constituents. To accomplish this task, the Commission reviewed the most recent diversity report produced in August 1993. We also reviewed a report authored by Dr. Gill Hickman's LDSP 356 students in December 1995 entitled "The Diversity Project: A Student's Prospective." We then examined outside organizations that have experienced some success in diversifying themselves. They included other universities (Dartmouth, Duke, and Middlebury College) and Georgia Power. In order to contextualize the information received from the various communities, the Commission thought it important to examine diversity from a socio-historical perspective at the University and in relation to the City of Richmond. To achieve this, the Commission enlisted the services of students from Dr. Bhatt's RHCS 312 course (see APPENDIX C page A.3 for an executive summary of their full report).

The Commission felt that broad participation from the University community was essential to the success of the diversity project; therefore, multiple approaches were used to engage the University community:

- **Identified four subcommittees** - using the charge given to the CGC by the President and Provost, an invitation went out to members of all segments of the community to participate. The four subcommittees were where the significant work of the Commission took place. They offered the University community the opportunity to serve and participate in gathering data necessary to inform the goals that are recommended by the Commission. The subcommittees were: Campus Culture, Curricula/Co-curricula, Recruitment & Retention, and External Communities. (All subcommittees examined faculty, staff, administration, and student populations). Full reports, including data gathered and recommendations may be found in the appendices.
 - Subcommittees conducted surveys, hearings and meetings with various units to gather necessary data to inform the goals that the Commission was charged with formulating and recommending to the President and Provost
- **Co-Sponsored the Collegetown Retreat (Jan. 8-11) for 34 students and 13 faculty, staff and community members** – Collegetown is an experiential learning opportunity in diversity appreciation, prejudice reduction, and human relations skills development. Students who participated completed a pre and post assessment, with follow-up assessment conducted in April (results may be found in APPENDIX G page A.171).
 - Upon completing Collegetown and returning to campus, the Collegetown graduates facilitated a Town Hall meeting to hear from their peers about diversity issues. In addition to the Town Hall meeting and other campus events, they were also instrumental in working with PETE to sponsor training for faculty in dealing with sexual orientation issues in the classroom. This was one of the most well attended PETE workshops held this year.
- **Arranged a workshop entitled "Learning to Cope with Difference" by Dr. Terrence Roberts for senior level administrators and other key personnel** - the CGC thought it imperative to begin preparing UR's leaders to assume their roles as leaders of the diversity initiative. We believe the initiative will not be successful if leaders are not fully committed and able to model (lead by example) the behavior -- respecting and

understanding one another -- expected in others. (See Dr. Roberts' report with details of training and recommendations in APPENDIX H page A.177).

- **Secured the services of a third party facilitator (Visions, Inc.) to conduct focus groups** for faculty and staff (by classification) in March 2004. (See results in APPENDIX H page A.182). In addition to conducting focus groups, Dr. Simpson and Dr. Griggs of Visions, Inc. met with the CGC, and subsequently the President and Provost, to provide a context and framework for understanding their findings and recommendations. Equally important, they provided techniques for articulating the diversity message.
- **Learned about current activities/events** taking place on campus relative to encouraging diversity and celebrating differences with the help of the Celebration of Difference Group in identifying these events.

CGC GOALS /RECOMMENDATIONS, AND STRATEGIES

Because of limited resources, the CGC has tried to identify goals that will have the greatest impact on the largest number of constituents within the community. CGC recognizes that there are many deserving programs and those are included in the strategies. The Commission considers all six goals to be equally important and critical to moving toward cultural transformation at UR. As you consider the goals and recommendations, please consider that they are a common set of indispensable goals. They are coherent and symbiotic. They are also dynamic, and therefore should be modified as circumstances necessitate.

The CGC struggled with what term to use -- diversity or multiculturalism -- and with composing an acceptable definition. The difficulty was in finding a language that is inclusive rather than exclusive, and in terms that all members of our community can understand and articulate. A decision was made early on to stay away from a common list that is descriptive but that says little about what diversity/multiculturalism looks like in action. Toward that end, the Commission offers the following vision for diversity at the University of Richmond:

Our task, as a university community, is to create a common ground for all sorts of human diversity, but that diversity must be understood and go beyond any one category of difference. It includes measurable human demographics, one's uniqueness as he/she sees it, and one's beliefs, values and perspective. It is each individual within our institution being valued as a contributing member to the whole. It is about learning, working and living in a community where each person is encouraged and challenged to reach their full potential, while maintaining their own identity and individuality.

Toward that end, creating a common ground requires that each of us embrace this challenge of critical self-examination, learning about others and committing ourselves to such learning at all costs, knowing that the value is in both the process and the result of truly transforming the University of Richmond culture. Our task, simply put, is to create common ground.

Goal 1: Cultivate a Vision (meant to promote respect and understanding), by offering appropriate professional and personal development for all members of the University community at all levels of the institution. The focus group facilitators recommend the following strategies, and CGC concurs:

Strategies:

1.1 Provide Focused Training and Consultation for Senior Leadership to Fulfill the Unique Role in Leading and Modeling a Diversity Initiative

- Senior leadership must articulate the rationale, methods, and goals of a multicultural and diversity initiative in such a way that leaders and managers can be held accountable for positive results. Appropriate funding must also be allocated. Training and consultation are a means to facilitate more in-depth talk about issues of diversity and understanding the dynamics of modern oppression and internalized oppression on organizational growth.

- It can also be a forum for a strategic plan to respond to specific concerns related to diversity.
- 1.2. Provide Orientation and Training for the Board of Trustees Regarding the Diversity Initiative
- To understand the assumptions behind the initiative.
 - To be informed enough to be supportive of the efforts.
- 1.3. Develop training and enrichment that focuses upon and/or incorporate significant faculty and student interaction.
- Institutionalize an experience such as Collegetown to provide a training experience that brings students, faculty, and staff together for a common learning opportunity.
 - Explore concrete ways of making the undeclared advising program responsive to the needs of all students.
 - Organize, call for, and facilitate conversations concerning diversity issues in relation to teaching among faculty and between faculty, staff, and students in conjunction with PETE
- 1.4. Require all students to participate in a one-semester off-campus Experiential Learning opportunity.
- 1.5. Continue to Develop Programs that Support Multicultural Learning
- Establish forums for debate and dialogue.
 - Create facilitated opportunities to discuss and debate controversial issues.
 - Create, publicize, and explain support systems for target groups so that faculty and staff are more fully aware of resources for students as well as themselves.
 - Develop more programs through the arts and the Modlin Center that establish a multicultural presence.
 - Continue support for the Chaplain's Programs, Safe Zone, and participation in Collegetown.
 - Continue support for the Women's Studies Program as an academic program as well as its corollary co-curricular component, WILL.
 - Develop programs through the Center for Civic Engagement that allows students, faculty, and staff to engage and collaborate with diverse populations from the greater Richmond area and beyond.
 - Provide incentives for tenured as well as non-tenured faculty, staff and administrators to participate in multicultural training that enhances sensitivity to interpersonal behaviors and personal feelings and beliefs that impact diverse interactions. Such training fosters personal and group comfort in relating across groups and could be offered through the faculty development program.
 - Continue programs such as the Cigna and Oldham Scholars programs.

In order for any cohesive collaborative effort regarding diversity to succeed, all members of the University community must be able to receive and discuss differences of opinion without distrust and fear. In the course of its work, the Commission heard from a number of UR

community members who found it hard to speak out on issues of diversity for reasons they attributed to a “culture” or “climate” at the University. Common themes included a “culture of gentility,” a “don’t rock the boat” feeling, and a sense that dissent is not encouraged. Similar accounts were noted by consultant, Dr. Terrance Roberts, and in the focus group findings conducted by representatives from Visions, Inc. Whatever the source of these perceptions, it is important for the University to take visible steps to ensure that all constituencies feel free to speak their minds.

Goal 2: Create a climate that promotes free and open discussion of differences without fear, distrust, or undue anxiety.

Strategies:

- 2.1 Create a dialogue to determine a safe and open way to address this issue, because the University environment is not conducive to forthrightness. A third party such as Visions, Inc. should facilitate the dialogue.
- 2.2 Hold supervisors and managers accountable for leading by example, keeping promises, and dealing fairly and ethically with every employee, no matter what his/her classification.
- 2.3 Establish and maintain designated people and offices that allow safe and confidential communications outside of the chains of command.

A major concern about diversity initiatives at colleges and universities is that there is often inadequate follow-through. A case in point is our own University. Between 1991 and 1993 an ad hoc committee worked methodically and painstakingly to produce a set of diversity proposals. A number of the proposals were eventually carried out, but most were not, or they were only partially implemented. Had the University administration remained focused on the 1993 report, there would not be a pressing need and the depth of the issues would not be so severe by 2003-2004. The members of the CGC have not done a comprehensive study of diversity initiatives at other institutions, but they have gained a clear sense that such initiatives have been hugely successful only when a person has been hired in an administrative position and given no other responsibility than to make sure that there is ongoing, complete follow-up on the original initiative. This has been notably the case at Middlebury College, Dartmouth College, and Duke University.

The members of the CGC therefore strongly believe that it is absolutely necessary to hire an individual whose primary responsibility is to provide oversight of the implementation of the diversity goals and strategies. Given the enormous amount of time required of the Coordinator of CGC, the Commission is convinced (all consultants used during the project agree) that it cannot be done in an effective manner without someone’s full attention. In the absence of such a position, UR is not likely to develop a comprehensive, cohesive voice for diversity, nor is it likely to sustain the momentum begun this year.

Goal 3: Hire a full-time senior executive/professional and create an Office of Institutional Equity to oversee and facilitate diversity goals. The position should report directly to the President and work collaboratively with all units to develop and implement comprehensive and cohesive diversity programs & activities. This person

would also serve as Chair of the Commission and monitor progress of the diversity implementation plan.

Strategies:

- 3.1. The search for the person to fill this position should be national in scope, and should be executed in an expedient manner.
- 3.2. The search committee should enlist the assistance of someone who knows those working in the field, such as Dr. Griggs of Visions, Inc. to assist in the search process.

To provide continuity the current CGC should continue -- at least for the first semester of academic year 2004-2005 -- until someone with primary responsibility for oversight of implementation of diversity goals can be brought on board. To that end, it is the consensus of the CGC (though with reluctance) that the current CGC continue in its role, at least through the first semester of the 2004-2005 academic year. It will serve in an advisory and oversight capacity while the leadership searches for and selects someone to oversee the diversity goals implementation.

Goal 4: Establish a Diversity Task Force (possibly continue the CGC) with Wide Representation from the University Community.

Strategies:

- 4.1. Include members from senior leadership as well as members from different levels of the University and different schools and programs.
- 4.2. Provide training and ongoing consultation to the Task Force in developing a common language for dealing with diversity issues and in developing concrete action plans.
- 4.3. Commit to at least a three-year plan in the beginning.
- 4.4. Have this structure oversee the assessment, information gathering, recommendations, and action plans for diversity, including measures for accountability.
- 4.5. Set up/monitor committees or structures to implement the following:
 - Address institutional review of documents and application of the nondiscrimination clause.
 - Review policies and procedures around the tenure process for the differential impact on target groups.
 - Study the equity of benefits and compensation across all constituencies.
 - Oversee the curriculum with respect to the integration of diversity issues, the development of experience based and community service learning and leadership programs, and the expansion of the CORE program with needed resources for supporting faculty in teaching more uncomfortable materials.
 - Develop mentoring programs for faculty and staff to help with retention of target group members.
 - Review hiring and recruitment practices; explore ways to expand the diverse pool of applicants and increase the number of underrepresented groups in areas such as human resources, admissions and the Board of Trustees.

- Study the campus climate and create ways to make the environment safe and welcoming to target groups of faculty, staff and administrators.
- Revisit the feasibility of a daycare program and the benefits for cross-group interactions and multicultural learning experiences.
- Look at accessibility issues for persons with permanent and temporary physical disabilities.
- Review promotion and hiring practices in all areas with respect to age as well as other target group variables.

Goal 5: Formulate on-going systematic methods for: leadership accountability; supervisor and management growth and development; communication and awareness; and policies and processes relative to institutional expectations.

Strategies:

- 5.1. Hold supervisors and managers accountable for the people aspects of their units (i.e., diversity, performance management, recruitment and selection, employee development, etc.)
- 5.2. Develop and articulate a policy for promoting diversity in recruiting, hiring, admission, and retention to guide practices.
- 5.3. Develop and conduct new supervisor and manager training. Make sure it includes performance management, career coaching, classification and pay administration, selection, UR values, and diversity.
- 5.4. Include diversity (why it's important and the vision for UR) training as a component of all orientation programs.
- 5.5. Develop a mentoring program for all new employees, new supervisors, and new students.
- 5.6. Create a leadership development program.
- 5.7. Improve communication regarding classifications, pay, selection, and career development.
- 5.8. Develop a communication strategy and plan around diversity and related policies such as harassment.

Goal 6: Devote fund-raising efforts to establishing endowments to support current and new programs aimed at improving the campus culture in relation to challenges surrounding diversity.

Additional goals and strategies deemed significant by subcommittees may be found in the following executive summary reports.

SUBCOMMITTEES EXECUTIVE SUMMARIES (Findings & Recommendations to CGC)

This is where the significant work of the Commission took place, while offering the University community the opportunity to serve and participate in gathering data necessary to inform the goals that have been established by the Commission.

Subcommittees' Charge:

The vision is to become known as an institution that is welcoming of differences, and more important, a community that values and understands differences as key to a dynamic, interactive, and transforming environment for work and education. Further, to become a place where all of its members are challenged to reflect on personal attitudes and actions that ultimately define “institutional culture” (adapted from the Commission’s Charge). The subcommittees’ mandate was to survey the University community regarding significant ongoing efforts designed to move us towards the above vision, and to identify systemic barriers to achieving this outcome. The various subcommittees were also instructed to solicit ideas, goals, and implementation methods for facilitating the necessary change needed to foster an environment that is conducive to transformation at UR. After analyzing the data, the subcommittees recommended to CGC possible goals, and implementation means that will enhance UR’s ability to retain, attract, and support faculty, administrators, students, and staff who seek a dynamically diverse community in which to teach, learn, and work. At least one Commission member was assigned to each subcommittee. The Committees were directed to obtain information in any manner they deemed appropriate (surveys, forums, individual interviews, etc)

Following are summary reports from the subcommittees, and broad recommendations from each area. Each subcommittee chairperson was asked to produce summary reports for the CGC, which included recommendations they deemed to be the most far reaching. Out of those presentations and discussions, the six broad goals listed above were developed.

CAMPUS CULTURE:

Membership:

Archana J. Bhatt (chair), Jessica Bigby (student), Abigail Cheever, Bettie Clark, Dominic Finney, Dorothy Holland, Natalie McCoy (student), Ladelle McWhorter, Amandeep Singh Sidhu (Law School student), T. R. Straub (student), Jonathan Zur

Methodology

The campus culture subcommittee, like the other subcommittees, worked to gather information from a variety of constituencies on this campus. In addition to this, we worked to identify and address the ways in which the current climate does and does not serve the process of information collection. Thus, we viewed our task as information gathering, and to a certain extent modeling potential cultural transformation. To that end, two recommendations from the subcommittee were presented earlier in the year and completed. These two recommendations were external facilitation and student forums. As a committee, we organized campus culture under the following categories:

- language
- constituency specific issues
- university policies
- campus space
- university traditions
- university orientations

This report details the ways in which each of these categories were identified as central components of campus culture, the recommendations offered in response to those components, the background/key issues pertinent to each category and the implementation strategies of the presented recommendations where appropriate.

The methods utilized throughout the committee work include: analysis of previously gathered data, various hearings with constituencies on campus, and analysis of university texts such as the website, buildings, etc. Additionally, the committee had several meetings, which centered on discussion of key issues on campus, culminating in portions of this report.

GOAL: The University should actively create and foster among all its members openness toward and respect for a diversity of opinions, values, cultures, backgrounds, and life goals and an appreciation for the contributions to our educational mission that are made by people from all parts of the institution. To achieve this goal, the University of Richmond should systemically assess the current campus culture and implement strategic goals throughout the institutional structure, university programs and our interpersonal relations to foster a culture of transparency and acceptance. This culture then would be the cornerstone of the UR community.

STRATEGIES:

1. The University should critically examine the ways in which language is utilized (terminology, complicity in allowing derogatory/inappropriate terms, position of

language in larger texts, etc.) throughout the campus and make the changes necessary to create a linguistically inclusive environment.

- Students should be afforded opportunities in which to engage in dialogue in an ongoing manner such that they can participate in the process of diversity as well as benefit from the result of diversity. By investing personally in the experience of fostering social justice on campus, students will become more invested in the outcomes of such programs on campus and will learn to navigate in a world that is already diverse. This involvement can be achieved through the following two practices: Town Hall dialogues and Collegetown.
 - Reexamine the ways in which the Greek system exists currently on campus so as to address the functions of community building through the structure. This study should result in a self-assessment report with membership from current Greeks, alumni, faculty, non-Greek students, and applicable administration (i.e. Student Affairs, President's Office, Chaplaincy, and University Police).
2. The University should actively create and foster among all its employees openness toward and respect for a diversity of opinions, values, cultures, backgrounds, and life goals and an appreciation for the contributions to our educational mission that are made by people of various races, religions, national origins, ages, sexes, sexual orientations, and different forms of physical able-ness.
- Determine the level of policy education among employees.
 - Provide a hard copy of the employee handbook to every employee.
 - Create a University Policy Committee to review and evaluate existing policies for inclusiveness.
 - Provide target of opportunity lines to encourage the hiring of faculty from non-traditional backgrounds.
 - Provide same-sex partner benefits.
 - Determine and establish a maternity leave policy.
 - Expand financial aid programs in the law school.
 - Require diversity education of incoming students and all employees.
 - Investigate making the residence halls coeducational.
 - Investigate including a diversity pledge in the honor code.
3. Conduct a Study that Specifically Analyzes the Campus Environment as it Relates to Issues of Diversity and Inclusiveness

In order to shape our environment to achieve our educational purposes and our desires for a more vibrantly inclusive and diverse community, we must conduct a study of the current physical environments, the constituencies using them, the policies governing facility use, and the perceptions regarding our physical environments. We need to analyze the functional aspects as well as the symbolic, non-verbal communications of our physical spaces.

We recommend that the following questions be used to guide the study (from Strange and Banning, 2001):

- Do students, faculty, and staff have opportunities and spaces to connect with others on campus around their common interests, values, and experiences?

- Are differences of interests, values, and experiences accommodated in caring and supportive ways?
 - Are decision-making structures and practices facilitative of participation?
 - Do symbols, traditions, and other cultural artifacts reflect and celebrate the community of the whole as well as the community of the various parts?
4. Institute University-wide Colloquy as a tradition to begin each academic year. Currently, first year students (undergraduate, law, and continuing studies) have Orientation programs to commence each academic year. The President and Provost host a Fall Faculty Convocation for faculty members and senior administrators with the intention of providing short-term and long-term direction for overall University. Staff members are invited to a President's Staff Address that takes place a few weeks into the fall semester.

No event exists for upper-class students (after the first year), and no event exists for the entire University to serve as an opening celebration for the academic year. In fact, there is not one tradition that is meant for and that attracts the entire University community.

The majority of University traditions are held in the spring semester. Honors Convocation, the most academically-oriented tradition, is split by academic school. The coordinating deans cited attendance at these events as disappointing.

This event would include faculty, staff, and students from each school and division within the University. The spring Honors Convocations that currently take place for students would serve as the bookend event to Colloquy. Planners of the current separate convocation programs should explore the possibility of a joint event. Several issues must be taken into account in the planning and coordination of this event. Students in the School of Continuing Studies often have full-time jobs or daytime obligations that prevent them from being at such a function during the day. Classes in the T.C. Williams School of Law often begin one week before the rest of the University because of classroom hour requirements for accreditation. Staff members who work non-traditional shifts (8:30 – 5:00) would be likely to encounter conflicts in planning to attend an event during those hours. All of this taken into account, such an event should still be held, with efforts made to accommodate the greatest number of people possible.

Strategies for completion should include the following:

- *The Presidents Office should serve as the primary coordinator of Colloquy and should convene a committee with representatives of all of the Academic and Residential Dean's Offices as well as the Provost and the Director of Human Resource Services.*
- *A specific block of time must be designated in the University calendar, without allowing for any conflicts. We recommend late afternoon, which would allow those employees working a night shift to come in early and give those students taking evening courses a better chance to be included.*
- *Due to the size of the anticipated audience, the Robins Center is the best location for the Colloquy.*

- *The initial University-wide Fall Colloquy should take place at the beginning of the fall 2005 semester.*
5. Modify University orientations in a manner such that diversity issues are incorporated throughout the entire orientation process rather than being identified as a single-issue item. Additionally, orientations should be considered an introduction to the University culture and should reflect the values most important to the university. Specifically:
- Employee orientations should provide ample explanation of University non-discrimination and harassment policies as well as introduce to the various community building initiatives across campus. Faculty orientation should incorporate specific sessions geared to introduce incoming faculty to fellow colleagues who work on/represent diverse constituencies on campus (i.e. Safe Zone, Office of Multicultural Affairs, the Chaplaincy, and the Center for Civic Engagement should make presentations at faculty orientation to inform faculty about the diversity initiatives on campus.)
 - A task force should be establish and enacted to examine the various undergraduate orientation programs in order to identify specific modifications necessary to establish parity between the various orientations and to build connections between the orientations so as to address the perception of segregation among students. This may include examining timelines, direction, and management of each orientation.

Conclusion

In measuring campus culture, it was clear to us as a committee that there is symbiotic relationship between action and mindset. In this report, we have attempted to address this relationship as well as both components individually. Finally, we offer these recommendations with the hope and belief that the greatest measure of success will be the time when “diversity” and its practices become part and parcel of the University of Richmond. These actions will “have always been there’ in the minds of our community members.

Finally, as stated at the beginning of this report, a true measure of campus culture is in the sense of community fostered on campus and beyond. With this in mind, we offer the following quotation defining the ideal community:

A place where there are people to whom we can speak with passion without having the words catch in our throats, where a circle of hands will open to receive us, and voices will celebrate with us whenever we come into our own power. Community means strength that joins our strength to do the work that needs to be done to ensure that our learning and working environments are characterized by inclusiveness, recognition and respect for all members equally.

Based on a definition of community by Starhawk

RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION SUBCOMMITTEE:

Membership:

Kristen Bandura (student), Joycelyn Bassette (student), Marianella Belliard, Pat Chandler (co-chair), John Douglass, Robert Nelson, Pam Spence, Hope N. Walton, Steve Wilborn, Teresa J. Williams (co-chair)

Methodology

Data for the Recruitment and Retention report were gathered by both informal and formal means. The more formal means included our review of information and data contained in the following three previous studies on diversity at the University: The Diversity Commission Report (1993), The Diversity Project: A Student Perspective (Dr. Gill Hickman's Leader As Change Agent class, 1995); and Minority Recruitment Summary and Program Enhancement Proposals (2001).

Other sources of information and data included a review of Human Resource Services employment statistics (APPENDIX D pages A.50-A.55), personal interviews with senior Human Resource Services personnel (APPENDIX D page A.56), and telephone surveys of peer institutions and peer aspirant schools (APPENDIX D page A.57). Questions were designed and disseminated for focus groups (APPENDIX D page A.58). An email survey (APPENDIX D page A.61) of 316 full-time tenured, tenure-track and contracted faculty yielded 118 sets of responses.

Review and Summary

The student body represents an intrinsic part of the Common Ground Commission's objective in changing the environment of the University of Richmond and transforming it into a space that embraces the richness of difference and multiplicity that form this nation. Students' sense of belonging, acceptance, and fitting in became pressing concerns for the subcommittee. From the start, the subcommittee focused on the different components that make up the student college experience and how those contribute to their academic achievements, personal growth, and intellectual development. This subcommittee acknowledged the decisive role that social and cultural campus life could have on the academic and personal development of the students. Thus, examining the existing social, cultural and academic student organizations, their function and the impact they have on cultural and social environment for the students: How diverse are they? Is there life outside them for non-members? What does it take to belong to them? What does it mean to be a member? For the subcommittee, understanding and recognizing the lack of diversity among the students is not only pivotal to achieving true diversity, but it is also the first intersection and interconnection of different components such as race, sexual orientation, social class, nationality, language, and political ideology, to name a few. In a truly diverse space, difference exists, not without conflict, but with honest disagreement, openness and the exchange of ideas, intellectual thoughts, and personal experiences is encouraged by its same composition.

Since the last diversity report in 1993, the University has hired 4 Asians, 8 African Americans, 5 Hispanics, 123 women and 142 men. All of the Asians and Hispanics who were hired during this time remain employed at the University. Only 18.3% (26) of the men and 20% (25) of the women have left, but the numbers for African American faculty who have left are higher, 50% (4). The data suggest that not only does the University have difficulty recruiting people of color, but retaining African American faculty is equally problematic.

While the opinions expressed through the faculty survey are varied, several themes were articulated. Faculty perceptions of the percent of racial and ethnic diversity on campus do not match the actual numbers. Furthermore, faculty are less likely to have been involved in campus initiatives or efforts to increase diversity within the administrative staff category. In addition, faculty are concerned that intellectual and class diversity are often ignored in discussions about diversity. As one professor stated, “Diversity can be both visible and invisible . . . Awareness of all facets of diversity must be considered.” Faculty also questioned the genuineness of the University’s latest diversity initiatives. “People of difference often have been welcomed only where they think and act like the mainstream.” “A commitment to diversity is more an attitudinal change than simply bringing in people who look different.”

Analysis of data and employment statistics for staff confirm a disturbing trend: there is a disparity in the amount of diversity represented within classifications. While the vast majority of people of color are employed under Classification V, the number represented in Classifications I, II, III and IV is minimal. (For specific data and analysis, see final report APPENDIX D page A.36).

GOAL: The University of Richmond must create a living, learning and working environment where all differences are valued.

STRATEGIES:

1. Develop a definition of diversity and create a policy statement centered around this definition. (p. A.41, APPENDIX D)
2. Hire a senior executive/professional and create an Office of Institutional Equity to oversee and enforce the University’s policies related to diversity. The position should report directly to the Provost. (p. A.41, APPENDIX D)
3. Increase the number of introductory course offerings in the area of diversity, specifically targeting courses taught by non-tenured and junior faculty. (p. A.42, APPENDIX D)
4. Establish a visiting scholar and/or post-doc program that focus on scholars from diverse backgrounds. (p. A.42, APPENDIX D)
5. Develop a systematic approach to aggressively recruiting and retaining faculty, staff, and students from diverse backgrounds. (p. A.42, APPENDIX D)
6. Give weight in the admission evaluation and hiring process to characteristics that add a different dimension to our current population. (p. A.43, APPENDIX D)
7. Provide scholarship funds for under-represented populations (student, faculty, administration) In the case of staff, when some incentives exist, there should be encouragement from supervisors to take advantage of those opportunities. (p. A.43, APPENDIX D)
8. Provide more opportunities for faculty, staff, and students to interact. (p. A.42, APPENDIX D)

Conclusion

The University's diversity initiative will be viewed, by many, with skepticism; but implementation of the aforementioned goals would serve as evidence of the commitment to a community that values the understanding of differences as key to a dynamic, interactive, and transforming environment for work and education.

CURRICULA/CO-CURRICULA SUBCOMMITTEE:

Membership:

Lori Bailey (student), Laura Byrd Earle, Andrew M. Ferguson, Raymond F. Hilliard (chair) Catherine P. King, Kevin D. Kuswa, Lewis A. (Andy) Litteral, KimMarie McGoldrick, Virginia Page (M.L.A. student), Elizabeth A. Sheehan, Shirley Woods, W. Clark Williams

Methodology

Holding a series of two-hour meetings in January and February of 2004, conducting two two-hour hearings with representative faculty and with deans Steve Bisese and Juliette Landphair concerning University-wide general education curriculum, and breaking up into two-person teams to interview members of the campus community who are responsible for various co-curricular programs or operations, the members of the Common Ground Commission Subcommittee on Curricula/Co-curricula sought answers to two basic questions:

1. To what extent do issues related to diversity concern or affect the general education curriculum or each particular co-curricular program?
2. Are there specific ways in which the general education curriculum or a particular program could contribute to the goal of making the University culture more open to students, faculty, and staff who represent diversity of one sort or another?

These general questions led to more specific questions, and the hearings and interviews resulted in a cluster of individual reports on the general education curriculum and on various co-curricular operations, including the advising program for “undeclared” students. (To review the full report, including the sub-groups, see APPENDIX F, p. A.89)

A few of the individual reports do not contain recommendations for improvement with regard to diversity issues. For example, the report on the Speech Center shows that the Center is now making a sufficient contribution to fostering a tolerant and open campus culture, and to working with students identified with differences of various kind (see APPENDIX F, p. A.109); and the report on the Jepson School of Leadership Studies indicates that the same is true of that entire school (see APPENDIX F, p. A.163). However, all of the reports, including those that resulted in no particular recommendations, provide a great deal of explanatory or contextual information, and a number of them contain specific recommendations accompanied, in each instance, by a rationale. *All of the reports are attached to the summary report, which presents the main recommendations* (see APPENDIX F). We urge readers of this document to read the individual reports as well as this summary report in order to acquire a fuller sense of the reasons for the various recommendations.

Because the mission and the needs of the T.C. Williams School of Law differ significantly from the mission and the needs of the schools that focus on undergraduate education, we place all but one of the recommendations concerning T.C. Williams in a section toward the end of this summary report. The recommendations concerning the Law Library have been placed in the section of this report that concerns the University libraries. (See APPENDIX F, p. A.127)

The recommendations in this report are numerous and varied, but a number of key themes recur throughout. These include the significance of experiential learning, the importance of establishing endowments to support particular curricular and co-curricular programs, and the value of fostering among students the kind of disciplined intellectual give-and-take associated with such activities as debate. These and other recurring themes reflect the subcommittee's understanding that there should be a close relationship between the aims of the general education program and the aims of various programs that fall under Student Affairs. Four of the programs that we examined are part of the Students Affairs division: Academic Skills, Wellness, the College Fellows and President's College Associates Programs, and WILL. We urge the Common Ground Commission to recognize how fundamental Students Affairs is to the successful integration of the curricular and co-curricular; indeed, this has always been one of its primary missions. Within Student Affairs, Residence Life, with its residence hall programming, plays a critical role across the University in connecting classroom knowledge to diverse real world experience in ways that are not only intellectually valuable but integral to students' psychological and physical well-being. In addition, both deans of the coordinate colleges, Juliette Landphair and Steve Bisese, are assistant deans of Arts and Sciences and thus structurally positioned to bridge the curricular and co-curricular. Undeclared advising, also addressed in this report, is based in Westhampton College under the direction of Dean Landphair, emphasizing the importance of a Student Affairs perspective on students' academic lives.

In this document we use the word *recommendation* in lieu of the word *strategy*, but readers should view our recommendations as strategies for achieving what we see as a single important goal: making the general education curriculum and the various co-curricular programs or operations as consistent as possible with the overarching goal of making the campus culture more open to students, faculty, and staff who represent diversity of one kind or another. We leave it to those who will consider our recommendations—the Common Ground Commission and University administrators--to determine who will have responsibility for implementing them if they are adopted, what the cost of each will be, when each recommendation should be carried out, and how its implementation and effectiveness will be assessed. In some instances there will be no significant monetary cost—for example, we recommend that the staff of the campus newspaper, *The Collegian*, make a sustained effort to recruit a more diverse range of students. In other instances, the cost will be considerable.

Goal: The University should make an ongoing, systematic effort to educate members of the community – faculty, staff, and students – about the existence and the value of diversity.

Possible strategies:

The following strategies and called “recommendations” in the *summary report* from the Common Ground Commission Subcommittee on Curricula/Co-curricula (page references are to the *summary report*):

- 1) Require all students to participate in a one-semester off-campus Experiential Learning opportunity. (See part II in the *summary report* p. A.92, APPENDIX F)
- 2) Enhance the undeclared advising program and such related co-curricular programs as the College Fellows Program to make them mores responsive to challenges concerning diversity. (See part III, Section A in the *summary report*, pp. A.93-94, APPENDIX F)

- 3) Sponsor biennial workshops on how to integrate discussions of diversity into the curriculum. (See part III, Section A in the *summary report*, p. A.98, APPENDIX F)
- 4) Make sure that PETE fosters ongoing conversations concerning diversity issues, in relation to teaching, among faculty, and between faculty, staff, and students. (See part III in the *summary report*, p. A.100, APPENDIX F)
- 5) Take steps to make sure that *The Collegian* covers diversity related issues as comprehensively as possible, and that it regularly recruits a diverse staff. (See part III in the *summary report*, p. A.100, APPENDIX F)
- 6) Part IV, items 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 in the *summary report*: concerning the Law School (pp. A.100-101, p. A.100, APPENDIX F)
- 7) Devote fund-raising efforts to establishing endowments to support particular programs aimed at improving the campus culture in relation to challenges surrounding diversity (See part I in the *summary report*, p. A.91, p. A.100, APPENDIX F)

EXTERNAL COMMUNITIES SUBCOMMITTEE:

Membership:

Kimberly Bowers (student), Darryl Dance, Leonard Goldberg (co-chair), Jan Hatchette, Camisha Jones, Anne Meehan, Robb Moore (co-chair), Walter Schoen, Jennell Whitfield, Shirley Woods (ex officio)

Introduction

Three areas of focus were identified for this report with a subcommittee member(s) responsible for coordination: Employers (Anne Meehan); Alumni (Camisha Jones); and, Greater Richmond (Darryl Dance and Robb Moore). Since most of the sub-groups' focus involved a broad range of off-campus persons and/or groups, the fast-track timeframe of the broader Commission's study had a limiting impact on the results of each report. These reports, however, provide a brief sketch or snapshot into the mindset of the target groups. Conclusions and recommendations are tentative, at best, but they do suggest various areas worthy of further study. *Rationale for each recommendation is contained in each of the subcommittee reports.*

Methodology

Both the employer and alumni sub-groups developed questionnaires that were distributed to a random sample of their respective populations. 170 questionnaires were mailed to active employers; 186 alumni received email questionnaires. Returns were marginal, given the timeframe involved (10 and 17 respectively) – hardly a number upon which conclusions could be drawn. Still, some interesting anecdotal comments are informative in terms of designing potential future studies. Details of the particular methodologies used are contained within the body of each full report. The sub-group that considered engaging “greater Richmond” articulated the importance for the University to address off-campus interests.

Recommendations

The Employer subcommittee proposes the following recommendations:

Recommendation 1: The Common Ground Commission should conduct a more thorough investigation regarding recruiter feedback on the topic of diversity. Both employers who recruit on campus as well as employers who do not actively recruit at Richmond should be included in the investigation.

Recommendation 2: Information should be gained through recruiter focus groups led by an outside consultant team during the late spring or early summer to avoid the busy campus recruiting season that occurs in early fall and early spring.

Alumni: Perhaps the most disturbing comments we heard came from three alumni who made the following statements:

One graduate who wrote most of her comments in all capital letters felt that if the university sought to be more inclusive it would inevitably become less selective in the type of students it accepts and would thus become like a public institution. Another

graduate called to indicate his concern about the current focus on diversity. He felt that this new focus might be an inappropriate digression from the mission of the university as an institution of education. He did not understand why improvement was needed or why the university would feel a responsibility to prepare graduates who could interact well with others of diverse backgrounds. He felt that the overall quality of the university might be lowered by efforts to diversify and be more inclusive. Another graduate felt that the main issue was a breakdown in communication between people of diverse backgrounds and thus, felt that inclusiveness training would not help.

The **Alumni** subcommittee proposes the following recommendations:

Recommendation 1: Communicate about the University of Richmond's commitment to diversity and why focusing on diversity is relevant to the education process.

Recommendation 2: Communicate about campus developments that are relevant to the climate for diversity.

Recommendation 3: Offer more diverse programs and especially programs that offer opportunities for dialogue.

Recommendation 4: Provide campus-wide programs that represent the interests of under-represented groups.

Recommendation 5: Recruit more diverse faculty, staff and students.

Recommendation 6: Identify organizations, publications, career and college fairs, and media opportunities to reach potential faculty, staff and students of diverse backgrounds.

Recommendation 7: Make diversity a priority within the University of Richmond experience; focus on First Year Experience.

The **Greater Richmond** subcommittee proposes the following recommendations:

Recommendation 1: Make significant efforts to solicit honest and candid feedback about this university's history and current actions, particularly from those members of the greater Richmond community who represent the sort of ethnic, religious and socio-economic diversity which is under-represented in the University of Richmond community.

Recommendation 2: Assess whether our campus culture and systems discourage honest critique and/or communication from external communities.

Recommendation 3: Actively pursue opportunities to demonstrate to the wider community of Richmond that the University of Richmond is serious about changing its culture with regard to diversity and to that end is willing to be transparent about its history and present problems with regard to diversity.

Recommendation 4: Seek ways that the University of Richmond can better regularly access the greater Richmond community's reaction to our institutional actions and ways in which we can be more sensitive to that reaction.

THIRD PARTY RESOURCES:

Report and recommendations from Dr. Terrance Roberts.

In January 2004, Dr. Roberts was invited to UR to conduct diversity training for senior administrators. The purpose was to:

- Begin the critical self-examination needed to understand individual and communal perspectives
- Serve as the catalyst for leaders to think critically about the benefits of diversity, as they will have to carry the diversity message to others (internally and externally)
- To provide insight as to their roles as leaders in modeling the behavior they will require in others
- To begin building the trust necessary for openness and honesty

The CGC felt this self-development piece was necessary for buy-in by leadership, and the first step in moving towards the understanding and commitment needed if the diversity initiative is to reach the action phase. For Dr. Roberts' impressions and recommendations, see APPENDIX H.

Focus groups conducted by outside consultants from Visions, Inc.

The Commission found the report from Visions, Inc. to be very useful, as many of their findings support other data obtained through personal narratives, research, surveys and the last diversity report. Many of the recommendations made by this organization have been incorporated as strategies under the five of the six major goals recommend by CGC. Following are some general themes and highlights identified during the focus groups facilitated by Visions, Inc during March, 2004 (See APPENDIX I for full report). These things should be considered as only a small piece of the data and information use to inform CGC's final recommendations to senior administration.

Multicultural Concerns/Areas of Growth Themes and Highlights

There is frustration with talk about diversity and not enough action.

- Reports have been produced before, but the hard work required to sustain action is needed.
- There is a nondiscrimination clause, but there are perceptions from some groups that it is not being fully acted upon.
- "Many people are busy and feel it is futile."
- Training is needed for staff and faculty but many are perceived as resisting it.

The culture is perceived as one of gentility where there is not much tolerance for dissent

- A phrase that frequently came up in a number of groups is "don't rock the boat" or there will be consequences. Other phrases such as "don't make waves" or "don't muddy the waters" were also mentioned. "If you question, doubt or disagree, you are an obstructionist." There is a perception that it is not okay to be controversial, particularly if you want to advance in your career or get a favorable evaluation. Some more seasoned participants thought that there was more vigorous debate in the late '70's.
- There is the view that people do not want to entertain questions about power and political dynamics in a more serious debate forum.
- The culture is also described as one in which some fear speaking up for fear of retribution or pressure.
- Prejudiced statements by students are not challenged ("poor people don't want to work").
- Feminism is still considered an edgy issue.
- It was considered a struggle to present "The Vagina Monologues."

Recruitment of African-American faculty, staff, and administrators along with other People of Color has not been adequate.

- There is a scarcity of African American students, faculty and administrators as well as of other People of Color.
- Increased diversity has been seen more in terms of the increase of international students
- Human Resources has no person of color.
- Racism, classicism and cronyism are perceived in the hiring process with the sense that they have already decided who will be hired.

- Inherent modern racism with the description of someone not seeking to hire a person of color because they would have to be trained.

The climate is not welcoming for many target groups.

- Retention is a problem. Many expressed lack of support or mentoring once here.
- People are not stepping up to be pioneers for diversity in my department.
- Expressed concerns about not being able to speak openly in department meetings.
- A number of people spoke of talks with students of color or even lower middle or working class students who did not feel comfortable speaking up in class unless supportive and encouraging efforts were made by the teacher.
- Some staff are leaving and there is apparent discomfort in talking about it.
- Target group members expressed concern that diversity issues are seen as their problem and not that of whites or heterosexuals. Issue of both sides owning their part in the problem.
- Some communications have the impact of making some African Americans feel as if they are only here because of their racial identity and not what they have to offer.
- There is a lack of sensitivity to some of the G/L/B/T issues.
- The needs of faculty or staff with physical disabilities are not perceived as being taken seriously.
- Not everyone has a computer, particularly at certain levels, so if you are not hooked up to a computer, then you don't get information. This practice also has implications for hiring.
- A number of people also made reference to the ways the physical environment, although beautiful in terms of landscape and facilities, does not adequately represent others in terms of pictures, magazines or other interior details that could make others feel more welcomed.
- There are many physical barriers for people with physical disabilities

Another theme expressed across target groups was the concern about feeling valued, respected, and heard.

- Staff at the clerical/administrative and service/maintenance levels within the university expressed being asked to participate in meetings but then feeling their voice is not heard or validated in the meetings. (This interpersonal dynamic involves both sides in terms of how the target group members are validated by the non-target with acknowledgement and actions to incorporate their voice in decisions. Often the target persons give up because it is perceived as useless to express your opinion.)
- Class or status in the organization affects whether or not you get recognized or acknowledged for your losses. Family members die and there is no article or acknowledgement in university communication vehicles.
- Many expressed concerns about the seemingly exclusive value placed on scholarship and not enough on developing the whole person. Along with this concern were comments about test scores being so exclusively important in admissions and not enough on looking at other criteria for success.
- This theme was particularly expressed in terms of communication between members of different status groups/between target and non-target groups.

- The staff of the Collegian and Alumni magazines is not seen as diverse enough to reflect diverse opinions and perspectives.

There is a need for more training, curriculum development and review of policies and benefits.

- Integrate a higher level of multicultural consciousness into the curriculum.
- Supervisory training and diversity training is needed at all levels. It was mentioned that PETE (faculty development program) has done some programs on diversity but tenured faculty are not required to attend.
- Serious concerns were expressed about the tenure review process and the need for objectivity, accountability, and a grievance procedure.
- Other policies of concern included equality in terms of benefits and time off. It appears that more communication may be needed regarding the rationale for certain policies and a review in terms of what is equitable.
- Policies regarding living on campus and domestic partner benefits are another significant issue.
- The issue of people being paid a livable wage was also brought up and the sense of paternalism with a Santa Tree at Christmas for maintenance and service workers who apparently don't make enough.
- How the nondiscrimination clause is being implemented and whether action is seriously being taken to implement - this was brought up in a number of groups.

CONCLUSION

There are many positive programs at the University of Richmond, many of which are having a significant impact relative to diversity awareness and understanding. However, few provide the human relation skills needed to navigate the landmines that are often associated with diversity/multicultural work. The CGC believes the recommended goals will facilitate this objective.

There are few opportunities in life that truly can be considered **defining moments**. CGC believes this is one of those moments in the University's history. Will we be bold and become a leader in creating an environment that values its community members, and benefit from the gifts that each brings; or will we find ourselves looking back thinking -- what a missed opportunity? It is up to the leadership to seize this occasion to create a university known for its inclusiveness and richly diverse environment making it a number-one choice for those across the nation aspiring to work and learn in such a setting.

Finally, we want to reiterate the importance of hiring someone with primary responsibility for facilitating the action steps needed to guide the cultural change we envision at UR.

Implementation Plan for Recommended
Common Ground Commission
Goals and Strategies

Attachment A

<p>The goals and strategies set forth in this implementation plan, for the diversity initiative, come out of the work and recommendations of the Common Ground Commission (CGC), established by the President and Provost in August 2003. The information used to develop the goals and strategies were created from various forums used to engage the University community (administration, faculty, students, and staff). CGC also examined data and practices that are internal and external to the University.</p> <p>These goals are not in priority order; rather they are a cohesive set of strategic goals designed to work together in transforming UR's culture.</p>			
Goals, Strategies, Recommendations	Responsibility & Cost	Target Implementation Date	Possible Assessment Methods
Goal 1: Cultivate a Vision (meant to promote respect and understanding), by offering appropriate professional and personal development for all members of the University community at all levels of the institution.	Equity Officer	Spring 2004 & following completion of Goal #1	Institutional Audit & Situational Attitude Scale from "Assessing Campus Diversity Initiatives: A Guide for Campus Practitioners"
1.1 Provide Focused Training and Consultation for Senior Leadership to Fulfill the Unique Role in Leading and Modeling a Multicultural Initiative.	President / \$25K	Spring 2005	360 Degree Evaluation & other recommended methods from OIR
1.2 Provide Orientation and Training for the Board of Trustees Regarding the Multicultural Initiative.	President / \$10K	Orientation - Fall 2004 followed by Training in Spring 2005	To be determined by OIR
1.3 Develop training and enrichment that focuses upon and/or incorporates significant faculty and student interaction.	RC & WC Deans & PETE	Fall 2004 & Ongoing	OIR & TBD by Equity Officer
1.4 Require all students to participate in a one-semester off-campus Experiential Learning opportunity.	A&S, Jepson, RSB deans in collaboration with CDC & Service Learning Coordinator	Fall 2005	CDC & Service Learning Coordinator & OIR
1.5 Continue to Develop Programs that Support Multicultural Learning.	Respective Departments responsible for the activity	Ongoing	Units to work with OIR to develop measures

Implementation Plan for Recommended
Common Ground Commission
Goals and Strategies

Attachment A

Goals, Strategies, Recommendations	Responsibility & Cost	Target Implementation Date	Possible Assessment Methods
Goal 2: Create a climate that promotes free and open discussion of differences without fear, distrust, or undue anxiety.	Common Ground Commission by Institutional proxy until Institutional Equity Director is hired	Fall 2004	To be determined by the Office of Institutional Research & Assessment (OIR)
2.1 Create a dialogue to determine a safe and open way to address, as this environment is not conducive to forthrightness.	Facilitated by 3rd Party to be identified by CGC/ \$26K	Fall 2004	Determined by OIR and Equity Officer
2.2 Hold supervisors and managers accountable to lead by example, keep promises, deal fairly and ethically with every person in the institution, no matter what the position level.	Senior Leadership & all Units within the University	Spring 2005 following dialogue & training - then ongoing	360 Degree Evaluation
2.3 Establish and maintain practices that allow safe and confidential communications outside of the “chains of command.”	CGC will make recommendations to President & Provost for specific offices & key personnel across the University	Fall 2004	
Goal 3: Hire a senior executive/professional and create an office of institutional equity to oversee and facilitate the diversity goals. The position should report directly to the Provost/President, and work collaboratively with all units to develop and implement comprehensive and cohesive diversity programs & activities.	President & Search Committee/ \$200K per year	Search should commence immediately with possible hiring date of Jan. 2005 - no later than Oct. 2005	
3.1 The search for the person to fill this position should be national in scope, and should be executed in an expedient manner.	President & Provost Offices/ \$30K	A.S.A.P.	# of applicants with the requisite skills

Implementation Plan for Recommended
Common Ground Commission
Goals and Strategies

Attachment A

Goals, Strategies, Recommendations	Responsibility & Cost	Target Implementation Date	Possible Assessment Methods
3.2 Enlist the assistance of someone who knows those working in the field, such as Dr. Griggs to assist the search committee in identifying target areas for candidates and creating the job description & profile of candidates.	Current CGC Coordinator will initiate discussions w/ Dr. Griggs & hand over to President, Provost & Search Committee	A.S.A.P.	
Goal 4: Establish a Diversity Task Force (possibly continue the CGC) with Wide Representation from the University Community to serve as an oversight body as these goals are implemented.	President & Provost	Spring 2005	
4.1 Include members from senior leadership as well as members from different levels of the University and different schools and programs.	Current CGC in collaboration with President & Provost	Fall 2005	
4.2 Provide training and ongoing consultation to the Task Force in developing a common language for dealing with diversity issues, developing concrete action plans and being supported in its efforts.	Chair of CGC in collaboration with the President & Provost / \$20K	Ongoing	
4.3 Commit to at least a three-year plan in the beginning.	President & Provost	TBD by Senior Admin.	
4.4 Have this structure oversee the assessment, information gathering, recommendations and action plans for diversity with measures for accountability.	Equity Officer with OIR	Fall 2005	

Implementation Plan for Recommended
Common Ground Commission
Goals and Strategies

Attachment A

Goals, Strategies, Recommendations	Responsibility & Cost	Target Implementation Date	Possible Assessment Methods
4.5 Review of institutional documents, forms, policies, practices, programs, and procedures regarding benefits, hiring, accessibility, and curriculum.	University Policy Development & Review Group to be appointed by the President & Provost	Fall 2004	
Goal 5: Formulate on-going systematic methods for: leadership accountability; supervisor and management growth and development; communication and awareness; and policies and processes relative to institutional expectations.	President & Provost	Spring 2005 but no later than Fall 2005	360 Degree Evaluations and other measures determined by OIR & Equity Officer in collaboration with Human Resources
5.1 Hold supervisors and managers accountable for the people aspects of their units (i.e., diversity, performance management, recruitment and selection, employee development, etc.)	Senior Leadership & Leaders in Respective Units / \$10k per year	Fall 2005	Annual Performance Evaluations of Managers & Supervisors and Focus Groups
5.2 To guide practices in this area, the University should develop and articulate a policy for promoting diversity in recruiting, hiring, admission, and retention.	Offices of Admission, Student Affairs, Vice President of Business & Finance w/ CGC & Equity Officer	Fall 2005	
5.3 Develop and conduct new supervisor and manager training. Make sure it includes performance management, career coaching, classification and pay administration, selection, UR values, and diversity.	Office of Financial Aid (for student employees), Human Resources in collaboration with Equity Officer	Fall 2005	
5.4 Include diversity (why it's important and the vision for UR) training as a component of all orientation programs.	All units responsible for programming (HR, Student Affairs, Respective Deans) in collaboration with CGC & Equity Officer	Fall 2004	OIR Recommendation

Implementation Plan for Recommended
Common Ground Commission
Goals and Strategies

Attachment A

Goals, Strategies, Recommendations	Responsibility & Cost	Target Implementation Date	Possible Assessment Methods
5.5 Develop a mentoring program for all new employees, new supervisors, and new students.	All units responsible for programming (HR, Student Affairs, Respective Deans) in collaboration with CGC & Equity Officer	Spring 2005	OIR Recommendation
5.6 Create a leadership development program.	President & Provost Offices, Vice President for Business & Finance in collaboration with Equity Officer	Fall 2005	
5.7 Improve communication regarding classifications, pay, selection, and career development.	Human Resources	Fall 2004	
5.8 Develop a communication strategy and plan around diversity and related policies such as harassment.	Human Resources w/ Equity Officer, CGC, & Univ. Policy Development Review Group (to be named)	Fall 2005	
Goal 6: Devote fund raising efforts to establishing endowments to support the current and new programs aimed at improving the campus culture in relation to challenges surrounding diversity.	Advancement with oversight by the President	TBD	Receipt of funds, endowments, grants, earmarked for diversity and cultural development.