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I. Executive Summary

The 3rd Annual Conference on Student Engagement and Persistence was held on Friday, January 30, 2015 at the Cohen Center on the FGCU campus (see Appendix A and B). The Retention subgroup of the Engagement and Retention Management Committee (ERMC) chose “Building Inclusive Campus Environments at FGCU: A Conversation with Faculty, Staff, Students and Administration” as the topic for the conference after internal deliberations as well as discussion with the keynote speaker, Dr. Shaun Harper, who is the Executive Director of the Center for the Study of Race and Equity in Education at University of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia, PA. Dr. Harper is also the editor of “Creating Inclusive Campus Environments” (for cross-cultural learning and student engagement) and it therefore seemed appropriate to base the conference topic and the breakout sessions on parts of his book.

Thanks to the committee’s efforts to spread the word about the importance of the conference at a time of performance based funding for universities and the value for administrators, faculty and staff to hear from Dr. Harper more than 140 participants preregistered for the event. The total number of attendees (150 plus) can be considered a testament to the value placed on student success and campus inclusivity by faculty, staff and administrators.

The day began with a Welcome Address given by Dr. Gregerson, Dean of the College of Arts & Sciences, which included a short review of the first two conferences as well as changes that had happened since then based on the outcomes and recommendations. The conference proceeded with remarks from President Bradshaw leading to his introduction of the keynote speaker, Dr. Shaun Harper. Dr. Harper’s address focused on intentionality in building inclusive environments. He talked about his work with different universities and gave examples of successful changes made by administration and faculty alike. His main message was that change doesn’t occur unless we have the intention to create change as individual faculty but also as an institution as a whole.

Following Dr. Harper’s keynote address a student panel of six students talked about their experience at FGCU. The students represented different groups, such as the LGBT community and ethnic minorities. The discussion and Q&A session was moderate by Dr. Harper.

Provost Toll closed out the morning session by talking about the metrics of performance based funding for the Florida State University System and how FGCU was adapting to and thriving in this new environment.

The afternoon session started with a short Q&A session with Dr. Harper before participants split up to attend the different Breakout Sessions on Collaborative and Collective Action. The sessions lasted two hours and were loosely based on chapters from Dr. Harper’s book. Participants then reconvened to listen to and discuss the reports from the session facilitators. Dr. Harper made final comments based on these reports. The conference ended with closing remarks by Dr. Gregerson followed by a wine and cheese reception.
Following the conference, attendees received an email with a link to an online survey to provide feedback regarding all aspects of the conference and their experience. Although the overall feedback was positive (see Appendix D), the number of responses was disappointingly low.

The reports of the breakout sessions (see Appendix C) were discussed by the Retention subgroup and used as a basis for recommendations towards building an inclusive campus environment that will help students, regardless of their background, to integrate and be successful at FGCU.
II. Breakout Sessions Overview and Outcomes

Overall six Breakout Sessions on Collaborative and Collective Action were offered to conference participants. Participants were given the opportunity to indicate which session(s) they were interested in. Dr. Greene took charge of finding and instructing facilitators for the sessions, but also assigned registered participants to the different sessions based on their expressed interest and their role at FGCU. Our goal was to have diverse groups in each session to get input from different areas inside FGCU.

The sessions lasted two hours each. The facilitators shared information on what is happening at FGCU, some specifics of programs that directly impacted the topic of each session, facilitated a discussion on the topic, and tried to find a consensus on action items to improve on the current situation.

After two hours participants gathered back in the ballroom and each facilitator reported on the results of their group session. The facilitators also compiled a written record/report of their session and submitted it to the conference committee. The reports from each session can be found in Appendix C Breakout Sessions Reports.

The Enrollment and Retention Management Committee would like to extend a special “thank you” to the facilitators of the following breakout sessions.

Not By Accident: Intentionality in Diversity, Learning and Engagement

Summary: The emphasis of this session was on intentionality in education practice, recruitment and retention related to diversity and learning. Facilitators shared information on what is happening at FGCU, some specifics of programs which directly impact the topic, facilitated a discussion on the topic, and garnered participants’ help in brainstorming future action.

Facilitators: Valerie Garcia-Rea, Assistant Director TRIO Student Support Services – Classic
Susan Genson, Assistant Director TRIO Student Support Services – STEM
Marc Laviolette, Director of Admissions

Sensemaking of Multiculturalism on Campus: The Importance of Student Voices

Summary: The emphasis of this session was on the need to listen to student perspectives about multiculturalism in their institutions, plan programs, and develop partnerships across campus. What are we doing? What are some new actions we can take to address these issues?

Facilitator: Xue Qin Wang, Assistant Dean for Multicultural and Leadership Development

Making Campus Activities and Student Organizations Inclusive for Racial/Ethnic Minority Students

Summary: This session tried to “explore issues of minority student engagement in campus communities”. What are the barriers to involvement? What are the possibilities and intentional acts we can take to create an inclusive environment? How do these issues relate to Enrollment and Retention?

Facilitator: Dr. Shelby Gilbert, Assistant Professor College of Education
Understanding the Difference Diversity Makes: Faculty Beliefs, Attitudes and Behaviors

Summary: This session put emphasis on research and reality related to understanding faculty views about diversity on campus, tried to challenge participants’ thinking on the issues raised, and to garner their help in formulating action items.

Facilitator: Dr. Elia Vázquez-Montilla, Professor College of Education

Cross-Cultural Engagement: How Are We Doing, Can We Do More?

Summary: The emphasis of this session was on enhancing participants’ understanding of racial/ethnic dynamics on college campuses, including ours, and ways institutions can promote and sustain transformative cross-cultural engagement.

Facilitators: Dr. Billy Gunnels, Director of Undergraduate Scholarship and QEP
Marc Laviolette, Director of Admissions

Enacting Multicultural and Democratic Ideals on Campus: Challenges and Opportunities

Summary: This session wanted to explore the question, “What kind of community should higher education aspire to be?” What are the challenges, what the possibilities? How does the concept of community impact Enrollment and Retention?

Facilitator: Dr. Win Everham, Professor of Environmental Studies

Distilled Observation and Recommendations from the Breakout Sessions

- It’s our responsibility to take the burden off our students “to retain themselves”
- Bridge the gap between Academic Affairs and Student Affairs in intentional ways around broad topics. Share knowledge and ideas
- Build tradition, like Convocation, into the university experience of new students
- Build an Eagle Identity
- Create a Campus Diversity Center
- Incorporate diversity issues into existing required courses- e.g. Colloquium, Composition I
- Be intentional about the language used in all campus environments, materials, etc.
- Student reps on University committees paired up with a professional committee member to serve as a mentor
- Make use of RSOs to promote diversity and inclusion
  - RSO representatives can visit classes
  - Require crosstalk among diverse RSOs (part of funding model?)
- Conduct a climate survey of faculty, staff and students focused on diversity and multicultural awareness
  - Use data to create a plan to address shortcomings
  - Make use of focus groups to learn directly
- Establish learning communities dedicated to specific majors, interests, types of issues, etc.
• Promote increased relationships between faculty and student life and/or academic support programs
• Integrate training through the Lucas Center regarding inclusive educational environments
  o Integrate initiatives in new faculty and adjunct training
• Integrate more student participation in campus and community events in academics
• Create a “Diversity Café”, i.e., a place for faculty, students, and staff to engage in healthy and focused discussions about diversity concerns and issues
• Service learning diversity requirement
  o Require service learning or participation in learning communities as part of degree requirements, or incorporate participation through the university Transitions course.

**Additional action items discussed during evaluation of the breakout sessions reports:**

- Presemester programs
- Faculty helping with move-in
- More faculty/colleges involvement in FGCU family weekend
- Bring a parent/friend to class day
- Increased undergraduate research efforts
- Six months follow-up orientation for new faculty
- New staff orientation twice a year
- Common university Outlook calendar
- Specific orientation from colleges in addition to freshman orientation
- Lucas Center FLC How can faculty connect with students
III. Findings and Recommendations

The discussions in the breakout sessions and during the evaluation of the reports from the facilitators again emphasized that there is no single action that will dramatically improve student engagement or create an integrated diverse campus, but that it takes intentional efforts from administration, faculty, staff, and the student body.

The main findings were

1. Faculty numbers for attendance were not as high as we had hoped for; this was illustrated by the fact that less than 25% of registered conference participants were faculty and many decided not to attend the afternoon breakout sessions. A possible assumption of the turnout demographics might be that student engagement and retention are still largely seen as the responsibilities of those in Student Affairs. Regardless of the cause of this low faculty turnout it is apparent that in future more efforts have to be made to get faculty and staff to attend the conference and to actively participate in the breakout sessions.

2. Students have not been sufficiently integrated into the engagement and retention efforts so far. Apart from the students on the student panel only four students participated in the conference. Future conference planning committees should make a concerted effort to integrate students into the planning of the event and to encourage them to participate and share their experiences and perspectives.

3. The published work of Dr. Shaun Harper clearly demonstrates that thoughtful and well-designed inclusion programs/practices have a positive impact on retention and learning. Although there are some efforts for integration of our diverse student population there have to be more efforts from all parties to promote diversity and to create an inclusive learning and living environment.

4. There still is a need for institutional wide initiatives focused on promoting the formation of an Eagle identity that would help shape students’ sense of belonging and pride of being part of the FGCU family.

Based on this assessment and the reports from the breakout sessions we are putting forward the following list of recommendations:

1. A climate survey of faculty, staff and students focused on issues of diversity, inclusion and multicultural awareness, and the impact on student retention and progression.
   • Following Dr. Harper’s approach it is recommended to survey diverse students on what made them successful, what made them stay at FGCU and what they would consider the main obstacles for student success. For example, demographic data about the students who leave FGCU prior to graduation show that we struggle to retain Caucasian male students at the same levels as other student populations. It would be beneficial for us to know as much as we can about the Caucasian male students who do persist to graduation, and apply this knowledge to improve retention rates in this population.
• Provide mini-grants to faculty and students to engage into FGCU-specific studies exploring these topics for presentation at next year’s conference. For example, graduate students (under the supervision of faculty) could conduct a qualitative study of successful white male students and identify the factors that are most closely related to their persistence and graduation.

2. Re-establishment of freshman convocation in the context of a First Year Experience program to help build a culture of inclusion and to elevate the importance of traditions that symbolize integration into the academic community.

3. Creation of diversity related training opportunities for faculty, including adjunct faculty, via the Lucas Center for Faculty Development.

4. Since the development of a positive, inclusive campus community is a shared responsibility of faculty, staff, and students each college and its faculty and leadership should get actively involved in building the campus culture. This could include several programs that are very easy to implement, such as “Bring your Family to Class Day” and College Open Houses that bring together faculty, staff, and administrators with students and their families. Another possible way would be participation in Eagle Family Weekend much like we do in the campus-wide EagleExpo.

5. To ensure success, our students must integrate into the campus life. Strong engagement and retention efforts include building an inclusive campus environment. One way of doing this would be to encourage Registered Student Organizations’ leaders to continue to communicate and collaborate among diverse student groups in order to work on projects together that benefit the campus community. The development of a steering committee for RSO’s might prove useful for this purpose.
IV. Appendix

A. Conference Schedule

8:15-8:45 am  Continental Breakfast and Workshop Registration, CC Ballroom

8:45 am  Welcome and Overview of the Workshop (Dr. Robert Gregerson, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences)

Dr. Wilson Bradshaw, President
Introduction of Plenary Speaker

9:00 am  Keynote Address
Dr. Shaun Harper, Associate Professor, Graduate School of Education, And Executive Director, Center for the Study of Race and Equity in Education, University of Pennsylvania

10:20 am  Break and Transition

10:30 am  Student Panel
Moderated by Dr. Shaun Harper

11:30 am  Dr. Ron Toll, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

12:15-1:00 pm  Working Lunch

1:00-1:15 pm  Q & A session with Dr. Shaun Harper, CC Ballroom

1:15-3:15 pm  Breakout Sessions on Collaborative and Collective Action (see schedule page 6/7)

3:15-4:15 pm  Plenum Discussion of Results of Breakout Sessions, CC Ballroom

4:15 pm  Closing Remarks and Reception, CC Ballroom
B. Conference Program
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The Enrollment and Retention Management Committee would like to extend a special “thank you” to the following individuals who have made this conference possible:

- Dr. Wilson Bradshaw, President
- Dr. Ron Toll, Provost and VP for Academic Affairs
- Dr. Mike Rollo, VP for Student Affairs
- Steve Magiera, VP for Administrative Services and Finance

Facilitators for Afternoon Breakout Sessions:

- Dr. Win Everham, Professor of Environmental Studies
- Valerie Garcia-Rea, Assistant Director TRIO Student Support Services - Classic
- Susan Genson, Assistant Director TRIO Student Support Services - Stem
- Dr. Shelby Gilbert, Assistant Professor College of Education
- Dr. Billy Gunnels, Director of Undergraduate Scholarship and QEP
- Marc Laviolette, Director of Admissions
- Dr. Elia Vázquez-Montilla, Professor College of Education
- Xue Qin Wang, Assistant Dean for Multicultural and Leadership Development

Student Panel:

- Olivea Adetu
- Courtney Cravens
- Karah Crawford
- Todd Grieb
- Lisa Ray
- James Till
Keynote Speaker

Dr. Shaun Harper
Associate Professor, Graduate School of Education
Executive Director, Center for the Study of Race and Equity in Education
University of Pennsylvania

Dr. Harper’s research examines race and gender in education and social contexts, equity trends and racial climates on college campuses, Black and Latino male student success in high school and higher education, and college student engagement. He also occasionally writes about intercollegiate athletics. Dr. Harper has published 12 books and more than 90 peer-reviewed journal articles and other academic publications. He has received over $11.4 million in research grants.

Several education associations have praised Professor Harper’s scholarship, including the American Educational Research Association (2010 Division G Early Career Award, 2014 Relating Research to Practice Award); Association for the Study of Higher Education (2008 Early Career Award); National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (2004 Dissertation of the Year Award, 2010 Outstanding Contribution to Research Award, 2012 Robert H. Shaffer Award for Faculty Excellence, 2013 Pillar of the Profession); American College Personnel Association (2005 Emerging Scholar Award, 2006 Annuit Coeptis Award, 2014 Contribution to Knowledge Award); and the National Association of Academic Advisors for Athletics (2008 Excellence in Research Award).


Dr. Harper earned a bachelor’s degree in education from Albany State, a historically Black university in Georgia, and his Ph.D. in higher education from Indiana University.

Professor Harper is the Executive Director of the Center for the Study of Race and Equity in Education. Visit the Center's website at: http://www.gse.upenn.edu/equity
### Schedule At-A-Glance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:15-8:45 am</td>
<td>Continental Breakfast and Workshop Registration, CC Ballroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:45 am</td>
<td>Welcome and Overview of the Workshop (Dr. Robert Gregerson, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Dr. Wilson Bradshaw</strong>, President&lt;br&gt;Introduction of Plenary Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Keynote Address&lt;br&gt;<strong>Dr. Shaun Harper</strong>, Associate Professor, Graduate School of Education, And Executive Director, Center for the Study of Race and Equity in Education, University of Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:20 am</td>
<td>Break and Transition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 am</td>
<td>Student Panel&lt;br&gt;Moderated by Dr. Shaun Harper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30 am</td>
<td><strong>Dr. Ron Toll</strong>, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:15-1:00 pm</td>
<td>Working Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00-1:15 pm</td>
<td>Q &amp; A session with Dr. Shaun Harper, CC Ballroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15-3:15 pm</td>
<td>Breakout Sessions on Collaborative and Collective Action (see schedule page 6/7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:15-4:15 pm</td>
<td>Plenum Discussion of Results of Breakout Sessions, CC Ballroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:15 pm</td>
<td>Closing Remarks and Reception, CC Ballroom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Afternoon Breakout Sessions

Not By Accident: Intentionality in Diversity, Learning and Engagement

Summary: The emphasis of this session will be on intentionality in education practice, recruitment and retention related to diversity and learning. Facilitators will share information on what is happening at FGCU, some specifics of programs which directly impact the topic, facilitate a discussion on the topic, and garner your help in brainstorming future action.

Facilitators: Valerie Garcia-Rea, Assistant Director TRIO Student Support Services - Classic
Susan Genson, Assistant Director TRIO Student Support Services - STEM
Marc Laviolette, Director of Admissions

Location: CC 213

Sensemaking of Multiculturalism on Campus: The Importance of Student Voices

Summary: The emphasis of this session will be the need to listen to student perspectives about multiculturalism in their institutions, plan programs, and develop partnerships across campus. What are we doing? What are some new actions we can take to address these issues?

Facilitator: Xue Qin Wang, Assistant Dean for Multicultural and Leadership Development

Location: CC 214

Making Campus Activities and Student Organizations Inclusive for Racial/Ethnic Minority Students

Summary: The emphasis of this session is to “explore issues of minority student engagement in campus communities”. What are the barriers to involvement? What are the possibilities and intentional acts we can take to create an inclusive environment? How do these issues relate to Enrollment and Retention?

Facilitator: Dr. Shelby Gilbert, Assistant Professor College of Education

Location: CC 249

Understanding the Difference Diversity Makes: Faculty Beliefs, Attitudes and Behaviors

Summary: The emphasis of this session will be on research and reality related to understanding faculty views about diversity on campus, challenge your thinking on the issues raised, and garner your help in formulating action items.

Facilitator: Dr. Elia Vázquez-Montilla, Professor College of Education

Location: CC 247A

Cross-Cultural Engagement: How Are We Doing, Can We Do More?

Summary: The emphasis of this session will be on enhancing your understanding of racial/ethnic dynamics on college campuses, including ours, and ways institutions can promote and sustain transformative cross-cultural engagement.

Facilitators: Dr. Billy Gunnels, Director of Undergraduate Scholarship and QEP
Marc Laviolette, Director of Admissions

Location: CC 247BC
Enacting Multicultural and Democratic Ideals on Campus: Challenges and Opportunities

Summary: The emphasis of this session will be exploring the question, "What kind of community should higher education aspire to be?" What are the challenges, what the possibilities? How does the concept of community impact Enrollment and Retention?

Facilitator: Dr. Win Everham, Professor of Environmental Studies

Location: CC 162
C. Breakout Sessions Reports

1. Session 1 Not By Accident: Intentionality in Diversity, Learning and Engagement
   Facilitators: Valerie Garcia-Rea, Assistant Director TRIO Student Support Services - Classic
                  Susan Genson, Assistant Director TRIO Student Support Services - STEM
                  Marc Laviolette, Director of Admissions

   Ah Ha Moments from the morning:
   • talking about intentionality and the faculty member who reached out to a student about joining him in research, and how this fits into the independent study process in our college (LCOB). Faculty has been expecting students to have a plan and know what they want to do when they approach them…but it’s important to look at this another way and understand that they often need someone to explain this opportunity and to reach out to THEM and provide the encouragement to get involved.
   • it’s our responsibility to take the burden off our students “to retain themselves” - what aspects of SSS can we adopt across campus because they work with the students who are able to be a part of this program?
   • what ways can we meet students where they are - bring programs, faculty, staff, opportunities into the classroom; take advising outside of the office and into public spaces to talk with students
   • the concept of remediation - keeping up with the baseline knowledge and educating ourselves about the issues
   • involving individuals with the power to impact change
   • An emphasis on strategy at the university level that is organized and intentional - cross unit/cross division discussion and collaboration

   Brainstorming
   • Murky middle - programming for those student who get lost in the shuffle. Identifying them, programming for them - students whose GPA is on good standing but they aren’t eligible for certain majors and they just float along…without any intervention from the institution
   • Accessibility/transparency of data about who we are losing, when we are losing them, what they look like
   • Programs like Mapworks - self-assessed evaluation of non-cognitive factors that would allow us to focus on individuals we CAN save
   • Remediation experience for faculty and staff, if we are keeping diversity focus in our mission. What does it mean to value diversity? What can faculty do to be more inclusive in the classroom? What resources can they read? What can we learn? How can the Lucas Center serve as the partner for this education?
• Build tradition, like Convocation, into the university experience of new students - but make them sustainable! Build an Eagle Identity...

• Departments don’t talk to one another in intentional ways - form a committee to educate each other. Provide new hires with information from each office about what they do and what role they play. Could take the DSA new hire orientation that is being developed and expand it to the entire university...

• Bridge the gap between Academic Affairs and Student Affairs in intentional ways around broad topics. Share knowledge and ideas.

2. Session 2 Sensemaking of Multiculturalism on Campus: The Importance of Student Voices

Facilitator: Xue Qin Wang, Assistant Dean for Multicultural and Leadership Development

What resonated with us from the morning session?

• Black males feel they have to prove themselves academically; prove they belong
• How to engage the “disengaged”
• Are we still making good people while meeting metrics?
• Changing the language
• Students who are in defined group build relationships within that community; i.e. learning community
• Different groups congregate in areas on campus
• FGCU gives personal connection but doesn’t track or identify frequent “fires”
• Need to figure out why students are leaving?
• Educating on the front end
• Students being informed about the classes they are taking on the front end (when they enter the University)
• Being there to just listen
• Build better networks between departments
• Representatives from committees need to share back to departments
• Need one place where all events are listed, and it is easily accessible
• The student panel was the first time students were given the opportunity to speak to faculty and administrators
• Sometimes student input is difficult to translate to a solution, when contrary to other constraints such as policies, regulations, etc.
• Catch the students when they first come in; student ownership; peer to peer
• Need to hear what students want in the framework of what we know as professionals
• Literacy … getting journals and articles in the department
- Part-time and/or commuter/Adults returning to college … how do we engage them? We need to find a way to bring them in
- Being intentional vs. student taking responsibility
- Unable to get information/data about students easily
- Giving students a voice …we don’t ask
  - Being intentional about reaching out to students who serve on University committees
- Are we using data about why students leave?
- Addressing and listening to students

**Action Plan**

- Create an Enrollment Management Office
- Have student comment boxes available around campus
- Be intentional about the language used in all campus environments, materials, etc.
- Take initiatives from this workshop to students for action plans
- Student rep on University committees paired up with a professional committee member to serve as a mentor
- Being intentional about conversations with students; bring them with us
- Implement a Retention Management system
- Faculty and staff make a video intro for the website instead of just using a picture
- Establish an assessment plan to implement that evaluates diversity/multicultural awareness on campus (This will be a responsibility for the Enrollment Management Office)
- Establish a program where RSOs can earn additional funding for partnering with another organization that is different than theirs.
  - Encourage RSO leaders to do public outreach
  - Joint fundraising efforts with other organizations.
- Provide opportunities for students to discuss diversity issues, etc. (expand current Lecture Series)
- Continue to establish opportunities for peer-to-peer mentoring
- Establish learning communities dedicated to specific majors, interests, types of issues, etc.
  - Promote increased relationships between faculty and student life and/or academic support programs
- Overhaul the University calendar of events
- Make data available institution-wide; hold focus groups
- Integrate training through the Lucas Center regarding inclusive educational environments
  - Integrate initiatives in new faculty and adjunct training; HR should also have a program for when staff are hired
- University-wide initiative to increase multicultural awareness; include faculty on action plans for implementation
3. Session 3 Making Campus Activities and Student Organizations Inclusive for Racial/Ethnic Minority Students

Facilitator: Dr. Shelby Gilbert, Assistant Professor College of Education

- The EagleLink website is not very useful or user-friendly. Revamp EagleLink or develop a new, more useful website that all RSO advisors can easily access and update information about their organizations.
- Encourage more collaboration among RSO advisors to keep informed of events that other organizations are hosting. This could lead to cross-organizational events and avoid overlap of certain goals.
- Use the electronic media boards around campus more effectively to inform students of events around campus.
- Encourage faculty to allow RSO representatives to share brief presentations about their organizations to their classes, particularly those that are closely tied to majors and careers.
- Integrate more student participation in campus and community events in academics. Require service learning or participation in learning communities as part of degree requirements, or incorporate participation through the university Transitions course.

4. Session 4 Understanding the Difference Diversity Makes: Faculty Beliefs, Attitudes and Behaviors

Facilitator: Dr. Elia Vázquez-Montilla, Professor College of Education

Issues during this breakout session were discussed from 2 points of view: a) faculty; b) students.

Common themes for both faculty and staff emerged from the discussion:

- Being part of a community is important; a sense belonging needs to be developed.
- Challenge of adapting to the higher education environment while maintaining your unique cultural voice.
- A strong diverse voice can bring negative reactions and perceptions of being difficult.
- Being respected for who we are is essential; respected by peers; by faculty; regarded for the effort and achievement.
- There is tension from being asked to represent or speak for the cultural group; dualism and dilemma of being identified with a cultural group as well as being asked to speak on behalf of them.
- All education is cultural education; OR All education has to do with diversity and culture.
- There is evidence of unexamined assumptions made by both faculty or students.
To resolve any of the issues discussed, a consistent plan of action needs to be developed at institutional level. Thus the following questions was pondered during the breakout session - What institutional resources do we have at FGCU that could help us in understanding diversity issues? Following are possible ideas that the group decided would provide opportunities to better understand diversity and support to diverse perspectives and environment on campus. All include the ideas of training, as well as, engaging types of activities/projects leading to a sustainable and deeper understanding and change in attitudes.

- **Give a status to diversity and a unified front.** A designated “Center” or place for anyone, especially students to go and raise concerns. This place needs to be visible to anyone on campus. *Maybe designing a specific sticker or logo that can be visible throughout campus will make students know about this center and will identify us as a university seriously attending to diverse issues.*

- **The must be an institutional effort to give status to the diversity issues.** Although there are departments and other offices on campus concern with diversity issue, they tend to be task oriented. *This presents a missing educational piece in the education of diversity. This may be a place for faculty, students, and staff to engage in healthy and focused discussions about diversity concerns and issues.* (“Diversity Café”? ) (more related to the Spanish concept of “tertulias”; a place where people gather to have a conversation).

- **Forums** (2 or 3 per semester?) related to diversity issues (mandatory of not?) (maybe giving extra credit to students?)

- **Substantial and meaningful orientations for all.** Faculty needs to be cognizant of the classroom environment and directly intervene when an issue arise. *Training for faculty and staff* (Lucas Center) will allow for a prompt response to diverse issues.

- **Active engagement from all.** Activities where students, faculty, and staff talk about how they feel in terms of diversity issues and progress made on campus and actively engage in a project supported by the university.

- **Use some of our established courses** (such as colloquium, comp1, ecological literacy) and include a divisive diverse topic or a sensitive targeted reading as part of the work).

- **Service learning diversity requirement.** Service learning could have an amount of hours (10hrs?) designated for specific diversity issues which will makes students look for areas outside their comfort zone. Working along these organizations could be highlighted as those fulfilling the diversity requirement.

- **Surveys.** Begin defining diversity issue needs by surveying faculty, staff and students in terms of attitudes, beliefs, and disposition they have towards diversity.
5. Session 5 Cross-Cultural Engagement: How Are We Doing, Can We Do More?

**Facilitators:** Dr. Billy Gunnels, Director of Undergraduate Scholarship and QEP
Marc Laviolette, Director of Admissions

- **Where we are (Mark Laviolette):**
  - Selectivity – high traditional university (just above average)
    - Average ACT 23, SAT 1570, GPA 3.7
    - Admission grade 54% (dropped by 7% since last year)
  - Retention rate – increases every year about 1-2 points
    - We are higher than average in comparison to our peer institutions
  - 6yr grad rate
    - 47%

- **Consultant says:**
  - Need for multi-level goals for many different metrics
  - Need to revise annual marketing/recruitment plan to contain those goals
  - Attrition rate problems – what happens to students that do not make it into their programs?
    - Should we move to direct admission rather than admission at junior level
  - Where are our “decline” students going if they choose not to come here after acceptance?
    - Our competition: UCF, USF, etc.
  - Strengthen institutional research function as it applies to admission functions
  - Define target market “sweet spot” that will make a difference in enrollment outcomes
    - Is there one group of students we are missing? Like tiered scholarship levels….
  - Identify academic segments based on yield rates (GPA and test scores)
  - Identify academic programs where there is capacity to grow – and then market them
  - Load more names into our database (marketing/recruitment)
  - Website – needs work
    - Have updated tuition page (changed to annual rate)
    - Students want to see: academic programs, costs, scholarships, financial aid
      - Need to be able to highlight academic programs in a succinct way
  - Campus visitation program – should be able to correlate the visits with growth
    - May need to increase to 4 or 5 Eagle EXPOs
    - Do we need to bring middle school students to campus? Or should we focus more on high school
  - Calling campaigns – get admitted students to commit to FGCU
  - Financial Aid – when are we giving out, to who, and how efficient is it
  - Better understanding of students at risk
- Look at intended program of study, unmet needs, geographic, GPA/test score, high school type, resident vs. commuter, veterans, etc.
- How can you help them? – increase advising
  - Admit rate – are students more likely to come if admitted early or later
  - Focus on 2-3 year retention rate and 3-4 year retention rate
    - Transfer out rate: 15%
    - Retention rate: 49% (?)

Bill Y. Gunnels: how can we transform student experiences??
- What is our perception of where we are at vs. what our students’ perception is?

What does “we are FGCU” mean? What is our culture?
- Sustainability and civic engagement
- We are a teaching university
- We are student centered
- “Dunk City”
- We have strong ties to our region
- Pride ourselves on being innovative
- Collaborative – shared governance
- Diverse campus
- Actively engaged (on and off campus)

Student’s perspective
- White, middle class – so are we diverse??
  - We may have diversity in population, but it is segregated/separated
  - Segregated communication
- Student body is visibly white
- Students see the struggle of growth and adaptation – incorporation of Friday classes
- Commuter school – large population of working students/student-workers
- Varied perspectives (commuter vs. on campus vs. non-traditional students)
- Undergrads think we have “weaker” grad programs that are not as competitive as others
- Athletics focused (recent phenomenon)
- Focused engagement – they focus on one thing, but don’t know how to be inclusive or include other groups
- “dunk city”
- “token” sustainability/civic engagement
  - Happens “to late in the game”
- Teaching university with a lack on research (ability and knowledge of)
• Cultural elements are academically compartmentalized
• Student centered – feeling that faculty care, small class sizes

What are our Universal Priorities?
• Student centered
  o What does this mean?
    ▪ It should be all about them…. How to make them better learner, employees, citizens
    ▪ We should engage them in various opportunities and high impact experiences
    ▪ Put our money where our mouth is – make sure we provide money and funding for more classes and research, etc.
    ▪ Professors want students to succeed and actually have time to teach
  o How do we engage them?
    ▪ What we do now is "somewhat normalized" and compartmentalized in communities
      • Athletics, honors, LLC, SSS, WiSTEM
    ▪ Take advantage of opportunities for faculty development
  o What physical artifacts do we have to engage our students?
    ▪ Various RSOs, clubs, organizations – GSA/LLC
    ▪ Our campus (swamps to beaches)
    ▪ Fraternities and sororities
    ▪ Campus employment – orientation leaders, RA’s
    ▪ Multi-cultural leadership development
      • Emerging Eagles – leadership development program
    ▪ Eagle I Ambassador; as well as other Ambassador program
    ▪ Honors Program
    ▪ Us as faculty and staff
    ▪ Mentoring program

How do we deal with disconnect? Where are the myths and traditions? What are our traditional artifacts??
• Dunk City is a symbolic, traditional artifact
• Sustainability and civic engagement are symbolic artifacts
• Approachable culture – you can talk to anyone, including deans

How do we engage diversity?
• Office hours/locations; non-traditional
• More interaction with students
Utilizing online discussion boards to help make more introverted students comfortable

- Employee responsibilities to engage students outside the classroom
  - Who do we engage? Are we doing it for the student or the university??

- Fostering mentor/mentee relationships
- Ask and listen to student opinions
  - Include students in programs – duh…?
- Intentional advising
  - 20 minute sessions with 5 min programmatic and 14 min personal advising
  - Advising encouragement
  - Different advising roles

How do we LEARN?? (Assessment)

- Surveys – maybe not the best
- Focus groups; personal invitations rather than mass email invitations
  - Having an intentionality
- Observations
- Relationship building
- Asking the hard questions and LISTENING for the responses (even if they are not what you want to hear)
- Reading – what does the literature say
- Engaging ourselves
- By example

How do we apply what we learn?

- By setting the example or standard
  - Administration/faculty/staff engage diversity
- Return the knowledge – communicate back what we learned
  - Communicate discovery
  - Inform our efforts

6. **Session 6 Enacting Multicultural and Democratic Ideals on Campus: Challenges and Opportunities**

*Facilitator:* Dr. Win Everham, Professor of Environmental Studies

I. Review of Chapter 12
a. The chapter focused on the challenge of creating a comfortable place for people who see themselves as 'other', but then recognizing the challenge in facilitating boundary-crossing among these isolated, comfortable spaces.

II. Articulation of issues – *chronological rather than in any prioritized order*

- SGA and funding for RSOs is perceived as 'controlled' by Greek organizations resulting in inequitable allocation of funding.
- RSO are diverse and can provided some comfortable 'save' zones, but all may help border crossing and getting diverse groups to interact
- How do we attract, embrace, value, honor diversity – including in areas not discussed at the workshop: e.g. socioeconomic status, or age
- A university should be a place for modeling interactions and community-building across multicultural boundaries.

III. Suggested actions

- **Faculty and staff need to be trained to practice/model before of tolerance**
  - We need opportunities to read and reflect on the important scholarship in the field.
  - Students, staff and faculty all need to engage in this ideas starting with their orientations to campus.
  - On-going education of the entire campus with courses: e.g. issues of diversity.
- **We need to develop strategies for community building among silos** (e.g. faculty staff, or academic units). e.g. “Take a Hike” effort from Counseling and Student Health Services.
- **We need to generate another Climate Survey**
  - this will generate assessment data and help us focus our efforts.
  - **We need to re-build trust in this process and instrument.** Members of our community will not engage in this process when they believe the last survey resulted in no substantive change.
- **We need to move beyond just talk to specific, measurable, assessable actions.**
  - Forums are one form of actions. Encourage “Difficult Conversations” or dialogues
  - Speakers series and follow-up forums.
- **The entire community needs nurturing to make everyone feel welcome.**
  - Bring back convocation as a community-building activity.
  - Arrange weekly schedule with a ‘free hour’ to facilitate scheduling events, professional development, engaging students, commuter students, faculty and staff interactions.
- **Coordination of resource sharing and information access**
  - main calendar that can be sorted by themes.
  - centralized email.
• **outlook calendar – centralized.**

• **High-level task force to review best practices and guide:**
  - effective information sharing.
  - community-building.
  - nurturing multicultural discourse.

IV. **Conclusions**

• Our conversation indicated that efforts to build a diverse, multi-cultural, engaged, democratic, community inevitably is tied to *simple community building*: better communication, efforts to facilitate boundary crossing, and nurturing the feeling that all opinions are solicited and considered in any decision-making processes. Students, staff, and faculty will be active members of our community when they feel their differences are recognized, respected, and embraced. This in turn creates a model community that can attract and retain people of diverse backgrounds, experiences, and opinions.

• Although this vision can be facilitated by a variety of diffuse efforts, it is unlikely to be achieved without significant structural change. To build a multicultural nurturing community will require specific goals and metrics and careful assessment of our efforts.
D. Participants Assessment of the Conference (with responses)

3rd Annual Student Engagement and Persistence Conference Survey Results

N=15

1. Which best describes your role at FGCU?
   a. Faculty (n=4)
   b. Staff (n=6)
   c. Administrator (n=5)

2. Which part(s) of the conference did you attend?
   a. Morning only (n=2)
   b. Morning and afternoon sessions (n=13)

3. Please rate the quality of meals served at the conference:
   a. Likert scale 1 = Poor to 5 = Excellent (3.8)

4. Please rate the quality of the keynote address:
   a. Likert scale 1 = Poor to 5 = Excellent (4.6)
   b. Briefly explain your response

5. To what extent will you utilize what you learned at the conference in your daily work?
   a. Likert scale 1 = Not at all to 5 = A great deal (4.2)
   b. Briefly explain your response

6. To what extent was the format of the conference conducive to learning and discussing material?
   a. Likert scale 1 = Not at all to 5 = A great deal (4.27)

7. How important were the following aspects of the conference to you?
   a. Keynote Speaker/Facilitator (4.47)
      i. Likert scale 1 = Not important at all to 5 = Extremely Important
   b. Provost Toll’s Address on Performance Based Funding (4)
      i. Likert scale 1 = Not important at all to 5 = Extremely Important
   c. Student Panel (4.27)
      i. Likert scale 1 = Not important at all to 5 = Extremely Important
   d. Small Breakout Groups with Colleagues (4)
      i. Likert scale 1 = Not important at all to 5 = Extremely Important
   e. Large group share back (3.27)
      i. Likert scale 1 = Not important at all to 5 = Extremely Important
   f. Food (2.8)
      i. Likert scale 1 = Not important at all to 5 = Extremely Important
g. Getting away from the office (3.07)
   i. Likert scale 1 = Not important at all to 5 = Extremely Important
h. Potential of how to incorporate what I learned in my work (4.47)
   i. Likert scale 1 = Not important at all to 5 = Extremely Important

8. From your experiences, what aspect do you think FGCU does best to build inclusive learning environments? (List the discussion groups for participants to choose)
   a. Please comment on your response above (0.13)

I think that while some faculty/staff/and offices at FGCU do each of these things on smaller levels with smaller populations, there is definitely room for improvement on all of these. I am looking forward to seen the new programs and initiatives that develop post-conference based on all of our discussions and the advice of Dr. Harper and the student panel.

unfortunately could not attend some of the sessions so unable to give adequate evaluation

We need to work on all of these. I was forced to select one, but I don't think we do ANY of these well.

There are always activities, events, and organizations geared towards various aspects of diversity and how we can include them in learning environments.

I think our campus does a great job of incorporating student voices in our campus. Our campus does a better job than we were given credit of addressing the key topics discussed.

Though I was forced to pick ONE of the above, every aspect mentioned needs to be improved upon HUGELY. While there may be pockets of individuals and the odd division or department that is making slight inroads into building these inclusive learning environments, the truth is that they are the exception rather than the rule. We are marginally better than we used to be but room for improvement definitely exists.

Where there's a will, there's a way.

I do feel that FGCU may solicit feedback from students but I have not seen any action on the feedback that has been gathered in any area on campus.

I think FGCU does a good job of having a multitude of events and programming on campus that highlight diverse populations.

9. From your experiences, what aspect do you think FGCU needs the most improvement to build inclusive learning environments? (List the discussion groups for participants to choose)
   a. Please comment on your response above (0.53)

I was forced to only select one, but I think we need to work on ALL of these.

Often times we in silos and do not cross engage.

Again, our campus does a good job and was not given enough credit for addressing the key topics discussed.
We say and think we are working from an intentional space, but are we really? We tell the students we hear them, but do we really LISTEN? I'm not convinced most on this campus understand what Cross-Cultural Engagement really is.

We may need more encouragement to incorporate students into all campus discussions that affect student enrollment.

There are a number of committees addressing various issues on campus, yet many students are not at this time brought into the decision making process.

I think we could be much more intentional with the efforts that we make in terms of programming and learning experiences for our students. I also think FGCU needs a better vehicle for gathering student feedback and their voice on campus, rather than the traditional means (through SGA, etc.).

10. **What would have made this conference more beneficial to you?** (Open-ended question)

   I think this conference would have been more beneficial had it been spread out over more than one day. I would have liked to have been able to be in more than one of the breakout sessions, and it was a lot of information to take in all in one day.

   The conference itself was great. Â What will be the true test of our collective and individual investment will be what we do with the information, how we keep the conversations going, and how we effect change

   If my entire department/office could have attended together and then debriefed together at the end that would have been great.

   More specific examples and better moderation of the student panel.

   Were the facilitators in each breakout session really informed and trained on how to keep the attendees on target? People in my session had a tendency to go off on tangents that didn't really pertain to the key points we were addressing. Using the time instead to beef across the board about what wasn't working for them rather than what not working for STUDENTS...big difference. Less time in the breakouts and more time to dig deep into what was learned from those sessions during the Sharing portion.

   More structure to breakout groups.

   Adding time to break off in departments to discuss implementation possibilities.

   The conference became a little confused when it mixed issues of diversity and overall retention. Either topic would be beneficial, but mixing them confused the dialogue.

   Smaller groups for the breakout discussions. While there were lots of ideas shared, there may have been too many ideas to work with.

   Breaking this up into two days (and giving more interfacing time, and plan creation time even within our individual teams/units) would have made this more beneficial. There also should have been more representation from administration (i.e. all of the Deans). This is an event that administration should support their faculty and staff to participate in, and I heard that some units did not have that type of support for fear of closing offices or not being available to students (especially when this is a free
11. What topic area(s) would you suggest we cover in future sessions provided by the Enrollment Management Retention Committee? (Open-ended question)

I think it important to cover any topics that would relate to the service we provide to students and making our campus the most welcoming environment for them. From service-learning to student organizations and campus involvement, I think it is important to remember they are the focus. I also think it would be nice to have some kind of "tradition" that FGCU can be known for that students will look forward to every year.

Using Appreciative Inquiry

Faculty development in areas of strategic need.

Reaching out to under-represented students on the campus such as: Students with Disabilities, Graduate Students, Commuter Students, Veteran Students, etc.

Creative (not competitive) collaboration.

Surprise me...anything student centered because we are here for THEM.

Building a cohesive structure for enrollment management.

The completion agenda, and what FGCU can do to encourage our students to complete their degrees. Building bridges between divisions (i.e. Student Affairs and Academic Affairs).

12. Overall, how beneficial was this conference to you?
   a. Likert scale 1=Not beneficial at all to 5 = Extremely beneficial (4.27)

13. Do you think you will attend this conference in the future? (Yes, probably)
   a. Yes, probably
   b. No, probably not
   c. No, definitely not

14. Would you recommend this conference in the future to colleagues? (Yes, probably)
   a. Yes, probably
   b. No, probably not
   c. No, definitely not

15. Do you have any additional comments or suggestions regarding this conference? (Open-ended question)

I think students need to be included in and invited to this conference.

There is always something to take away from these conferences and apply in our work. Depending on how invested the participants are and how visionary and committed they/we are to making...
changes the takeaways can vary. Each conference has given me something to think about, a few good points, and some ideas to consider the way we do our work.

GREAT conference! I cannot wait to see what the committee does next year.

I would have liked more support for the positive things our campus does do, rather than focusing on areas that it was suggested we improve.

I would love to see feedback on whether or not any of these conference have made an impact

I really enjoyed Dr. Harper as a guest speaker. The keynote was by far the most beneficial piece of this conference. Providing literature to supplement this discussion would be helpful.

Thank you for planning and organizing this conference and continuing to involve faculty and staff.

Dr. Terrell Strayhorn would be a great keynote option in the future as well.

There were 15 responses to the follow-up survey distributed after the conference. Of the respondents, 4 were faculty, 6 staff, and 5 administrators. Most respondents (n=13) attended the full conference. Overall, respondents positively rated the keynote address (4.6), its utility to daily work (4.2), and the extent to which the format was conducive to learning and discussion (4.27). Additionally, respondents were favorable to the quality of meals (3.8), Provost's address (4), student panel (4.27), and the small group break outs with colleagues (4). The part of the conference with the lowest respondent score was the large group share back (3.27).

Open-ended questions complete by respondents shared that students should have been invited to attend. Respondents were asked to choose one area in which the most improvement was needed to better build inclusive learning environments. Responses included:

- I was forced to only select one, but I think we need to work on ALL of these.
- Often times we in silos and do not cross engage.
- Again, our campus does a good job and was not given enough credit for addressing the key topics discussed.
- We say and think we are working from an intentional space, but are we really? We tell the students we hear them, but do we really LISTEN? I'm not convinced most on this campus understand what Cross-Cultural Engagement really is.
- We may need more encouragement to incorporate students into all campus discussions that affect student enrollment.
- There are a number of committees addressing various issues on campus, yet many students are not at this time brought into the decision making process.
- I think we could be much more intentional with the efforts that we make in terms of programming and learning experiences for our students. I also think FGCU needs a better
vehicle for gathering student feedback and their voice on campus, rather than the traditional means (through SGA, etc.).

Additionally, respondents shared the following feedback regarding how the conference could be more beneficial:

- I think this conference would have been more beneficial had it been spread out over more than one day. I would have liked to have been able to be in more than one of the breakout sessions, and it was a lot of information to take in all in one day.
- The conference itself was great. What will be the true test of our collective and individual investment will be what we do with the information, how we keep the conversations going, and how we effect change.
- If my entire department/office could have attended together and then debriefed together at the end that would have been great.
- More specific examples and better moderation of the student panel.
- Were the facilitators in each breakout session really informed and trained on how to keep the attendees on target? People in my session had a tendency to go off on tangents that didn't really pertain to the key points we were addressing. Using the time instead to beef across the board about what wasn't working for them rather than what not working for STUDENTS...big difference. Less time in the breakouts and more time to dig deep into what was learned from those sessions during the Sharing portion.
- More structure to breakout groups.
- Adding time to break off in departments to discuss implementation possibilities.
- The conference became a little confused when it mixed issues of diversity and overall retention. Either topic would be beneficial, but mixing them confused the dialogue.
- Smaller groups for the breakout discussions. While there were lots of ideas shared, there may have been too many ideas to work with.
- Breaking this up into two days (and giving more interfacing time, and plan creation time even within our individual teams/units) would have made this more beneficial. There also should have been more representation from administration (i.e. all of the Deans). This is an event that administration should support their faculty and staff to participate in, and I heard that some units did not have that type of support for fear of closing offices or not being available to students (especially when this is a free professional development opportunity that directly and positively affects how we work with students to encourage their success).

Overall, respondents shared that the conference was beneficial, that they would attend in the future, and that they would recommend to colleagues. Open-ended responses provided the following feedback:

- I think students need to be included in and invited to this conference.
• There is always something to take away from these conferences and apply in our work. Depending on how invested the participants are and how visionary and committed they/we are to making changes the takeaways can vary. Each conference has given me something to think about, a few good points, and some ideas to consider the way we do our work.

• GREAT conference! I cannot wait to see what the committee does next year.

• I would have liked more support for the positive things our campus does do, rather than focusing on areas that it was suggested we improve.

• I would love to see feedback on whether or not any of these conference have made an impact.

• I really enjoyed Dr. Harper as a guest speaker. The keynote was by far the most beneficial piece of this conference. Providing literature to supplement this discussion would be helpful.

• Thank you for planning and organizing this conference and continuing to involve faculty and staff.

• Dr. Terrell Strayhorn would be a great keynote option in the future as well.

Respondents shared that future topics might include:

• I think it important to cover any topics that would relate to the service we provide to students and making our campus the most welcoming environment for them. From service-learning to student organizations and campus involvement I think it is important to remember they are the focus. I also think it would be nice to have some kind of "tradition" that FGCU can be known for that students will look forward to every year.

• Using Appreciative Inquiry

• Faculty development in areas of strategic need.

• Reaching out to under-represented students on the campus such as: Students with Disabilities, Graduate Students, Commuter Students, Veteran Students, etc.

• Creative (not competitive) collaboration.

• Surprise me...anything student centered because we are here for THEM

• Building a cohesive structure for enrollment management.

• The completion agenda, and what FGCU can do to encourage our students to complete their degrees. Building bridges between divisions (i.e. Student Affairs and Academic Affairs)