

January 30, 2006

Name of Task Force subcommittee:

PARTICIPATION AND EMPOWERMENT

Names of subcommittee Chairs:

NANCY SQUIRES, ED DRUMMOND

Listing of subcommittee members

Charles Mcateer/Admin  
Jedan Phillips/UHMC  
Winston Wakefield/UHMC  
Andrei Antonenko/GST  
Gina Vanacore/OSA  
Teng-fong Wong/CAS  
Aryeh Grossman/GST  
Judi Segall/Pres  
Olufemi Vaughan/CAS  
Ora Bouey/HSC  
Robert Holland/UHMC  
Edward Drummond/UHMC  
Jenny Hwang/OSA  
Jenny Wang – undergraduate student

FOR THE FOLLOWING, SEE THE ATTACHMENTS

1. Provide the goals and objectives of your subcommittee;
2. Outline major discussion topics addressed in your meetings to date (elaborate as necessary);
3. Provide any specific expertise that you may need to address the topics under discussion;
4. Outline any activities that you plan to implement as a subcommittee or in partnership with another subcommittee;
5. Outline how your subcommittee will engage some of those who will be responsible for implementation with your subcommittee's discussions during the next three months;
6. List future plans and activities.

## **PARTICIPATION AND EMPOWERMENT SUBCOMMITTEE - January 30, 2006**

### GOALS

- 360 degree communication and information sharing
- wholistic view of employees
- alignment of organizational cultures and processes
- develop trust at all levels
- connect issues across the whole campus and levels
- reach out to all underrepresented groups; they need representation on committees and at all levels

### PROBLEMS TO BE ADDRESSED

- where to go to express concerns
- there are different rules for different groups and levels
- different rules and inconsistencies for different departments

### PREPARATORY TASKS

- describe the culture of the university
- identify the 'guardians' of that culture or perhaps more broadly the influencers.
- identify barriers to communication

### SPECIFIC TASKS

- improve the way we welcome new people to SBU
- enhance communication and outreach to attract diversity
- improve access to websites for all groups and individuals
- institutionalize some sort of broad based access to communication outlets
- increase efforts to retain all members of the campus
- have rules, guidelines, regulations for decision making that are clear and binding at all levels

### CHARACTERISTICS OF THE BODY THAT WILL BE FORMED TO OVERSEE THE IMPLEMENTATION

- an advocacy group
- broad representation (and hence broad dialogue)
- engage in post task-force monitoring or compliance
- empowered to actuate change
- have access to exit interviews of all members of the community

## **DRAFT PROPOSAL – PARTICIPATION AND EMPOWERMENT COMMITTEE**

January 30, 2006

Since this subcommittee cannot solve the many individual sources of alienation and dissatisfaction that we have discussed, it is proposed that the University create a "Campus Climate Response Team." This team would be constituted much as the subcommittee is --- representing all parts of the campus community. The team would be empowered to work on campus-climate problems, either problems already identified in the various surveys, or problems brought to it by representatives of various constituencies. This would provide a long-term, ongoing mechanism for whittling away at the sources of the alienation that many members of the campus community feel. It would also empower people in the community by giving them and their problems a fair hearing. It is important that the existence of the team and the results it achieves receive wide publicity. It is equally important that this be a group that can speak directly to members of the administration and hold them accountable.

Examples of the kinds of problems that could be addressed:

- The problem that was brought up about lack of access to email for some people on campus. (Related to that might be the fact that different parts of campus use different email systems.) The team would have to identify the trouble spots, talk to the appropriate technical people, present a proposed solution to the administration, and follow through to make sure the problem is addressed.
- The poor treatment of lecturers on campus. Lecturers, a group that is growing fast, probably suffer the greatest feelings of alienation. They are treated as second-class citizens. Sometimes they are without computers, email, telephones, etc. There is no professional track for them and no reward for achievement. They are seriously underpaid and often work more than one job, which can compromise their work SBU. Proposals to solve these problems have been on the table for at least six years. The current iteration is with the University Senate, and has been under consideration by it for five years. The response team might have better success, particularly if it tackles the different aspects of this horrible situation individually.
- The GSO survey identified academic departments that seem to have particularly high levels of problems that affect students (e.g., harassment on the basis of race and gender). Probably in consultation with the graduate school and the appropriate deans, the response team could address these pockets of trouble, first by having town meetings with the students in those departments, and then by proposing specific and realistic solutions to the administration.