

CULTURE OF RESPECT

Summer 2015

Presented by:

Pat McGuire, L.H.D. '12

Professor Emeritus of Economics

Mara O'Laughlin '66, L.H.D. '13

*Assistant Vice President, Director
of Admissions, Retired*

Culture of Respect

“This summer, our campus received significant national media attention as Hobart and William Smith Colleges were drawn into the center of the nation-wide dialogue regarding sexual assault on college campuses.... [in response] we have expanded our Title IX Office, revised our policies, increased training around sexual misconduct and bystander intervention, and identified a suite of tasks designed to ensure the safety and wellbeing of our students. Importantly, we have begun the hard but essential work of moving beyond mere compliance with the law to the creation of a campus model that values inclusion and social justice.... But I believe we can and should do more.... We must think about our overall campus climate—and the challenges that exist here as well as in society at large.... It is time to reaffirm our history, capture the energy of the moment, and foster a culture of respect on our campus.”...

— President Mark D. Gearan

Convocation Address, September 1, 2014

At Convocation, President Mark D. Gearan spoke of the challenges that faced us as a community—the challenge to “engage in honest, robust, and respectful dialogue,” to “create the campus community that we all aspire to be part of—imbued with respect, empathy, civility and compassion.” Out of that challenge, the Culture of Respect initiative and Steering Committee was formed to examine all aspects of our Colleges’ community and to recommend steps we might take to enhance a Culture of Respect throughout our community.

The Steering Committee was co-chaired by Pat McGuire, L.H.D. ’12, Professor Emeritus of Economics and Mara O’Laughlin, ’66, L.H.D. ’13 Assistant Vice President for Institutional Advancement, Director of Admissions, Retired. Amy Forbes, Associate Director of the Centennial Center for Leadership, served as Director for the Committee. Committee membership included:

- Brandon Barile, Director of Residential Education
- Anne Buckley P’15, Co-Chair of the Parents Executive Committee
- Jerry Buckley P’15, Co-Chair of the Parents Executive Committee
- Sandra Chu, Head Coach, William Smith Rowing
- Jeremy T. Cushman ’96, M.D., President of the Alumni Association
- Caroline Demeter ’15, William Smith Student Trustee
- Laura Free, Associate Professor of History, Chair, Women’s Studies
- Lou Guard ’07, Esq., Chief of Staff and Counsel
- Aloysee Heredia Jarmoszuk ’98, President of the Alumnae Association
- DeWayne Lucas, Associate Professor of Political Science and Associate Dean of the Faculty
- Gail Herman McGinn ’73, Trustee
- Aly McKnight ’15, President of William Smith Congress
- Alejandra Molina, Director of the Office of Intercultural Affairs
- Greg Raymond, Head Coach, Hobart Lacrosse
- Richard Salter ’86, P’15, Associate Professor of Religious Studies
- Nick Stewart ’15, Hobart Student Trustee
- Henry Smith ’15, President of Hobart Student Government
- Titi Ufomata, Provost and Dean of the Faculty
- Cynthia Williams, Professor of Dance

The Culture of Respect was the second part of a two-pronged response from the Colleges’ community to the issues raised by the allegations of sexual misconduct on our campus. The first part was focused on

issues of compliance and further insuring the safety of our community members. Much progress has been made since the summer of 2014. A few examples include the issuance of an Interim Sexual Misconduct Policy, currently under revision, prepared in collaboration with students, faculty, and staff; a considerable expansion of the Title IX Office and, after a national search, the appointment of a full-time Title IX coordinator; faculty, staff, and students participated in extensive bystander training, now an ongoing process; a 24-hour hotline has been implemented in partnership with a local rape crisis center; and students participated in the 2015 HEDS Consortium Sexual Assault Campus Climate Survey.

The Culture of Respect Steering Committee, on the other hand, was charged with examining the overall campus climate, engaging in an in-depth study of campus policies and the perceptions and perspectives of Hobart and William Smith Colleges' community members, and offering recommendations designed to enhance a Culture of Respect. It is our hope that in a more equitable, civil, and compassionate community, behaviors and societal attitudes which are racist, homophobic, sexist, classist and violent will diminish in all of society.

Our recommendations are offered in a collective voice. We were a committee representing every segment of the Colleges' community; many decades separated students and graduates; some staff and faculty met for the first time. We brought different insights and levels of experience to the task—a task that required many difficult conversations. Some of us were challenged by our colleagues to defend long held precepts. Others brought fresh voices and insights to the discussions. While not every member of the group agreed on every aspect of each recommendation, we offer this report with the conviction that as a community we must continue to build a genuine and lasting Culture of Respect.

PROCESS

President Gearan suggested that the Culture of Respect Steering Committee approach its task through the formation of distinct subcommittees, representing five focus areas outlined in his Convocation address. The Steering Committee met as a whole three or four times a semester throughout the 2014-2015 academic year, and each subcommittee met regularly; most convened weekly or bi-weekly. The working group subcommittees were: Dialogue Across Difference, Facilities, History and Heritage, and Safety and Wellness. A fifth, Curriculum, was deferred to the ongoing work of the faculty's own curricular discussions.

Each subcommittee included a cross-section of representatives from the Steering Committee's membership. The subcommittees conducted interviews with many individuals, researched existing models and/or best practices, and sought to understand the ways in which a Culture of Respect was supported or undermined on our campus. Each subcommittee engaged in numerous conversations with various segments of our community, generated ideas and suggestions, and ultimately created recommendations for actions it believes will enhance a Culture of Respect on the Hobart and William Smith Colleges' campus and throughout the larger community.

The Steering Committee sought a broad spectrum of opinion on specific issues relating to our Colleges' culture, for example athletics, fraternities, and the Coordinate system. In addition, we asked open-ended questions designed to elicit more subjective responses about people's roles on campus, how they see others and are seen by others, as well as their interactions with each other.

As each subcommittee studied aspects of Hobart and William Smith Colleges' practices and policies within its particular focus area, overarching themes and topics began to emerge. For example, each subcommittee noted intersections with other subcommittees: a discussion of campus facilities and social space became intertwined with discussions on fraternities, alcohol consumption, and gendered privilege; definitions of wellness involved considerations of the Title IX initiatives, town-gown relationships, and

the structure and organization of campus offices; an examination of the Colleges' history and heritage led to conversations about athletics, admissions, and the deans' offices.

The co-chairs of the Culture of Respect Steering Committee have chosen to integrate the findings of the various subcommittees and present their perspectives and recommendations in nine thematic sections: Academic Culture, Alcohol, Athletics, Community, Coordinate System, Fraternities, Inclusion, Space, and Structures and Organizational Policies.

The co-chairs of the Culture of Respect Steering Committee chose to present our findings organized through these nine thematic sections, knowing that it was impossible to fully capture the richness of each subcommittee's discussions and deliberations. Additionally the co-chairs wanted to acknowledge the overlapping and interrelating connections across subcommittees. In many thematic sections, recommendations appear verbatim from the original subcommittee report. In other sections, we have attempted to distill the essence of recommendations from several reports and present them as overarching recommendations, independent of any one subcommittee's focus.

The attached report represents our complete set of recommendations to enhance a Culture of Respect at Hobart and William Smith Colleges. As the co-chairs of the Culture of Respect Steering Committee and based on the many confidential conversations we had over the past year, we also shared our candid observations and reflections with President Mark Gearan.

APPRECIATIVE INQUIRY

The Steering Committee's work was guided by the principles of Appreciative Inquiry. The traditional approach to cultural change is to look for the problem, do a diagnosis and find a solution. The primary focus becomes what is wrong or broken; since we are looking for problems, we find them. By paying attention to problems, singularly, we emphasize and amplify them. Rather than focus solely on the "problem" and find appropriate fixes, the Appreciative Inquiry model directs us to examine the areas of our community that represent our successes and our strengths: what are we proud of, and how can we achieve even more positive results in other areas, based on those successes and strengths. There is much to be proud of at Hobart and William Smith. Our community of faculty, staff, alumni and alumnae, parents, and students have all contributed to our ongoing successes. As an asset-based model, Appreciative Inquiry engages strengths to counter challenges and weaknesses. In the inquiry process we enter into a dialogue about our values and our aspirations; through this dialogue we lay the foundation for cultural change based on shared experiences and common goals. In both meetings of the full committee and subcommittee meetings, we continually returned to the model of Appreciative Inquiry as a framework.

We have summarized the work of the subcommittees below.

Dialogue Across Difference Subcommittee

The Dialogue Across Difference subcommittee began its inquiry with two basic assumptions: 1) it defined respect as the ability to see or recognize another person in their fullness, including differences, and defined being respected as feeling that one could be seen and recognized in one's fullness, including differences; and 2) that respect and dialogue occur most specifically in face to face encounters. Following the model of Appreciative Inquiry they turned to groups that were successful in creating atmospheres on campus where respect was accorded, and on clubs, organizations, and programs in which students, staff, administration, and faculty have the opportunity to see and recognize others, and be seen and be recognized by others.

The Dialogue Across Difference subcommittee found that there are many places on campus where such encounters occur regularly, persistently, and fruitfully. They believe those existing programs

can be modified and expanded to increase dialogue across the entire campus, and that the benefits of such dialogues include a greater satisfaction among our students, a stronger bond among different demographic segments of students, and may contribute to higher retention and persistence rates. Specific recommendations from this subcommittee are organized around three different modes for creating conditions that enhance dialogues across difference: time, space, and programs.

Facilities Subcommittee

The Facilities subcommittee examined the ways in which our facilities and campus spaces serve to enhance a Culture of Respect. They looked at both opportunities and challenges in the ways our facilities and spaces are aligned with the needs of our students, faculty, and staff across academic, residential, cultural, leadership and social activities. They identified many opportunities to reconfigure current spaces and facilities to meet diverse needs, found several instances of inequitable distribution of space and facilities resources which are causing tension across different constituencies, and made specific recommendations in line with their findings.

History and Heritage Subcommittee

The History and Heritage subcommittee began their work by asking, what are our primary definers? They noted our historic commitment to the liberal arts, of course, but also our legacy of innovation as demonstrated by interdisciplinary course work beginning with the Western Civilization program after World War II and continuing to our current goals-based curriculum; Women's Studies, LGBT Studies, and Men's Studies; the Honors program; our far-reaching program of study abroad, with participation by more than sixty percent of our students; and more recently, our powerful commitment to service and community engagement.

Ultimately, the History and Heritage subcommittee focused its work on three historically and culturally significant features of Hobart and William Smith: athletics, the Coordinate structure of the Colleges, and fraternities. Each of these are were seen to be critical aspects of our community's need to build a stronger Culture of Respect.

Safety and Wellness Subcommittee

The Safety and Wellness subcommittee began by discussing definitions of safety and wellness. They questioned what information, best practices, and/or insight was needed to fully address the topic, what were our current strengths in these areas, and identified people to interview whose expertise or perspective on topics pertinent to safety and wellness might inform its information gathering. Through interviews with several individuals, the subcommittee sought to understand safety and wellness issues through 1) the behaviors, needs, and perspectives of our current students; 2) how current institutional policies, structures, and practices impacted our ability to foster and sustain a Culture of Respect; and 3) what are the perceptions and realities surrounding academic culture, social culture, athletic culture, and residential culture. The conversations were wide-ranging; several themes surfaced more than once, and many overlapped with what other subcommittees were working on and talking about.

THEMATIC SECTIONS

Academic Culture

One of the points of intersection across all the subcommittees is the Hobart and William Smith Colleges' academic culture: a broad term which encompasses the ways in which our formal academic curriculum, co-curricular programs, the structure and organization of our academic day, academic support services, offices of student services, and processes for student advising, mentoring, and supporting our students creates an academic, social, and physical environment.

The Colleges' Mission Statement declares: "Hobart and William Smith Colleges are a student-centered learning environment, globally focused, grounded in the values of equity and service, developing citizens who will lead in the 21st century." Our slogan, "Preparing Students to Lead Lives of Consequence" also focuses on the ideas of global citizenship and commitment to service, yet it is in our curricular goals and graduation requirements that we articulate some of the values associated with a Culture of Respect. Goal 6, "Develop an intellectually grounded foundation for understanding differences and inequalities of gender, race and class," is typically met through course work in Africana Studies, American Studies, Economics, LGBT Studies, History, Political Science, Public Policy, Sociology, and/or Women's Studies, but can also be addressed through courses in Art History, Education, Environmental Studies, Media and Society, Religious Studies and/or Theatre. Courses with content that addresses Goal 6 abound across the curriculum. Course work that addresses Goal 7 "Acquire critical knowledge of the multiplicity of world cultures, as expressed for example, in their languages, histories, literatures, philosophies, religious and cultural traditions, social and economic structures and modes of artistic expression," also broadly permeates the curriculum, appearing throughout programs and departments. Goal 8 "Develop an intellectually grounded foundation for ethical judgment and action, deriving from a deep, historically informed examination of the beliefs and values deeply embedded in our views and experience," is a statement of our emphasis on the dual importance of thinking and doing; understanding and acting.

Recommendations

1. The Dialogue Across Difference and Facilities subcommittee reports each made suggestions regarding the academic day and its structure. We recommend hiring an external consultant to work with a select group of faculty and the Registrar to create a model which can be used to explore new ways of structuring the academic day. This model should attend particularly closely to creating a "common hour" and exploring possibilities for extended teaching hours. If evening hours are included in a new schedule, they should be voluntary for faculty. One of the main impediments to face to face encounters on our campus is the lack of a common time in which students, faculty, and staff can meet and get to know one another. Additionally, we have found that students and certain staff often feel "squeezed," and disrespected, by competing pressures that are "unresolvable." We think that a block of co-curricular time would alleviate that problem. This is a solution that has been implemented at many institutions across the nation.
2. We recommend appointing an Officer of Inclusion and Equity who would work with faculty, staff, and students to develop policies, courses, and/or opportunities for continued social justice growth (See "Inclusion" recommendation #1). We must increase opportunities for dialogue, interaction and collaboration across student, staff, and faculty. A Culture of Respect is strengthened when all participants feel included, welcomed, listened to and respected. Feedback received points to a culture where racism, homophobia, sexism and intolerance continue to exist, and students report being disrespected for their race, cultural identity, economic status, sexual orientation, gender, religious affiliation and/or background. Many initiatives, such as the Race and Racism Coalition, Mosaic NY, the Office of Intercultural Affairs, student clubs, the Colleges' curricular goals requirement and the efforts of individual faculty, staff, and students are positive developments in actively working to improve the environment on campus, but there is much work to be done.

3. We need to review the current structure and organization of Orientation and consider expanding it to 1) a longer period so that First Year students can process the amount of information being presented to them; 2) include more experiences that help students form positive social bonds, connect them to HWS and Geneva with a better “Sense of Place,” and 3) create a more robust connection, both socially and academically, with our new students.
4. Learning Community models are already in place at the Colleges. Given the success rates and campus connections facilitated by these models, the Colleges’ should review opportunities to grow these communities in a way that allows an organic connection between faculty, students, and their residential space.
5. We need to provide academic and social skills experiences through multiple venues. We recommend expanding co-curricular opportunities such as the Personal Empowerment Program.
6. We suggest examining the history of the Peer Education in Human Relations program and the academic course work it provided to determine whether a new iteration of it would be useful in fostering a Culture of Respect. Additionally, examine the ways in which current courses which contribute to Goal 6 “Develop an intellectually grounded foundation for understanding differences and inequalities of gender, race and class,” could be addressed in the first year to highlight this goal as central to our values.
7. We suggest continuing an examination of the academic support services programs and offices to ensure that students are getting the support they need in ways that are congruent and coordinated with other student services and programs on campus. When students are struggling academically they are less apt to engage in positive ways with the campus community.
8. Meaningful change will not happen unless we commit academic, cultural, and social resources to identifying and eliminating the structures and barriers which divide and/or oppress members of our community. As President Gearan noted in his Convocation Address, it is an essential time for us “to get it right.” In the spirit of that call to action, we recommend the following:
 - a) Invite the members of the various constituencies that have been working on these issues, as for example, The Coalition on Race and Racism, Social Justice Studies Program, Fisher Center, Intercultural Affairs Office, LGBT Studies Program, and Mosaic NY, to develop an action plan for cultural change. In collaboration with members of other organizations such as the Asian Student Union, Caribbean Students Organization, Latin American Organization, Pride Alliance, Sankofa, and the Women’s Collective, the charge would be to develop a 2020 Action Plan for Hobart and William Smith Colleges.
 - b) Support this endeavor with the appointment of a faculty director and/or an outside facilitator who is experienced with guiding such discussions. The newly appointed Officer of Inclusion and Equity should be an integral member of this process.
 - c) Determine what academic structures and programs (both current and future) would enhance and support a truly inclusive community of scholars and learners. Would an expanded Social Justice Studies program, with full time faculty lines and academic major tracks, be an appropriate model? Would a Center for Diversity and Equity, similar to the Fisher Center, provide the best support? What resources do we already have as a community that could be leveraged and enhanced? How can the work of this body and its recommendations assist us in building a stronger, more diverse, and more inclusive community?

Let us pledge ourselves to moving forward on these issues and develop an action plan for 2020 that is based on listening to each other, seeing each other, and committing to creating cultural change.

Alcohol

Underage drinking in the United States has become a serious problem, and at times a life-threatening problem. We must reduce the level of risk to the health and safety of our students during their time with us and we intend to uphold our commitment to our “Community Responsibility Statement” (see “Community,” recommendation #1) and remove alcohol abuse as a major threat to the Culture of Respect.

At HWS, we have dealt with underage drinking for many years as have other colleges and universities around the country. For the entering classes in the fall of 2014, 64.5% of first-year students indicated that they frequently or occasionally drank wine or liquor while in high school. On the other hand, 56.4% of all first years in our comparison group of colleges and 44.7% in all colleges across the nation, according to the Comparative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) data, drank prior to their arrival at college. HWS has had a higher relative percentage in every year since 2006. Given the number of underage students on our campus every fall and the apparently easy availability of hard liquor, beer and wine, we strongly feel this is an unsafe and dangerous situation and one that can create serious conflict and potential violence and disrespect among students.

The impact of drinking hard liquor with its higher alcohol content is faster, more severe and more dangerous than the consumption of beer and wine. All are illegal for anyone under the age of 21. Many undergraduates succumb to peer pressure and drink until they pass out. Someone drunk on hard liquor cannot make reasonable decisions especially about issues of safety and health. The Colleges have begun to confront this issue by implementing bystander training, an excellent method of peer intervention, but it may be unreliable if everyone is drinking to excess. The connection between alcohol and sexual violence is a concern on college campuses nationwide.

Recommendations

1. The Alcohol Policy at Hobart and William Smith Colleges should be revised to reflect the community’s commitment to respect for all members of our community. It should be fully described in the future Hobart and William Smith “Community Responsibility Statement.” Our principal recommendation is that hard liquor be banned or prohibited from the Hobart and William Smith campus at the start of the fall semester, 2015. The Hobart and William Smith Colleges’ community must make a strong statement about our serious intention to address the drinking issues on our campus. This policy recommendation along with adjusted sanctions for violation should be implemented immediately. We should discuss the potential impact of this policy with the campus community and the conversation should begin with the goal of improving the health and wellness of our students and moving more forcefully toward a Culture of Respect. While there will be challenges to enforcing this policy, it is important that we send a clear and unambiguous message. We seek a more comprehensive community-based alcohol policy. The prohibition of hard liquor from our campus will not solve the cultural and broader systemic issues contributing to problem drinking and other related consequences of alcohol use, but it is a clear signal of our intention to continue to improve the safety and wellness of the HWS community.
2. The current Handbook of Community Standards combines the use of alcohol and drugs under a broad umbrella of “Alcohol and Other Drugs” (AOD). We recommend that a distinction be made explicit in the Handbook between an alcohol policy and a policy for other drugs.
3. We recommend a review of the other drugs policy currently in effect.
4. We recommend that the sanctions related to our current four level approach remain in place for violations of beer and wine consumption. The sanctions for hard alcohol will start at Level 3 for the first violation and move to Level 4 for the second violation. The explanation of the sanctions

as described in the Handbook of Community Standards need some clarification and rewording but the message will be clear.

5. Our new student orientation must include a session that presents and explains the new alcohol policy (in 2015) and the “Community Responsibility Statement” (beginning in 2016). It should be presented by representatives of staff, faculty and students.
6. We recommend that the new Director of Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention in the Counseling Center lead a task force to work with all the different groups on campus that are connected in any way to alcohol use to develop our community’s education and outreach approach to the problem of alcohol abuse on our campus.
7. We recommend the work of Professors Wes Perkins and David Craig on Social Norms remain an integral part of our approach to these problems.
8. Our entire community should help provide more options and alternatives to excessive drinking early and throughout a student’s time with us. While this work should be centered in the Division of Student Affairs, we encourage the active participation of athletes, fraternities, clubs, student groups, faculty and staff in this effort. Success requires an integrated “all hands on deck” approach that will need the cooperation of the entire community in our efforts to provide social non-drinking options for all students especially for the first and second year classes.

Athletics

Intercollegiate sports programs at Hobart and William Smith Colleges are an integral part of education at the Colleges. Student athletes are given the opportunity to compete on the field, court or water against student-athletes from other schools. These programs are very successful at many levels. Intercollegiate athletics provides student-athletes opportunities for cooperation, leadership, and competition as a representative of their college. The programs have met with success as our student-athletes have won numerous league, regional and national championships as well as individual honors related to athletic and academic performance. They learn important lessons about their own limitations, teamwork, dedication to personal and team goals and behavior and most importantly they learn respect for themselves, their team, opposing players, coaches and referees. The lessons they learn are carried throughout their time with us and into their futures. They also learn that their time and talent alone are not enough to achieve, they must rely on the time and talent of many others. Winning isn’t everything but working with and respecting others as well as oneself is one key to success in life. Our student-athletes should contribute positively to the Culture of Respect in our community.

Intercollegiate athletics is one part of a student’s college experience and, for the student-athlete, there are many conflicts that must be managed and resolved. The conflicts often result in difficult decisions that need to be made and it is in dealing with these conflicts that respect for self and others grows or declines. At Hobart and William Smith Colleges, there are many areas where the realities of campus life often conflict. These are especially prevalent within the Colleges’ athletics programs.

Athletics at Hobart and William Smith Colleges are structured into two separate programs, the Hobart College Statesmen and the William Smith College Herons. This is a unique model that affords both men and women ownership of their sports experience.

Recommendations

1. Our last Title IX review was completed in 2012. We recommend within the year another professional Title IX review to implement suggestions for achieving equity between the two

departments for sports teams, student services, staff support, staff compensation, and private fundraising. This is consistent with the national dialogue in which HWS prides itself in being a participant.

2. We recommend creating an advisory board of members of the athletic staffs of each College under the oversight of the Vice President of Student Affairs to discuss, analyze, and make recommendations for policy changes to both athletic departments. The membership will consist of the two athletic directors, two coaches chosen by the VP of Student Affairs from each program and two students from each college appointed by the Athletic Directors and approved by the VP of Student Affairs. This advisory board would act independently from the Committee on Athletics, a subcommittee of the faculty's Committee on Academic Affairs. The purpose of the advisory board is to initiate and sustain communication between the two departments. Our committee was disappointed by the lack of communication between the programs at the coaches' level. These men and women are professionals and they have all made their mark in their fields. The Colleges would benefit from their interaction. New ideas and strategies can be discussed and considered. We think the recent decision by Hobart football to have a dry season for 2015 is a step in the right direction; importantly it arose from a conversation between the two athletic departments.
3. The facilities for recreation and wellness at the Colleges must be expanded. We look forward to immediate actions for this coming academic year, 2015-16. As noted in other areas of the Culture of Respect report, possible examples include refurbishing Bristol Gym and Winn-Seely Gym and the upper level of the Barn after theatre moves into the Performing Arts Center. A weather protected dome over McCooley field would allow outdoor sports to have access to practice fields. This will free up other facilities such as Bristol Fieldhouse for recreation and wellness activities. In addition, there should be an increase in the number and availability of exercise equipment in all present and future facilities.
4. Fundraising support in each department must be examined and addressed. In particular, the departments should support a program of equal sharing of major gifts or rebalancing resources from operating budgets. Title IX supports rebalancing for the gender that does not receive the booster support.
5. Responses to poor social behavior should be standardized between departments.
6. New initiatives from the deans' offices and the Division of Student Affairs to retain students who were cut from teams should be explored.
7. Hobart and William Smith athletic programs should continue their work in the areas of bystander training, diversity training, and leadership development. Hobart student-athletes should work specifically on areas of male privilege.
8. It is important from the perspective of both departments to support an adjustment to the academic day's schedule as referenced in other sections of this report. We feel that a change must be made to facilitate communication among all sectors of the campus to reduce conflicts for students and to respect the time and talent of all employees of the Colleges.
9. Off-campus houses can be problematic and we recommend the Colleges re-examine these arrangements.
10. In the long run, we strongly support upgrading the swimming pool to better support not only our intercollegiate program but our overall commitment to the community's well-being.

Community

In the opening of the 2015-2016 Handbook of Community Standards, we read, “This is a globally focused, student-centered learning environment grounded in the values of equity and service...Respect for the dignity, integrity, well-being, and property of all members is essential to the maintenance of and membership in the community.” Standards are focused around three guiding principles: respect for persons and property, freedom of expression and participation, and intellectual responsibility.

The community at Hobart and William Smith Colleges includes faculty, students, staff, alumni/ae, parents and our surrounding Geneva neighbors. The Culture of Respect Steering Committee was deeply impressed by our community members’ commitment to “seeing one another” and providing a “sense of belonging.” From sending a team of Genevans with Hobart and William Smith representatives to compete and win “All American City” status in Denver to welcome dinners for faculty; from staff breakfast celebrations to Geneva 2020 and its goal to improve high school graduation, literacy and college and career readiness; from open houses at the President’s home for students to the Geneva Heroes program where our students work side-by-side with Geneva school students in community service; from pasta night at the Chaplain’s home to family and reunion weekend, there is much to consider and marvel when it comes to our community.

That said, there is much to improve upon regarding the relationships between and among faculty, staff and students. We believe our community has become “silo-ed.” Each group has turned inward and too often does not recognize our collective responsibility. Our conversations and related data that we have reviewed over the past months indicate that we must reunite and dedicate ourselves to community building.

How we treat one another is a direct reflection of our culture.

Recommendations

1. Because of the strong support given for an honor code, the Committee recommends that we develop and adopt a broader “Community Responsibility Statement”. All members of the community including students, faculty, and staff should understand and invest in the meaning of a statement that outlines expectations and charges all of its members to follow. A “Community Responsibility Statement” must come from the community and we recommend that we develop our unique statement over the 2015-2016 academic year. The consequences for violating these standards and values should be clear, equitable, and appropriate.
2. Although staff feedback regarding overall satisfaction at HWS was quite positive, many commented upon a lack of opportunity for professional development, little transparency regarding promotions and hiring decisions, and a lack of respect from faculty. We recommend that these ongoing issues be seriously addressed by senior staff and faculty leadership.
3. Further, we recommend that the Colleges appoint a focus group coordinator to facilitate further discussions regarding tensions and issues of respect within the faculty. COFAC should have input into the selection of the faculty group and we recommend the focus group take place as soon as possible in order to develop policies to address the issues that arise from the sessions.
4. The number of HWS students who are good neighbors and contribute to the Geneva community through service, athletics, and other activities far outnumber those who do not. However, actions of disrespect by HWS students toward their Geneva neighbors, not to mention violation of the law, must have consequences. We recommend that consistent enforcement by the Colleges through Campus Safety and Residential Life, and the Geneva Police Department be strengthened. While meetings with the local community at the beginning of the year and

other good neighbor educational efforts are well meaning, the Colleges must consistently and equitably enforce penalties for infractions.

5. We recommend strengthening and expanding the work already being done within Residential Education with students who live off-campus in terms of their responsibilities as Geneva residents and their relationship to the community.

The Coordinate Colleges

Hobart College (1822) and William Smith College (1908) have enjoyed a structural relationship unique on the landscape of higher education. While there have been many women's colleges within a larger university (Barnard, Pembroke, Sophie Newcomb, Radcliffe, Douglass, etc.) there are few other collegiate structures like ours – two institutions identified by gender, sharing much but retaining their individuality.

William Smith's goal at the dawn of the 20th century was to create "educational opportunities for women that were equal to those for men." Initially, the two colleges were quite separate – geographically, educationally, and administratively. Separate traditions evolved, administrative offices grew to meet the needs of their respective student bodies. However, in 1943 the Colleges were joined as "coordinate colleges," Hobart and William Smith. While they shared, and continue to share, one faculty and curriculum, one Board of Trustees and President, they still maintain separate dean's offices, athletic staffs, student governments, and alumni/ae directors. Each college is chartered separately as a degree-granting institution in the State of New York.

Hobart and William Smith boasts one of the nation's first Women's Studies programs, begun in the early 1970's, and the first Men's Studies program, both an academic expression of our century-long focus on gender. Additionally, the Fisher Center for the Study of Women and Men, founded in 1998, "brings together faculty, students, and experts in gender-related fields in the arts, humanities, and social and natural sciences to foster mutual understanding and social justice in contemporary society."

In conversations with many constituents throughout this year of discussions vis-à-vis a Culture of Respect, we have encountered varying perspectives and opinions on the Coordinate system. Indeed, the Coordinate structure at Hobart and William Smith elicits passionate responses from all segments of the community. In meetings with alumnae and alumni, strong support for the Coordinate system was expressed by both women and men as an integral part of our heritage. Other constituents suggested that it is time for it to go. Equally passionate adherents insisted that we maintain it and others urged that we chart a middle course, that we reconceive the system to reflect 21st century realities. We listened carefully to those who argued on behalf of our transgender students, asserting that there is no place in the system for them and we heard equally strong support for a system that purposefully and deliberately empowers both men and women.

There are differing viewpoints about what the Coordinate system was, what it is, and what it might be. One reason for this is that the notion of gender and concepts of gender identity are in profound transition today in our society. The notion of gender has been upended since 1908. Contemporary definitions of gender reinforce the idea that gender identity is a social construct and that it's a continuum, not a bipolarity; a continuum with a long and complex middle, to be sure. There are issues and challenges for individuals at every point on the continuum. People in transition from one to another gender identity face difficulties, and individuals who identify as either male or female are often forced into a narrow set of behaviors, or caught between contemporary and traditional expectations in every aspect of their lives – sexual, professional, and personal. The Coordinate system is uniquely structured to explore these issues and the needs of every person on that continuum.

Recommendations

1. We recommend that the Coordinate system should not be eliminated or abandoned but be contemporized.
2. We recommend a substantive campus and alumni/ae discussion on the Coordinate system. To update and reconfigure the Coordinate system for the 21st century requires careful thought and attention. A community-wide initiative for the examination of the Coordinate system as an historical foundation and as a conceptual framework is essential to move us forward as a 21st century liberal arts institution.
3. Materials and correspondence sent to newly enrolled students prior to their arrival as first-years should reflect and enhance these thoughtful deliberations. There should be one session of Orientation devoted to the Coordinate structure (“Hobart Day” and “William Smith Day”) organized by the deans with input from upper class students, recent alumnae and alumni, and faculty with expertise in gender issues. This supports the recommendation elsewhere in this report to lengthen Orientation.
4. The Deans of the Colleges should be the epicenter and keepers of the Colleges’ Coordinate history, traditions, and structure as well as the Colleges’ focus on gender. We believe the role of the deans as mentors and advisors has a strongly positive effect on our students, and recommend that the deans’ offices be reconfigured to support their efforts. The reconfiguration should include an assessment of responsibilities currently given over to Student Affairs and an acknowledgment that the deans play a central role in the coordinate system.
5. The Colleges’ Handbook of Community Standards and the website should include a clear statement of policies with respect to transgender students. This would include, but not be limited to, policies regarding admission, transfer between the two colleges, and housing policies as well as resources on campus and in the greater community. Traditions and practices, especially those that force a gender non-conforming or transgendered student to “choose” an identity which is based on gender binaries, should be examined.
6. We recommend that marketing strategies in admissions include a clear communication about and explanation of the Coordinate system. Rather than ignoring or downplaying it we should embrace and celebrate it as a unique signifier in higher education at a time when a national lens is focused on issues of gender.
7. New staff and faculty hires should be given a broad orientation to the Coordinate system that includes its conceptual framework and its evolution as a 21st century entity.
8. There should be a concerted effort to assure that the name of the institution is properly and consistently used in all correspondence, in day to day interactions, both on campus and in the Geneva community and beyond. To only refer to the Colleges as “Hobart” disrespects William Smith. We are Hobart and William Smith Colleges. We are HWS.

Fraternities

Fraternities have existed at Hobart College since the 1840’s. Throughout our work questions of whether the fraternity system in its current state is a contributor to or a detractor from a Culture of Respect have arisen.

In its current state, the fraternity system has a number of positive attributes, which can be articulated by its members and alumni. Specifically, current members cite the system as a place where men find a sense of belonging, a comfortable social space, avenues for service, and housing outside of the typical dormitory

offering. This sense of belonging extends past graduation and the fraternities function as a place where brothers can return and reaffirm their connection to their fraternity and to Hobart College. For some non-members, including women, the fraternities serve as not only an acceptable social space but also a safe space. And for some, the fraternities serve as an extension of their academics, offering another venue for educational discussions amongst students who are academically like-minded.

In equal or perhaps even greater measure to the positive attributes listed above, members of our community also hold negative perceptions of the fraternities as institutions of male privilege. Students, faculty and staff also see them as the keepers of the Colleges' social scene and because of this they have a great impact on the ways in which our student body respects each other.

We have come to discover that the role that the fraternities play in supporting a Culture of Respect is complicated. At the end of our inquiry, we feel that an up or down approach to this timeworn system is not a solution. Instead, we feel that the advantages of the fraternity system could be better leveraged by the Colleges to create positive, lasting change.

Recommendations

1. We recommend revising the accreditation process so that fraternities make a significant, impactful and lasting shift to their culture. Fraternities have become a part of the national dialogue. Many small private liberal art schools are moving away from traditional fraternity systems. From our conversations, it is apparent that the fraternity system at Hobart College is an outdated model. However, our committee does not recommend banning fraternities from campus at this time. We recommend revisiting this conversation in two years to determine whether fraternities have adhered to the recommendations below or they could face loss of accreditation. Fraternities can provide a much greater and positive impact on the Culture of Respect.
2. Based on best programming practices at the Colleges, we recommend that fraternities implement a leadership model by the end of the fall 2015 semester. The accreditation process should be revised to reflect substantive and cohesive requirements that develop and exhibit leadership.
3. Students who live in a fraternity house must maintain a minimum GPA of 3.0. This closely corresponds to the Hobart College overall GPA ranging from 2.88 to 3.05 in recent years.
4. Hard alcohol must be banned at social functions.
5. We recommend that a fair and equitable social hosting contract be established and maintained. We should require third-party caterers for all hosted parties including those by fraternities. Additionally, we should look at ways to subsidize these costs for women-sponsored clubs, cultural clubs, as well as other student organizations.
6. The Colleges' oversight of fraternities should be strengthened. The purpose and function of the Council on Fraternal Life (COFL) should be examined and reorganized. COFL must include members with disciplinary power and the discretion to establish and implement sanctions on fraternities if recommended actions are not taken. Members must be willing and able to enforce higher standards to ensure a cultural shift. COFL should be charged to oversee fraternities as they work to implement a new leadership model.
7. We support the call for more venues for large scale William Smith social hosting. As it stands now, fraternities are one of the most important locations for social events on campus. As all male houses, fraternities do not address the desires of William Smith students to host their own social events. The control of social space by males raises additional questions about whether there should be sororities on campus. Some students have suggested this as a course of action. That

being said, we emphasize that it is not the opinion of this committee that adding sororities is a solution. Rather, we should address the systemic concerns about our current fraternity structure.

8. We should work towards social and residential equity with regards to space to counterbalance the exclusive nature of fraternities. We recommend creating other space-use opportunities in fraternities to benefit our entire campus.
9. The continued use of the property at 624 South Main Street by a “phantom” fraternity runs counter to the Culture of Respect that we work to maintain in our community. Any student who is affiliated with Sigma Phi is subject to review and should be withdrawn from the Colleges.

Inclusion

Early on, the Steering Committee developed a definition of respect that served to focus our inquiry. Respect is “the ability to see or recognize another person in their fullness, including differences, and that being respected involved the feeling that one could be seen and recognized in one’s fullness including differences.” Differences in social identities such as race, ethnicity, social class, sexual orientation, gender classification, religion and ability were important lenses to committee members.

Throughout our work, we assumed that one way respect could be enhanced is by dialogue, specifically in face-to-face encounters. In other words, we looked not only at what it might mean to have a dialogue across difference but also what conditions can be created to facilitate face-to-face encounters, sustained over time, among people with different social identities. Enhancing respect through sustained face-to-face encounters would in turn facilitate a sense of inclusion that community members told us they valued. A step beyond diversity, inclusion should be a condition that the Colleges actively practice day to day in order for our members to have a sense of belonging that underlies respect.

The benefits of an inclusive community are a greater satisfaction among our students and a stronger bond among cross-cutting demographic segments of students. These two items contribute to higher retention and persistence rates. Faculty and staff also benefit from an inclusive community that shares respect for one another. These values have direct implications on work satisfaction, productivity and the student experience. We suspect that such dialogues across difference are instrumental to the sort of transformational experiences for which Hobart and William Smith are known (anecdotally and statistically). Cultivating an inclusive community is therefore vital for our institutional identity and sustainability.

Recommendations

1. The Committee recommends appointing an Officer of Inclusion and Equity to support the following areas of potential engagement: Title IX, hiring, admissions, professional development for staff and faculty and co-curricular programming (See “Academic Culture” recommendation #2.)
2. The Committee also recommends reactivating the Committee on Inclusive Excellence or creating a new similar body to explore the ways in which our curriculum, admissions practices, hiring policies, leadership decisions and professional development, to name a few, enhance or hurt a culture of inclusion and respect at HWS.
3. Yearly professional development around inclusion and diversity should be offered to faculty and staff. The Officer of Inclusion and Equity should lead these efforts with the support of the Human Resources and Provost’s offices
4. Existing spaces should be modified to eliminate barriers to dialogue across difference. These

should include reorganizing the eating space in Saga. We have come to understand that the current configuration in Saga functions to separate students on the basis of class, race, and social status.

5. The current spatial organization of the Scandling Center needs to be modified. At present the focus is on a long corridor that inhibits student interactions until they arrive at an eating space. A student union should include more mixed use areas where students can lounge, study, and engage in recreational activities.
6. A new faculty/staff club space on campus should be provided. Faculty, especially new faculty, and staff, report that important dialogues and communication happen when they meet one another, but that there are few times or spaces on campus where this “spontaneous interaction” can happen. The Common Room is only open for a short time each day, does not permit people who are bringing their own lunches to eat there, and does not facilitate the sort of conversations and encounters that can bridge gaps in faculty/staff statuses.
7. The Barn is an important potential social space on campus, and its current use should be re-evaluated. However, our subcommittee also notes that the Barn is particularly important as a space to some cultural clubs on campus. Therefore, care must be taken not to resolve demand for social space by taking space away from cultural clubs. We are pleased to note that some renovations have begun.
8. Sports, recreation and wellness facilities must be increased. Those facilities are often being used by varsity athletics resulting in clubs and individuals not able to gain access to the fieldhouse floor until after 9 PM. It may also address the concerns of students who perceive a priority given to varsity athletics as disrespect for non-varsity athletes.
9. We support expanding Learning Communities as part of the First Year Seminar program. These efforts increase student success in many areas ranging from satisfaction to retention and persistence.
10. We recommend that the subcommittee of Academic Affairs focusing on admissions and retention reexamine the Hobart Deans’ “33 Steps to Increase Retention.” This document addresses the persistent difficulties among some Hobart students that, in some cases, lead to disengagement, isolation, and dissatisfaction on campus. We believe a Culture of Respect will be increased insofar as these problems are ameliorated.
11. We support the call in the Middle States review for offering more short-term programs for those students who are not able to go abroad for an entire semester. Funding for such programs should be augmented to ensure that they are equally available to all students regardless of ability to pay. Our committee heard from students who remain connected with those with whom they traveled abroad in spite of returning to different social circles. Increasing the number of students who study off-campus in the sophomore year would bring these benefits back to campus earlier.
12. We encourage the Office of Student Affairs to link different groups on campus (for example, require co-hosting or coordinated activities among diverse clubs). In order to qualify for funding, all clubs and organizations must have a plan in place to address co-hosting. Our student body does not often venture outside of smaller groups of friends and acquaintances. Requiring contact among different groups will likely increase face-to-face contact, dialogue, and respect.
13. We support expanding the Pre-Orientation Outdoor Adventure Program (POAP) to include more first-year students. We found that students who participated in POAP often formed sustained friendships with other members of their POAP group, even when they ultimately

travelled in different social circles. We suggest that we create alternative programs for students who are unable to participate in POAP because of summer commitments or sports activities. We might consider using the October break as an alternative time for such activities.

14. We support developing a “ropes course” at Fribolin Farm. Currently facilities are rented from Cornell. These courses are often used in team building exercises and outdoor education. Like Bristol Fieldhouse and Boswell Field, a ropes course facility could also be rented out or loaned to community organizations, thus strengthening the bond of HWS and the Geneva community.
15. We recommend providing a limited number of subsidized meals at Saga for faculty and staff. These meals should be for use in the main dining area (not the Common Room). Increasing the presence, visibility, and accessibility of faculty and staff will improve relationships among the differing constituencies on campus and allow for increased face to face contact.
16. We recommend increasing support from the Provost’s office to allow for more course-related enrichment activities.

Space

Moving from an enrollment of about 2,000 to 2,364 students has had a major impact on our campus. During that transition, the administration took steps to ensure that the 11:1 student-faculty ratio was maintained, that residence halls were reconfigured and spaces were re-conceptualized to accommodate student needs. In addition, Dining Services extended their hours to serve a larger student body. However, more needs to be done to address the physical space of campus, who has access to that space, who uses that space, and especially who controls it.

A repeated theme in our conversations with a variety of HWS constituencies revolved around questions of space. Having space to be seen and recognized in one’s fullness including differences is essential to our view of respect. In multiple conversations and from different subcommittees, we heard the call for more social space for interactions among faculty, students, and staff. We noted the concerns about the crowding and non-traditional triples in residences; the search for private and cozy nooks and crannies to study, work, and be; and the lack of large and small venues for conversation, interaction, and engagement of students across gender, race, and fraternal status. A central recommendation is that we take steps to enhance the spaces on campus that create respect for all students, all staff members, and all faculty members.

As the construction of the Performing Arts Center has recently reminded us, building new physical spaces on campus is not an easy, overnight, or inexpensive endeavor. A number of recommendations here are thus long-term, while others are meant to be strategic and to provide short-term opportunities.

Recommendations

1. Decide optimal size of student body given residential, athletic, academic and social demands. This recommendation is not that the Colleges return to a smaller student body but that HWS ensures that this is the right path for the institution and is sustainable. We are sure that the Board, the President, Senior Staff, and other decision makers recognize that such a policy requires the creation of additional spaces – residential, academic, athletic and social – on campus and will necessitate additional enhancements to ensure an ongoing commitment to a Culture of Respect.
2. A decision to decrease, increase, or maintain this student body admittedly will have its own set of consequences and ramifications for the campus and we should be prepared to accept the costs that go along with any decision. A decision to decrease the student body, for instance, will not necessarily preclude the other recommendations here—additional spaces may still be needed.

The Colleges must clarify, publicize, and explain this decision to campus constituents as well as community partners.

3. We recommend creating spaces that address the health, welfare, and safety needs of the campus. A primary need identified during our work was for a wellness center on campus, which serves multiple interests. In addition to providing workout, yoga, and activities space, for instance, this space could serve as a satellite office for the Counseling Center and Hubbs to provide services for students. The center could also be a source for information on health, counseling, academic and personal issues. The center may also be connected to a healthy foods dining space.
4. We support the current reexamination of the use of campus buildings and spaces throughout the academic day. This may include creating new structures; repurposing current ones, and extending/constraining the availability of facilities in order to meet the needs of various groups.
5. We need to reexamine the academic day to find ways to capitalize on the Colleges' residential nature. This may include creating a common hour for group meetings, offering evening classes, developing policies that respect the needs of underrepresented and diverse groups, and reconfiguring spaces that may serve multiple academic and social purposes.
6. We strongly recommend returning lounges that were converted to dorm rooms in residence halls back to their original use. In addition, we suggest reassessing the single-sex housing options, opening some of these spaces to opposite-sex residents, without sacrificing the nature of the Coordinate system.
7. We need to create a true student union, where students may hold events, gather, and organize. This space should be dedicated to student clubs and organizations, as well as events and activities appealing to small and large groups. Scandling Center was seen by many as a more of a dining and event hall but potentially could be reconfigured to be a union. We need to provide more opportunities that bring people together across social identities and that encourage groups to interact with one another. A true student union could address this need.
8. Recommendations of the Facilities, Safety and Wellness, and Dialogue Across Difference subcommittees all supported expanding the Campus Pub in terms of hours and facilities (larger space, additional activities/games); changing the seating arrangements in the Saga dining hall to encourage dialogue; refurbishing the Barn; and relocating the Campus Store.
9. We must ensure that all buildings and campus spaces are in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act and are accessible to individuals regardless of their abilities.
10. We must establish gender neutral housing and facilities policies to acknowledge and respect individuals who are transgender and/or questioning their sexuality. These policies should also ensure that there are gender neutral restroom facilities throughout campus.
11. We need to create more spaces that provide for and encourage collaboration in academic and social settings. This could include the creation of a coffee shop with casual seating on campus, an additional large lounge space with multiple smaller conversational areas, and additional interactive spaces. It may also include resituating faculty and staff offices to encourage dialogue across disciplines and work domains. These spaces should also reflect the "community feel and welcomeness" found in such spaces as the Intercultural Affairs Center and the Counseling Center.
12. We address elsewhere in this report the need to ensure that there is athletic space parity between the two colleges and that there are policies that address the needs of varsity, intramural, and

individual athletics. Space usage on campus should be apportioned so that no one group dominates the campus.

13. We must work with the Geneva community to find ways of addressing housing, social, and space needs of the HWS community that also benefit the Geneva community. While the town-gown relationship between Geneva and HWS on the whole is good, more can still be done to bring the two together.
14. We recommend, too, that we work with third party vendors and businesses to offer off-campus activities and social space that would accommodate HWS students without an emphasis on drinking. We envision a multi-level social space including a coffee shop and ample room for social activities.
15. Existing social spaces should be enhanced with amenities and features that may make them more appealing to various campus users. Chairs and couches in academic spaces for instance that invite students and faculty to sit and talk would be welcomed.
16. We also suggest that we conduct a thorough review of the campus for safety, improving lighting such as the Blue Lights.
17. We also support enhancing bicycle access to campus, providing more bicycle racks around campus, and encouraging bicycle use across campus.

Structures and Organizational Policies

To create a change in culture, it is necessary to consider organizational policies and structures that may be undermining a Culture of Respect. In our subcommittee conversations we sought to understand the ways in which current structures and policies impacted a Culture of Respect. Examples include how the structure and organization of the Hobart and William Smith deans' offices has changed over the past 15 years, and how this has affected students' perception of the coordinate system; how the structure and content of Orientation for First Year students, as well as for new faculty and staff, provides (or doesn't) a comprehensive introduction to our Colleges' values; how the current structure of the Division of Student Affairs, which has placed multiple programs and offices under one senior administrator, serves the needs of our students; and how policies on alcohol and other drug use, fraternity life, and/or student conduct have contributed to or undermined a Culture of Respect. In the recommendations that follow, we confront some of the structures and infrastructures that have come into focus as we have engaged in this critical task of enhancing a Culture of Respect.

Recommendations

1. The Division of Student Affairs should undergo a review of its structure and organization to determine what is working well and what is not. The review of this structure should include representatives from across the various stakeholders, including students, staff, and Office of Student Affairs personnel. Roles and responsibilities need to be clarified. In addition, we suggest examining best practice models at other institutions with the goal of designing a structure and organization that supports the good work already being done and allows for greater efficiency and success.
2. Admissions goals and policies should reflect what we determine to be the optimal size for HWS, not only in terms of revenue, but in terms of the educational and residential environment in which we believe. While we fully understand the economic realities driving many admissions decisions, we must ensure that those admitted are given every chance to succeed. We cannot transform the culture here without having a discussion about size, diversity, and admissions policies.

3. The roles and responsibilities of the deans' offices need to be reviewed and clarified. Is our institution well served by the current structure and organization of these offices? We support maintaining two separate deans' offices but suggest examining whether the current organization of having two deans be responsible for two class years, with the third dean representing the public face of each school is the optimal structure for each dean's office.
4. We support the recommendation from our Middle States self-study that the Colleges should invest in quantitative analysis within the Office of Institutional Research, providing the Office with the resources necessary to organize and use our substantial data. This will allow the Colleges to make more-informed decisions, ones based on factual evidence, not anecdotally fueled perceptions. The Office would then be able to assist individual departments, programs and offices in their data collecting and reporting.
5. Bystander training should continue to be implemented with increased participation until all students and the majority of faculty and staff have received training. The Title IX Office should regularly review the most effective ways to implement such training and its effectiveness.
6. We read with interest the proposal "HWS Gender and Sexuality Center: For and By Students" offered in the summer of 2014 and urge its serious consideration.
7. We must ensure that the orientation for new faculty and staff members communicates the institutional values and expectations regarding a Culture of Respect. This should be jointly designed by the Provost's Office (faculty) and the Human Resources Office (staff).
8. We recommend offering orientation-like events throughout the first two years: refresher bystander training sessions, social justice themed day-long symposia, lectures, performances and/or group meetings that engage the whole campus as a community. Keep Culture of Respect values visible and prominent throughout the year.
9. We encourage honest and accurate reporting on the progress made towards enhancing a Culture of Respect that has been made over the past year. Many faculty, students, and staff are not aware of these changes and need to know what our current policies and procedures are, and how to become involved in creating a Culture of Respect on campus.

CONCLUSION

The conversations, discussions, and interactions engaged in this past year by the Culture of Respect Steering Committee (twenty-two members) represent the deep commitment of many individuals. While no one document can adequately convey the full detail of a year's worth of multiple conversations, we have attempted to synthesize the information gathered and present our recommendations in a way that brings common themes forward and highlights observations made throughout the process.

The year's assessment revealed a community with many aspects that deserve celebration: we have students, faculty, staff, alumni/ae and Geneva community members who contribute in deeply positive ways to a Culture of Respect. We have structures, histories, and aspirations which support and guide us. The opportunity to reflect on how we could be better brought forth many recommendations and specific ideas across a variety of platforms. Many of our recommendations suggest further conversations with a broader constituency: to achieve cultural change we need to have campus-wide dialogue with all our members and clear agreement on our goals and priorities. This is not to suggest we can't implement some of the wonderful ideas we received fairly quickly, but it is a reminder that lasting change requires total commitment.

Within this report we have recommended several major campus-wide task force initiatives: one to involve the campus in a discussion of the Coordinate System, with an eye toward making it contemporary; one to look at creating a comprehensive approach to the problem of alcohol and other drugs on campus, an approach that is both equitable and equitably enforced. We also recommend gathering together key stakeholders into a conversation about equity and diversity—we need to listen when our students, faculty, and/or staff voice concerns about disrespectful treatment—listen, and respond. Finally, we need to continue our efforts to ensure the safety of every individual on campus by providing appropriate physical, social, and psychological support systems. We see the work of the Culture of Respect Steering Committee as an on-going dialogue rather than a finished conversation. As we end this part of the process, we hope that the Board of Trustees, our alumni and alumnae, and our faculty, staff, and student partners join us in continuing this important work in creating a truly vibrant Culture of Respect at Hobart and William Smith Colleges.