

## **Strategic Plan Bridge Fund Project Proposal**

**1. PROJECT NAME** – Emory Conversation Project (ECP). Formerly called Community Dialogue Facilitators Program

**2. PROJECT SPONSORS**

Sponsor 1

Name: Ed Lee

Title: Executive Director

Department: Community

Sponsor 2

Name: James Herndon

Title: Director

Department: Barkley Forum for Debate, Deliberation & Dialogue

Sponsor 3

Name: Lisa Loveall

Title: Director

Department: Student Involvement Leadership & Transition

Sponsor 4

Name: James Roland

Title: Senior Director

Department: Civic & Community Engagement

Sponsor 5

Name: Danielle Steele

Title: Director

Department: Belonging & Community Justice

Sponsor 6

Name: DeLa Sweeney

Title: Director

Department: Social Justice Education

### 3. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Racial slurs and slut shaming posted on Yik Yak. Swastikas painted on the Alpha Epsilon Pi chapter house. “Build a wall” chalked on sidewalks. Milo Yiannopoulos, an alt-right white supremacist and homophobe, invited to speak. All of these events tested the core values of Emory University. All demanded an immediate public conversation to tend to the underlying issues driving a wedge between various communities on our campus. Emory is not unique. Sherry Turkle argues in *Reclaiming Conversation* that our increasingly mass-mediated world has produced “a flight from conversation – at least from conversation that is open-ended and spontaneous, conversation in which we play with ideas, in which we allow ourselves to be fully present and vulnerable” (p. 4). Yet this type of conversation is the cornerstone for the development of empathy and creative collaborations. Unfortunately, very few people on our campus are trained to encourage, facilitate, and negotiate the difficult face to face conversations required to transform incendiary events into educational opportunities.

While Emory University maintains a strong and definitive commitment to diversity and inclusion, we struggle to find the appropriate response when campus events challenge our values. Our inability to consistently and proactively respond has led to demands that Emory more vehemently regulate its marketplace of ideas and curtail the speech of those perceived to be in violation of the university’s commitment to social justice. Instead of restricting speech in response to contentious campus issues, we need to expand the opportunities provided for students to dialogue across and about their differences. Population shifts on and off the campus will progressively increase the need to develop strategies that promote deliberative dialogue between communities. Turkle’s research identified a 40 percent decline in markers for empathy among college students. This alarming statistic indicates that their ability to engage in perspective-taking that allows them to understand and appropriately respond to the needs of others is increasingly at risk. She concludes that this downward spiral can only be reversed by reclaiming conversations. If we want our students to become empathetic citizens, we must follow the suggestion of the German philosopher Heinrich von Kleist and avoid closed sanitized connections and embrace “risky talk.”

The Emory Conversation Project (ECP) provides a template for teaching students skills they need to lead public and engaging conversations. While Milo Yiannopoulos may never return to Emory University, other future events will assuredly produce similar social disruption. Creating a team of students trained in the art of facilitation and negotiation will not only provide those students invaluable skills for the future careers, but it will also help Emory respond quickly and effectively to campus issues that challenge our core values.

The ECP program is a joint initiative involving the five departments of the Center for the Advancement of Student Agency and Advocacy and its Executive Director. ECP will improve Emory’s capacity to effectively navigate social and cultural changes occurring on and off the campus by establishing a team of 15-20 students who are trained to facilitate peer-to-peer dialogues across the campus. Development of a student facilitation team will (a) encourage members of Emory’s campus community to proactively respond to salient social and political issues, (b) lay the groundwork for campus members to engage about and across their differences, and (c) create a framework for collaborative engaged leadership across our various campus communities.

#### 4. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Emory Conversation Project (ECP) program provides a unique opportunity for coordinated collaboration between the Barkley Forum for Debate, Dialogue & Deliberation, Belonging & Community Justice, Civic & Community Engagement, Social Justice Education, and Student Involvement Leadership & Transition, the five areas of the Center for the Advancement of Student Advocacy and Agency. Each area possesses unique skills that are instrumental in developing a conversation facilitation team of courageous leaders driven to create more just communities. Creation of an intensively trained 15 to 20-member facilitation team that develops and implements strategies for engaging the rest of campus on salient and contested issues is the heart of the program. Biweekly two-hour training sessions led by the staff members from the departmental partners will equip students to develop and implement a suite of innovative programs that bridges the expanding cultural divide on and off the campus.

A 2016 study entitled “The Spreading of Misinformation Online” published in the *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* demonstrates the need for this program. Del Vicario et al. warned that “digital misinformation has become so pervasive in online social media that it has been listed by the World Economic Forum as one of the main threats to human society” (p. 557). They found that this misinformation primarily derives from selective exposure to content in homogenous clusters, i.e. echo chambers. Students rarely seek out countervailing information and increasingly avoid conversation that may challenge their own worldview. Turkle forwards that this flight to Facebook’s ideologically homogenous echo chambers endangers the kind of conversations that encourage us to “listen intently to another person and expect that she or he is listening to you; where a discussion can go off on a tangent and circle back; where something unexpected can be discovered about a person or idea” (p. 22). This are the types of conversations that encourages students to critically assess their own positionality and strat to cultivate independent perspectives. Turkle’s research identifies these face-to-face encounters as the antidote to many of the negative externalities of social media. Ed Lee and Ajay Nair’s essay entitled “Creating Hospitable Communities: Remembering the Emanuel 9 as We Foster a Culture of Humility and Debate” in *Using Debate in the Classroom* concurs. They conclude:

Humans are social creatures. We cannot grow without others and face-to-face encounters. We cannot grow without being challenged. Allowing students to play with their words and beliefs provides a safe space for them to practice being life-long learners on a journey to becoming culturally humble and provides them the tools to transform their online social media experiences. (p.127)

We are desperately in need new learning opportunities that encourage students to embrace the discomfort of face-to-face conversations and use them as a source for community building. Students are yearning for spaces to explore their differences and articulate their concerns. Unfortunately, that is increasingly becoming mass-mediated echo-chambers that place a premium on presentation and the expense of interrogation. Higher education can and should provide students an alternative. It can and should provide them forums to engage in “risky talk.” While social media may have robbed us of the power of words, structured and contested face-to-face conversations can restore it.

ECP will serve as an expansion of the Eagles Speak program, previously housed in the Barkley Forum Center for Debate Education, that provided students the opportunities to engage in deliberative dialogue in a noncompetitive setting. While Eagles Speak hosted public debates and invited guest speakers, it did not train students in the art of facilitation and negotiation, hold regular meetings, or function as a team. It did not have the capacity to quickly respond to exigent issues that demand a campus-wide conversation. Bridge funding for the ECP will allow for us to move forward on these fronts by enabling the departments of the Center for the Advancement of Student Agency and Advocacy to create a dialogue and facilitation team that takes the lead on creating opportunities for engaged and timely dialogue throughout campus. It will also provide a student-based analog to the staff and faculty led Community Dialogue series currently being developed by Dr. Suzanne Onorato. We are reminded of a statement by Emory's Coordinator of International Student Life, Rick Huizinga, as he talked about the recent executive order barring entry of nationals from Iraq, Syria, Iran, Libya, Somalia, Sudan and Yemen. Rick eloquently argued that in order for international students to be welcomed on our campus they needed to "see and feel" that other students care about them and want them here. From his perspective, staff involvement is a poor substitute for action. Students can should take the lead in creating a hospitable community for international students. We believe this is also rings true as we work to reclaim and teach the art of conversation.

The primary objective of the ECP is to normalize "conversation" as the initial response that ECL makes to cultural, social, or political events impacting students' lives. We request **\$21,920.00 over three years (\$7,306.67 per year)** to the establish a program that we envision will evolve into a campus-wide student engagement capstone experience. Additional financial support for programs will come in the form of \$3500.00 each year from the CASAA operating budget. Unlike other programs on the campus, ECP incorporates collaborative training in oral communication, leadership, and social justice. It is truly an attempt to respond to the needs of the whole student by pooling some of the immense talent residing in Emory Campus Life. While Emory remains deeply committed to cultivating a community of inquiry and dialogue, its development remains a secondary or tertiary goal for most initiatives. Facilitating inquiry-driven dialogue is the priority for the Emory Conversation Project (ECP).

The 8 components of the CDF program are:

- **Community Dialogue Facilitators Team (CDFT)** - Andrew Carnegie wrote that "teamwork is the ability to work together toward a common vision. The ability to direct individual accomplishment toward organizational objectives. It is the fuel that allows common people to attain uncommon results." Emory Campus Life (ECL) has long supported teams to teach students the benefits of collaborative engagement and servant leadership while instilling grit and determination. At the heart of its championship athletics program, robust recreational opportunities, ECL Communication Fellows Program and its nationally renowned debating society is a robust financial commitment to using teams to collectivize student talent and energy to produce uncommon results. ECP seeks to harness the ECL's commitment to teamwork to produce campus-wide conversations about salient cultural and political issues. We seek to establish a dialogue and facilitation team that helps to further inculcate ECL's core values of courageous leadership, critical inquiry, cultural humility and social justice.

CDFT will encourage our various campus members to participate in the grand conversations shaping our campus and the larger society. While very few would challenge the value of expanded participation in difficult conversations, a limited number of people have the skills to actually facilitate these conversations when they are across and about our cultural differences. The lack of people trained to effectively facilitate difficult conversations is one reason attempts at intergroup conversations find resistance and, occasionally, backfires. CDFT addresses this issue by annually training 15-20 students to facilitate conversations throughout the campus about our most intransigent and vexing social issues. CDFT members will acquire transferable skills that can be used to improve their community building and sustaining efforts elsewhere.

- **CDFT Meetings** – CDF team will meet for bi-weekly for training in dialogue facilitation, diversity and inclusion, and equity-based leadership. CDFT members will be recruited from established student groups. ECP programmers will work directly with Office of Sorority and Fraternity Life, RESPECT Program and Student Government Associations to ensure those programs are represented on the facilitation team.

The two hour biweekly meetings will be led by the ECP lead programmer and one person staffing one of the project's departmental partners. The agenda for each meeting will include (1) a training module focused on facilitation, social justice and/or equity-based leadership and (2) working session preparing for upcoming events. This aspect of the CDF program has the potential to annually produce 15-20 student leaders trained to facilitate contested conversations and negotiate disputes in their classrooms, dorms, and student organizations.

**Potential Benefits:**

15-20 CDFT member – (1) Face-to-face conversation practice. (2) Perspective-taking skills as they work to ensure all sides of an issue are represented. (3) Media literacy skills needed to engage in evidence based facilitation. (4) Enhanced awareness of the importance of social location in communication.

**Campus – Indirect**

- **Telling Beloved Stories (TBS)** – One of Dr. King's most compelling visions was that of the Beloved Community – a community where people of different backgrounds recognize their interconnectedness and that our individual well-being is inextricably linked to the well-being of others. During each CDFT meeting, a student will take 10 minutes to tell their Beloved Story by answering the questions: Who are you? It will be followed by a 10-minute Q&A. TBS will encourage the students to be curious, courageous, communal and creatively entitled. The stories will be presented during the meal portion of the meeting.

**Potential Benefits:**

15-20 CDFT member – (1) Team building via sharing and trusting of others with the intimate details of our lives. (2) Public speaking practice. (3) Opportunity see the world

from the perspective of others (4) Opportunity to self-author your life.

Campus – Indirect

- **Sustained Dialogue Initiative (SDI)** - CDFT will determine one issue that they believe is worthy of the campus thoroughly exploring for an entire year. Taking a multidisciplinary approach, the team will use diverse perspectives of Emory's faculty, staff and community leaders to engage the campus in a sustained conversation about the various aspects of the chosen issue. We anticipate that the CDFT will plan 2 SDI events in both the Fall and Spring semesters. Each event will be open to the entire campus in a venue that can hold 150 to 200 people. Each SDI event will be collaboratively planned with and co-sponsored by other student organizations.

Benefits:

15-20 CDFT member – (1) event planning skills as they prepare for various campus events. (2) Training in collaborative teamwork as they plan large events that cannot be supported through the work of a small number of people. (3) Enhanced social capital from networking with other student organization and SDI participants. (4) Facilitation experience during the programs.

Campus – (1) Multiple entry points for people to gain a better understanding of a social issue. (2) A sustained collective conversation that expands the entire year. (3) An opportunity to listen to ideologically diverse perspective on the same issue that will challenge the simplification of complex social and political issues.

- **Bring Your Own Voice (BYOV)** – CDFT will invite 2 undergraduates, 2 graduate students, 2 staff members and 2 faculty members to participate in a facilitated one-hour lunch time deliberative dialogue about a salient social or political issue. Background information on the issue will be researched and distributed before the BYOV session. The conversation will occur in two phases. Phase I will allow the participants to speak to their personal connection and response to the issue. Phase II will encourage the participants to identify and discuss possible policy responses to the issue. Drinks and dessert will be provided. We anticipate that the CDFT will plan 3 BYOV events in both the Fall and Spring semesters. Each event will support 8 participants.

Potential Benefits:

15-20 CDFT member - (1) event planning skills as they prepare for various campus events. (2) Training in collaborative teamwork as they plan large events that cannot be support through the work of a small number of people (3) Enhanced social capital from networking with BYOV participants. (4) Facilitation experience during the programs. (4) Research skills needed to put together an Issue Brief used to start the conversation.

Campus – (1) 48 campus members will annually participate in an intergenerational deliberative dialogue on a salient social or political issue. (2) Creates a low barrier of entry for intergroup dialogue. (3) Opportunity to practice face-to-face conversation (and politicization of campus issues. (4) Enhanced social capital from networking with other

BYOV participants.

- **“Just In Time” Dialogues (JIT-D)** – One thing critically missing from the campus’ response to cultural, political, and social disturbances is the capacity to immediately react in a proactive, productive and educative manner. Far too often we miss the exigency, the critical moment that will galvanize rich and stimulating public conversations. The CDF Team will develop immediate public dialogic responses to salient events in the form of teach-ins, lectures, student-led workshops, dialogues and/or debates. The goal is to facilitate 2-3 events in the Fall and Spring semesters. Each event will be open to the entire campus in a venue that can hold 150 to 200 people. Each JIT-D event will be collaboratively planned with and co-sponsored by other student organizations.

Potential Benefits:

15-20 CDFT member – (1) Crisis response skills (2) event planning skills as they prepare for various campus events. (3) Training in collaborative teamwork as that plan large events that cannot be support through the work of a small number of people. (4) Enhanced social capital from networking with other student orgs and JIT-D participants. (4) Facilitation experience during the programs.

Campus – (1) Quick exigent response to crisis that 150-200 people can attend. (2) Campus-wide conversation at a time when immediate engagement is needed (3) forum for intergroup dialogue

- **CDFT Retreats** – A retreat will be held in August to support the team’s development and student’s skills building. The Barkley Forum holds a retreat for all members of the debate team in August. This off campus gathering will be instrumental to building team camaraderie, establishing an ethic of sacrifice among participants and sustaining their commitment to the overall goals of the program. It is difficult to bring a diverse group of people together and encourage them to sacrifice for a common good without sufficient investment in team building efforts.

Potential Benefits:

15-20 CDFT member – (1) Establishing a common purpose that binds people from diverse backgrounds (2) Connecting team members so they are will to sacrifice for each other and the program (3) Intense facilitation training (4) Enhanced awareness of the importance of social location in communication.

Campus –Indirect

- **ECP Sponsors Meetings** – At a minimum, the project sponsors will meet with the project manager(s) once in the Fall, Spring, and Summer to develop training modules for CDF Team Meetings, evaluate and evolve the program, develop and implement a sustainability plan, access the program and respond to internal/external concerns. ECP

Project Sponsors Meetings will ensure that the ECP programming is in line with the goals of each sponsoring partner and remains an actively supported collaborative venture.

While the sponsors of the ECP understand the Bridge Funds Committee's desire for more departments outside of CASAA to sign on to the project, we fear that it is driven by a misunderstanding of CASAA as an organizational entity. It is **5** semi-autonomous departments with directors that control their own budgets and have independent visions for their units. CASAA as an organizational entity exists primarily to facilitate enhanced communication and programmatic collaboration across these departments. CASAA makes up **41%** of the community portfolio. At some point, all 43 people in the portfolio will work with the project. **4 of the 5** departments have more personnel than the Office Sorority and Fraternity Life, Office of Student Conduct, and Recreation and Wellness. While the proposal is clear that we will reach out to other offices and student groups to recruit and plan events, we fear the addition of more sponsors for the illusion of "interdepartmental collaboration" will hinder managing the project because parties will likely be partners in name only and finding time for consistently sponsor meeting will become increasingly difficult. Additionally, the delicate balance pertaining to the supplemental funding of the project could easily be upset new partners only willing to contribute their opinions and not their resources.

We believe that there are strong partnerships to be cultivated with the Committee on Open Expression to help it meet its educational responsibilities and the staff/faculty oriented Community Dialogue Task Force it is still in its planning phase. However, neither of those partnerships will be helpful in recruiting and training students in the first year of the project. We believe that should be the priority if this project is truly going to develop student conversation facilitators. We do not want to sacrifice student training because we are fixated on which departments have sign on as cosponsors.

## 5. IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE

January - March 2017

- Staff Training
- Program Development

March 2017

- Choose 15-20 Students for Cohort JUSTICE

April – July, 2017

- Staff Training
- Training module development

August 2017

- Project Sponsor Meeting
- Cohort JUSTICE Retreat I
- Assess Cohort JUSTICE

August – November 2017

- Biweekly Meetings
- SDI, BYOV and JIT-D

December 2017

- Project Sponsor Meeting
- Assess Cohort JUSTICE
- ECP Holiday Celebration

January – March 2018

- Biweekly Meetings
- SDI, BYOV and JIT-D

March 2018

- Project Sponsor Meeting
- Assess Cohort JUSTICE
- CDF Year End Celebration
- Choose 15-20 Students for Cohort CURIOSITY

April – July, 2018

- Revise training module

August 2018

- Project Sponsor Meeting
- Cohort CURIOSITY Retreat
- Assess Cohort CURIOSITY

August – November 2018

- Biweekly Meetings
- SDI, BYOV and JIT-D

September 2018

- Begin Implicit Bias Training

December 2018

- Project Sponsor Meeting
- Assess Cohort CURIOSITY
- CDF Holiday Celebration

January – March 2019

- Biweekly Meetings
- SDI, BYOV and JIT-D

March 2019

- Project Sponsor Meeting
- Assess Cohort CURIOSITY
- CDF Year End Celebration
- Choose 15-20 Students for Cohort HUMILITY

April – July, 2019

- Revise training module

August 2019

- Project Sponsor Meeting
- Cohort HUMILITY Retreat
- Assess Cohort HUMILITY

August – November 2019

- Biweekly Meetings
- SDI, BYOV and JIT-D

December 2019

- Project Sponsor Meeting
- Assess Cohort HUMILITY
- ECP Holiday Celebration

January – March 2020

- Biweekly Meetings
- SDI, BYOV and JIT-D

March 2020

- Project Sponsor Meeting
- Assess Cohort HUMILITY
- Choose 15-20 Students for Cohort EMPATHY
- ECP Year End Celebration

**6. ASSESSMENT PLAN**

- Interview and Survey Evaluations in March and December - 15-20 Community Dialogue Facilitators will be interviewed to assess individual and team goals, student run programs, and student development. Additionally, Likert-type scale survey evaluations will be used to assess staff members and individual training modules. The data gathering will follow Emory research protocol to ensure the findings are publishable.

We are primarily interested in evaluating the team as a space where students can find a sense of belonging, be a place for meeting their needs for a social life, and a pedagogical tool for cultivating civic responsibility. We will work directly with the ECL Assessment team to determine the proper protocols for evaluating the above.

- Individual project evaluations - Each ECP event will conclude with a voluntary on-line survey evaluation of their participants that will be used to inform future projects. The goal is to evaluate the facilitator’s facilitation skills and the willingness of the audience to participate in future ECP events.

**7. FUNDING REQUEST AND COST ELEMENTS**

**A. Total Request**

- \$21,920.00

**B. Direct Labor**

Tip: By “Burdened Hourly Rate,” we mean the cost rate to Campus Life, plus any fringe, overhead and/or general and administrative expense markup excluding profit. (Requests for full-time staff should not be included in this proposal.)

Title or Labor Category (i.e. grad student, intern, contractor, etc.)	Name of Contractor	Burdened Hourly Rate	Number of Hours	Amount Requested
[TITLE]	[NAME]	[\$\$]	[##]	[\$\$]
			Subtotal –	[\$\$]
			Total –	[\$\$] 0

Justification: How will this resource ensure project implementation success?

**C. Equipment and Materials**

Item Description	Quantity	Unit Price	Extended Price
[ITEM DESCRIPTION]	[##]	[\$\$]	[\$\$]
Reclaiming Conversation (Book)	60	\$11.00	\$660.00
Humble Inquiry (Book)	60	\$11.00	\$660.00
		Subtotal –	[\$\$]
		Total –	[\$\$] \$1320.00

Justification: What kinds and quantities of equipment or material will be needed to execute the project or associated tasks? Why?

**D. Travel and Miscellaneous Expenses**

Expense Type	Description	Total Estimated Cost
[EXPENSE TYPE]	[DESCRIPTION]	[\$\$]
Staff Training	Facilitation Workshops/Campus Visits	\$5000.00
Sustained Dialogue Initiative	4 events x 3 years x \$300 each	3600.00
Just In Time Dialogues	6 events x 3 years x \$300 each	\$5400.00
CDF Team Meetings	16 meetings x 3 x \$100 each	\$4800.00
CDF Retreats	1 event x 3 years x \$2500 each	\$7500.00
BYOV Deliberative Dialogue	6 events x 3 years x \$100	\$1800.00
	Total –	[\$\$] \$20,600.00

Justification: How will this support project implementation?

- Staff Training - Funding will allow us to provide facilitation training for the program manager and other staff consistently working with the program. Training the trainer is essential to the development of a year-long training protocol that effectively incorporates the talent in the various sponsoring departments and sustains the interest of the students.

- Sustained Dialogue – We anticipate the \$300 for each event will cover marketing, food, and the occasional small speaker honorarium in a venue that houses 150-200 people. We anticipate CASAA will need to subsidize some of the cost if the events become popular.
- Just In Time Dialogues – We anticipate the \$300 for each event will cover marketing, food, and the occasional small speaker honorarium in a venue that houses 150-200 people. We anticipate CASAA will need to subsidize some of the cost if the events become popular.
- CDFT Meetings – We anticipate the 2-hour team meetings will need to occur during dinner in order for everyone to consistently attend. The team meeting is an essential component of the overall program. The CDF projects will be poorly developed and ineffective without a collection of students who perceive themselves as part of a team. \$100 for each meeting will be used to provide dinner for the 15-20 Community Dialogue Facilitators and the staff members attending the meeting. There is a substantial body of literature that speaks to the value of eating together as a way to transform disparate isolated individuals into a caring community. ECP Team Meeting meals will simultaneously provide sustenance and become a team building ritual.
- CDFT Retreat - \$2500.00 partially subsidize a 2 day off campus retreat for the 15-20 Community Dialogue Facilitators. We consider this essential to the team’s development. Teamwork is cultivated. It does not automatically occur just by calling a group a team. You must develop a common purpose and sense of belonging. You must establish a common vision that members embrace if you want them to sacrifice for the collective. We are asking these students to stand in the line of fire as they push and prod the campus to have conversations about issues most adults only talk about with our closest friends. The facilitators will need a strong support network to deal with the failures and the inevitable criticisms. That support system has to be developed internally within the team. The retreat model is a common approach to team building for teams on and off the campus because it encourages and provides space for individual to focus on the team and its core objective. Additionally, it deepens relationships so they can withstand the strains of trying to achieve lofty objectives.

### E. Cost Summary

Cost Element	Total Estimated Cost
Direct Labor	[\$\$] 0
Equipment & Materials	[\$\$] \$1320.00
Travel & Misc.	[\$\$] 20,600.00
Total –	[\$\$]\$21,920.00

## F. Departmental Contribution

Include a description and explanation of any resources that the department will contribute in addition to Bridge Fund support, including human resources, time, space, etc.

**CASAA's HR contribution: over \$48,750 per year** (This is BF Program Coordinator & Wade Fellow, Campus. It does not include Director-level contributions)

### Human Resources

- |                         |                          |                           |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| • Lydia Smith           | BF Program Coordinator   | 75% of FTE on ECP program |
| • TBD                   | Wade Fellow, Campus      | 75% of FTE on ECP program |
| • Ed Lee                | Exec Director, Community | 5% of FTE on ECP program  |
| • Lisa Loveall          | Director, SILT           | 3% of FTE on ECP program  |
| • Danielle Bruce-Steele | Director, B&CJ           | 3% of FTE on ECP program  |
| • James Roland          | Sr. Director, C&CE       | 3% of FTE on ECP program  |
| • James Herndon         | Director, BF             | 3% of FTE on ECP program  |
| • DeLa Sweeney          | Director, SJE            | 3% of FTE on ECP program  |

Lydia Smith will serve as the project manager organizing the program and the point person for incorporating people and ideas from the five areas into the program.

Ed Lee will oversee the budget and long-term vision of the project.

The other five directors will oversee and guide the develop of the assessment plan and training sessions.

### CASAA Budget contributions: \$3500 per year

- Team Building - \$2000 will be earmarked for ECP Team building opportunities like purchasing of t-shirts, end of the semester celebrations, and student training materials. The Barkley Forum Endowment was created to help support experimental debate, dialogue and deliberation programs like the ECP.
- Team Building - \$1000 will be earmarked for retreat expenses that are not covered by bridge fund.
- Copying – \$500 will cover the non-marketing copying costs for the CDF program.

### Space

- Community Dialogue Facilitators will hold their team meetings in space designated for Berkley Forum Debate Team meetings.

## 8. CHECKLIST

Before you submit your proposal:

- Did you list the names of the sponsors and their departments?
- Did your unit heads review and approve the proposal?
- Have you demonstrated that the project innovates, steward's resources, engages collaboration, and uses assessment to foster a culture of informed decision making?
- Is your project timeline realistic and attainable?
- If your project lasts 3+ years, did you demonstrate how the program will be sustained?
- Did you clearly state how your funds will be used?
- Did you discuss your proposal with your strategic plan departmental contact?
- Did you discuss your assessment plans with your departmental assessment coordinator?