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I. Background

In the summer of 1994, a group of people with a common interest in Conflict Management (CM) met informally to discuss the use of CM in the University System. Like all university systems, Georgia's had seen an increase in lawsuits and in the cost of resolving disputes. The group determined that the increased use of CM was one appropriate response to this problem. Consequently, the Board of Regents formed a "Blue Ribbon Committee" to study the use of CM in the University System of Georgia (USG) and to make recommendations to the Board. In July 1995, the Regents adopted the recommendations of this committee in the form of The Board of Regents’ Initiative and Policy Direction on Conflict Resolution (Initiative). See Appendix A. The Initiative mandated the design and implementation of CM Systems on the campuses of the 34 institutions within USG. (In 2006, Georgia Gwinnett College opened bringing the total number of system institutions to 35.)

Institutions were provided with a six-stage model (see Figure 1) that would assist them in achieving this mandate. The president of each institution was required to appoint a campus CM liaison to provide the "communication bridge" both within their institution and between their institution and outside contacts. This boundary spanning role requires the selection of a person with an excellent grasp of institutional culture, leadership skill to facilitate a committee of diverse constituents, position of influence to promote the Initiative, and an interest in improving CM on their campus. The first task of the campus liaison was to form a Campus Conflict Resolution Committee (CCRC) to design, implement, and monitor the CM System. CCRC should be composed of members representing the full range of campus stakeholders. Each campus also had the freedom to devise their own assessment methodologies, to recommend a design that fit their campus, and to determine a means for evaluating and improving their programs.

Figure 1.
Six-Stage Model for Development and Implementation of CM Systems

Appoint Liaison and Committee (CCRC)
Evaluate & Improve
Implement Program/Service including plan for Capacity Building
Recommend Design for CM Program
Educate & Train Stakeholders
Assess Disputing and Conflict Handling Mechanisms
At the USG level, the Initiative established an Advisory Committee to the Chancellor to function much like a CCRC, but at the USG level, and to provide advice to the Chancellor and Regents on the progress of the Initiative. The Consortium on Negotiation and Conflict Resolution (CNCR) was charged with providing technical support, administering a system-wide mediation program, and evaluating the progress at the institutional and system level.

CNCR has completed three previous progress reports on the development and implementation of CM Systems at the institutional level. The 1996 to 1998 report and the 1998 to 2001 report focused on progress in each of the six stages of the model. These reports were based on data collected from on-campus visits with liaisons and CCRCs. A web-based questionnaire without on-campus interviews was the method used for the September 2001 to January 2004 evaluation with activities at the system level reported for the first time. This progress report, covering the period from January 2004 to January 2007, also includes institutional and system activities.

II. Methodology

CNCR designed a web-based questionnaire (see Appendix B) consisting of 36 questions pertaining to the following:

- the six stage model for the development and implementation of CM,
- campus leadership,
- innovations,
- sustainability, and
- impact.

Liaisons and their CCRCs had several months to complete the questionnaire on-line. Once questionnaires were completed, CNCR scheduled interviews with the liaisons/CCRCs. Dr. Marilyn Hazzard-Lineberger, CNCR consultant, completed 10 on-site interviews and Lin Inlow, CNCR Director of Education and Mediation, completed 24 on-site interviews. Thirty-four campuses completed the questionnaire and were interviewed. Georgia Gwinnett College was not included in this evaluation since the date of its opening occurred after the evaluation period.

At the USG level, this report summarizes data from the activities of the Chancellor’s Advisory Committee and CNCR that are directed at achieving the goals of the Initiative.

III. Institutional Level Progress and Recommendations

A. Designing and Implementing CM Systems at Each Institution

Liaisons and CCRCs were asked to respond to questions related to any action taken at each step of developing and implementing their CM program/service during the reporting period. It is important to note that the model represents a continuous quality control
process. Although most institutions had completed an initial cycle of the model by the end of the second reporting period (2001), continued efficacy of the CM System requires on-going conflict and conflict-handling assessment, responsive redesign, persistent implementation efforts, and evaluation.

Stage 1: Liaison Appointment and CCRC Formation and Function
After appointment by the president, the first task of the campus liaison was to form a CCRC which is representative of the full range of campus stakeholders. The CCRC identifies current conflicts, anticipates future conflicts, analyzes current conflict handling procedures, and designs and implements an improved CM System, if necessary.

Approximately 65% of respondents (N=22) reported that their CCRC was intact. The reasons given by the remaining 35% of respondents (N=12) for not having a committee included “change in liaison”, “change of upper leadership and (lack of) clear direction”, “lack of time”, and “competing demands”.

Recommendation: CCRCs should remain intact and active. After completing the initial cycle of the six-stage model, CCRCs have a continuing role and provide essential support to the liaison. The Chancellor’s Advisory Committee should identify and disseminate the best practices of CCRCs. CCRC members and liaisons should be appointed according to guidelines provided in A Guidebook for Implementing the Initiative and Policy Direction on Conflict Resolution (Yarn and Boyens, 1995). Some campuses have adopted a co-liaison model in order to share the liaison responsibilities. Other institutions should also consider appointing co-liaisons.

Stage 2: Education and Training
The education and training of liaisons, CCRC members, and key decision makers about CM theory, practice, and design have been critical factors in the success of CM at the institutional level.

During the reporting period, on-campus CM training was conducted on 17 campuses and involved over 1300 participants including faculty, staff, administrators, and both undergraduate and graduate students. Training involved orientations for different groups such as administrative managers, new employees, deans, department heads and students. Skill development workshops were offered in the topical areas of Dealing with Difficult People, Communicating at Work, Handling Difficult Situations and Behaviors, Confrontation and Conflict Mediation, Communication Styles, Managerial Mediation Skills, and the Arts and Skills of Coaching. These awareness and skill development workshops were presented in a variety of forums such as panel discussions, lunch-and-learn workshops, freshman seminars and orientation, faculty and staff development, leadership training, and management development programs.
Although not addressed by the questionnaire, CNCR notes that many institutions have information about their CM Systems on their websites.

Fifteen campuses described curricula infusion of CM theory. Liaisons identified undergraduate and graduate courses in mediation, negotiation and conflict resolution in such disciplines as business, law, psychology, communication, human services, anthropology, health sciences, and public administration.

**Recommendation:** On-going educational efforts are necessary not only to “spread the word” but also to inform the constant influx of new students, faculty, and staff in light of the turnover inherent in institutions of higher education. Best practices and educational efforts should be identified and disseminated to all USG liaisons by the Advisory Committee. Some educational efforts should focus on clarifying the liaison’s roles and responsibilities since some institutions are still struggling with this issue.

**Stage 3: Assessment**
In-depth and honest assessment of the nature of campus conflict and the efficacy of conflict handling mechanisms allows for strategic and thoughtful design of CM Systems. An assessment should have been conducted prior to any initial recommendations in design and implementation by the CCRC. In conjunction with evaluation, periodic reassessment allows for adaptation by the CM System to changes in the conflict environment.

Approximately one-fourth of institutions reported no monitoring of conflict on their campus. Institutions which monitor conflict provided a variety of methods. The following methods were reported with categories not exclusive of each other: 65% reported informal methods such as “word of mouth”, 41% used departmental reports such as statements from Affirmative Action/Human Resources, 29% used mediator/ombuds reports, 18% used committee reports, and 6% of respondents monitored conflict by reading campus newspapers/newsletters.

Liaisons identified numerous barriers that keep some issues/conflicts from being addressed on their campus. Personality issues of the disputants were recognized as barriers by 41% of the respondents with 32% of respondents stating campus practices were barriers. Budget resources and leadership support were both viewed as barriers by 21% of the respondents while 18% stated policies and 15% claimed a lack of human resources such as CM trained personnel and clerical support to be barriers. Lack of time was identified by 15% of respondents with lack of technical support reported by the remaining 9%.

Twenty-one institutions provided the following reasons to explain why issues do not get resolved on their campus: fear of retaliation, lack of trained mediators and knowledge/awareness about mediation, size of institution (i.e. too small), personalities of the disputants, managers’ fear of losing control, employees’ fear of losing jobs, resistance
to change, lack of faculty governance, leadership changes creating uncertainty and anxiety, faculty reluctance to mediate with students, management adopting “my way or the highway” philosophy, lack of trust regarding confidentiality of mediation, and the belief that administrators don’t respect the process.

**Recommendation:** The Advisory Committee should clarify the assessment stage as an on-going activity and distinguish assessment from evaluation by providing assessment instruments and models for implementation. Institutions should encourage and support campus assessment.

**Stages 4 and 5: Design and Implementation**

CCRCs have recommended and implemented a variety of mechanisms for managing and resolving conflict including on-campus mediation, ombuds programs, facilitation services, and improved grievance procedures.

**Mediation:** Seventeen institutions report active mediation programs/services, while another 7 institutions stated that their mediation program/services had been inactive or non-existent during this reporting period. Albany State University, Atlanta Metropolitan College, Bainbridge College, Georgia Highlands, Gainesville College, Georgia Southern University, and Middle Georgia College acknowledged that their campuses experienced either a liaison change, lack of senior leadership support, and/or competing demands thereby creating a suspension of these services. Nineteen institutions utilized their on-campus mediators or the System-wide Mediation Program to mediate 224 cases with the number of cases ranging from 1-60 per campus. Interpersonal conflict accounted for 131 cases, 89 cases pertained to work performance issues, and the remaining 70 cases involved interpretations of policy.

**Recommendation:** The Chancellor’s Advisory Committee and institutions should determine ways to revitalize those mediation programs that are inactive but are needed.

**Ombuds:** There are six institutions offering ombuds services. These campuses are Georgia State University, Kennesaw State University, Clayton State University, Georgia Institute of Technology, Augusta State University, and East Georgia College. Georgia State University, Kennesaw State University, and Clayton State University ombuds offer services to faculty, staff and students. Georgia Institute of Technology offers services only to faculty and staff. East Georgia College’s ombuds deals with student transfer issues, and Augusta State University’s ombuds committee handles sexual harassment complaints. With the exception of Georgia State University, these ombuds handled 507 cases. (At the time of writing this report, Georgia State University’s ombudspersons had not submitted a response to this question.) The 507 cases were categorized into six major areas: discrimination, academic dispute, personnel, interpersonal, whistle-blowing, and other. Interpersonal conflict accounted for 150 cases. Discrimination cases totaled 75 with almost half (N=34) of those cases pertaining to race discrimination. Other reported categories of discrimination included sexual harassment (N=13), gender (N=12), nationality (N=5), and age (N=4). Faculty governance (N=25) was the greatest concern.
for academic issues with intellectual property (N=8) and degree requirements (N=6) accounting for the remainder. In the area of personnel, 100 cases pertained to performance, 51 cases related to the interpretation of policies, 24 cases concerned salary, and 10 cases involved issues surrounding termination. Eleven cases were categorized as whistle-blowing. There were 89 cases that were undefined and classified as “other.”

**Recommendation:** Based on the success of these ombuds programs, it is recommended that other institutions seriously examine the establishment of ombuds programs, particularly the larger institutions.

**Organizational reporting:** Liaisons report the progress of developing and implementing CM to a variety of individuals. Of the 32 responses received, 53% (N=17) report to the President; 19% (N=6) report to the Vice President of Academic Affairs with 3% (N=1) reporting to the Vice President of Fiscal Affairs; 13% (N=4) report to Human Resources only 6% (N=2) report to legal counsel. Liaisons from Georgia Highlands College and Macon State College stated that they do not report progress to anyone on their campus. Some liaisons also manage the CM program. Eg. The campus liaisons for Clayton State University, Georgia State University, Georgia Institute of Technology, and Kennesaw State University are also the campus Ombudsperson.

**Recommendation:** The Advisory Committee should examine some of the problems and advantages of different reporting structures for individuals who are managing CM programs, such as ombuds and mediation. Conformity with national guidelines for ombuds offices should be followed, including independence, confidentiality, and neutrality based on reporting lines.

**Resources:** Eight liaisons reported they received some budget, ranging from $3,000 to $218,796. (It is important to note that the $218,796 budget reported by Georgia Institute of Technology includes two personnel positions in Human Resources who were not funded as a result of the Initiative but have some CM responsibilities.) Others reported either no budget or funds available as needed. When asked to rate their level of satisfaction with their budget allocation, 36% of the 29 respondents stated that they were “satisfied”, 27% were “somewhat satisfied”, and 24% were “not at all satisfied”.

Liaisons/CCRCs reported varying degrees of satisfaction with their overall resources for managing conflict: 21% were “satisfied”, 60% were “somewhat satisfied”, and 18% were “not at all satisfied”. When asked what resources would they like, responses clustered around time, budget, and people. Many stated the need for an annual budget for training, materials, website; dedicated employees/release time for training, liaison responsibilities, and ombudsing; designated space and phone; more champions and engaged CCRC; direct communication with senior administration; more minority mediators; and conflict resolution tips printed in newspapers and flyers.
Redesign: When asked if the liaison/CCRC planned to add any new CM activities on campus, 75% (N=25) of the respondents responded affirmatively. Some of those activities include training, survey campus; promote and market CM program/service, incorporate CM in policies, reconstitute CCRC, appoint co-liaisons, develop film series focusing on controversial issues, create a CM practicum, hire staff ombuds, develop forums for open dialogue, request budget, plan mock mediation for demonstration to faculty and staff, seek dedicated office for CM with an ombuds, and develop CM materials for training and teaching.

Recommendation: The Advisory Committee in conjunction with institutions should explore financial resources that would support the Initiative on those campuses that don’t have the necessary funding.

Stage 6: Program Evaluation
Although frequently overlooked, periodic evaluation of the services and programs provided under an institution’s CM System is important to any continuous improvement efforts. During the reporting period, six institutions completed an on-campus evaluation of their program/services. They are Columbus State University, East Georgia College, Georgia College and State University, North Georgia College and State University, Savannah State College, and Waycross College.

On the questionnaire and during the interviews, liaisons and CCRC members were asked to identify the strengths and weakness of their CM program/service. Those comments are summarized and aggregated by classification of institution. See Appendix C.
When measuring effectiveness of programs, respondents reported using multiple mechanisms such as satisfaction surveys (N=4), unsolicited feedback (N=17), routine follow-up with disputants (N=18), and formal evaluation (N=2). Twelve institutions used more than two different methods with Georgia College and State University and Georgia State University relying on all four mechanisms to measure effectiveness.

When asked about satisfaction with their campus CM, 27% of respondents were “somewhat satisfied”, 36% were “satisfied/very satisfied”, and 24% were “not at all satisfied”.

Recommendation: The Advisory Committee should encourage all CM programs in USG to develop and implement on-going methods of evaluating effectiveness of their programs with the understanding that periodic evaluation may indicate a need for an assessment.

B. Campus Leadership
Leaders who are able to influence the accomplishment of the Initiative’s goals at the system and institutional level are often those persons with positional power such as top administrators, e.g., the Chancellor, Presidents, or Provosts. In some cases, the designated liaison may have the requisite position in the institution to affect change directly. Others
leaders influencing CM are those individuals with certain personal characteristics or skills that enable them to promote the principles underlying the Initiative.

The many changes in the key leadership positions at both the system and institutional level presented challenges for liaisons and their CCRCs. During these past two years, an interim Chancellor and a new Chancellor were appointed and almost one-third (N=13) of the 34 institutions of the USG has had at least one new president. Seven of the eleven campuses actually had two presidents.

Thirteen institutions experienced a change in their campus liaison with Albany State University changing three times. Liaisons moving out of the system, retirement, transfers to other institutions, and new appointments explain the changes. Although there were changes in individuals, the job classification of the liaison did not change. For example, if a Human Resources employee was the liaison, then his/her replacement also came from Human Resources. This was also true for faculty liaisons. See Appendix D.

Liaisons and CCRCs were also asked to identify “natural problem solvers” on their campus. CNCR defines a natural problem solver as someone who most likely is a good listener and communicator, encourages others to solve problems, and can be counted on to offer constructive suggestions that make matters better, not worse. The occupational status of identified natural problem solvers ranged from president to administrative assistant. Of the 28 institutions responding to this question Human Resources was most frequently selected as having individuals who are natural problem solvers (N=14). Deans and chairs were the next most often selected by respondents (N=13) with individual faculty being named by 10 institutions. Six institutions identified Student Affairs personnel as being natural problem solvers while the President and Vice President for Academic Affairs were named by 5 institutions. Three campuses mentioned the Vice President for Fiscal/Business Affairs with Legal Affairs being recognized once.

A “champion” in CM is someone who repeatedly demonstrates leadership in the development and implementation of CM Systems, supports and promotes the goals of the Initiative, and personally encourages collegiality, trustworthiness, and collaboration. When asked to identify campus champions who support the Initiative, respondents from 25 campuses listed individuals who held positions ranging from president to faculty to professional staff. Human Resources was most frequently mentioned as a champion (N=12) with the President and the Vice President for Academic Affairs identified 11 times. Student Affairs personnel and academic deans and chairs were all recognized by 8 respondents. Five institutions viewed Legal Affairs as a champion of the Initiative. The Vice President for Fiscal Affairs/Business and faculty were both identified as champions by 3 of the respondents.

Recommendations: The Advisory Committee should develop transition strategies to address turnover at both the senior administrative and liaison level. Institutions should explore ways to better use natural problem solvers so that their contributions are not inhibited.
Advisory Committee and institutions need to cultivate and encourage CM champions.

C. Innovations
Nine respondents claimed unique programs had been created through their CM program during the reporting period. The following list identifies the institution and their innovation:

- **Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College** requires all new employees to complete a web-based program on mediation. Student and employee brochures are distributed to promote mediation.

- **Armstrong Atlantic State University** requires faculty to first talk to the campus mediator before filing an official grievance.

- **Clayton State University** offers mediation training to undergraduate students.

- **Fort Valley State University** has incorporated CM in the faculty, staff, and student handbooks.

- **Georgia Institute of Technology** designates a Human Resource representative to chair the grievance process for demotion/suspension cases while a tenured faculty member chairs the grievance process for the university at large.

- **Georgia College and State University** developed a user-friendly matrix of conflict handling processes/offices available to employees and students. The reader can easily access the matrix by searching the [http://www2.gcsu.edu/conflictresolution/index.html](http://www2.gcsu.edu/conflictresolution/index.html) and determining which office/process would be best for resolving his/her issue.

- **Georgia State University** offers a CM/Resolution Certificate Program for faculty and staff, a collaborative training program designed by the Ombuds Office, Management/Staff Development, and the Faculty Staff Assistance. A Performance Management Certificate Program for managers and supervisors is also offered. Additionally, there have been revisions to include CM in the staff and student grievance policies.

- **Kennesaw State University** has developed training in coaching skills for faculty and staff. Training has also been conducted for Resident Advisors and various leadership groups. There is an Ethical Leadership Certificate Program, a three-tier development program that addresses 12 specific leadership topics in each level. During each level the various topics include CM, such as conflict resolution, negotiation skills, team building, and effective communication.

- **Savannah State College** has developed a strategic plan for campus CM; trained student mediators; and created a conflict resolution course for the Department of Continuing Education.

- **University of Georgia** continues to have success with its program, Facilitated Discussion of Academic Dishonesty. Prior to the use of mediation disputants meet with mediation trained Human Resource professionals who facilitate a conversation between the parties. These conversations often result in resolution of the issue.
Although 37% of the respondents stated there were no incentives for developing innovations for managing conflict on their campus, a majority of liaisons/CCRCs identified many intangible incentives such as personal satisfaction, harmony and improved morale, appreciation by those whose conflicts have been resolved and by those who supervise them, pleasant work environment, preservation of business relationships, recruitment aid, empowered community, prevention/reduction of unnecessary conflict, showing that someone cares, and creating less work for all. More tangible incentives included training funds, inclusion of mediation certification in tenure and promotion portfolios, enhanced problem solving skills, options for managers to resolve conflicts at even lower levels, less time and frustration in coping with conflicts, avoiding escalating cases that go to grievance, improved trust within community, improved productivity, and avoidance of legal costs.

Recommendations: The Advisory Committee should continue to disseminate innovative practices and explore incentives for sustaining and growing CM Systems.

D. Sustainability
Words used to define “sustainability” vary and include institutionalization, durability, incorporation, and capacity-building, each with its own nuances of meaning. When asked about sustainability, 26 respondents cited steps that had been taken to sustain the existence and growth of their CM program. Those steps include training incoming liaison prior to liaison’s retirement, educating new administrators, changing policy, appointing a standing CM committee, establishing Office of Conflict Resolution with Ombuds, sending people annually to the CNCR Summer Institute on Conflict Management in Higher Education, creating a Graduate Student Ombuds, reconstituting CCRC, rotating members on the CCRC to ensure continuity of programming, having a stable budget, developing a strategic plan, establishing formal programs in Legal Affairs, and increasing publicity promoting the benefits of ADR.

Some of the most significant obstacles to sustaining and growing the CM program were identified by 28 respondents. Those obstacles pertained mainly to budget and time constraints; perception of retaliation by supervisors asked into mediation; lack of awareness, time, resources, intact CCRC, space, trained mediators, and buy-in from administrators, faculty and/or staff; leadership changes; competing needs and initiatives; and, maintaining the CCCR’s interest.

Some liaisons/CCRCs reported strategies to overcome their specific obstacles such as sharing responsibilities of the liaison with other individuals, revising policies, promoting CM, sending employees to the CNCR Summer Institute, reconstituting the CCRC, assessing nature of campus conflict and satisfaction with conflict handling mechanisms, and partnering with other offices to provide training.

Almost two-thirds (N=24) of the respondents recognized factors that had facilitated the implementation and continuous improvement of their CM program/service on their
campus. Some of those factors named were support of past Presidents and other senior administrators, continuous training of the liaison, “word of mouth” about the success of CM options, support from Human Resources and Student Life, anonymity in and access to online forums, partnering and funding of initiatives, commitment by management to encourage informal conflict resolution at the lowest level possible, people highly motivated and dedicated to the goals of the Initiative, and training programs.

**Recommendation:** The revision of policy to recognize the role of CM systems is vital to long term sustainability. Institutions that have not yet revised policies should move to do so.

### E. Impact

Liaisons rated the degree of impact the Initiative has had on the way in which conflict is resolved or managed on their campus. Dalton State College, East Georgia College, Georgia Highlands College, and Gainesville State College reported that the Initiative had “not at all” had an impact on resolving campus conflict while Kennesaw State University, University of Georgia, Valdosta State University, and Waycross College all acknowledged a “very significant impact”. Six campuses reported “very little impact” with the remaining 17 campuses reporting that the Initiative had “some impact”.

Evidence for ratings included the liaison’s anecdotal experiences, some informal tracking of campus conflict and its resolution, increased utilization of CM and support from senior administration, and the reduction in adversarial processes such as grievance hearings/academic honesty due process hearings.

**Recommendation:** The Advisory Committee should explore better ways to assess the impact of the Initiative such as a study on social networking.

### IV. System Level Progress and Recommendations

#### A. The University System-wide Mediation Program

Of the sixteen cases referred to the System-wide Mediation Program during the reporting period, thirteen were referred by campus liaisons with the remainder referred by the Office of the Chancellor. Two of these cases sought a facilitated discussion rather than mediation for which impartial facilitators were provided. Forty-two parties, 25 males and 18 females, were involved in the mediations/facilitations not including attorneys who were representing their clients. Forty per cent of all disputants were faculty (N=17) while 30% of all disputants were administrators including presidents, vice presidents, deans, and chairs. Staff comprised 28% (N=12) of the disputants while only one student sought mediation. The primary dispute for half of all cases (N=8) pertained to conditions of employment such as teaching workload, performance appraisal, job responsibilities, termination, etc. There were five cases involving discrimination, specifically age (N=3), gender (N=1), and race (N=1) discrimination. Although many cases also had
interpersonal conflict as an issue, there were only two cases that focused primarily on the interpersonal relationship at work. There was one case involving a student who contested the graduation requirements of the department. Nine mediations settled on all issues; three mediations reached partial settlement; and only two did not settle on any issues. Settlement was not relevant in the two facilitated discussions.

Recommendation: The Advisory Committee should insure that liaisons, CCRCs and senior administrators are aware of the System-wide Mediation Program.

B. Capacity Building

Annual Campus Liaison Workshops

At the request of the Chancellor’s Advisory Committee, CNCR conducts annual Liaison Workshops. “Fine Tuning Your Conflict Management Services” was the theme of the Tenth Annual 2006 Workshop at Fort Valley State University. Liaisons from all campuses except Albany State University, Atlanta Metropolitan College, Bainbridge College, Dalton State College, Floyd College, Georgia Institute of Technology, Macon State College, Medical College of Georgia, Savannah State College, Southern Polytechnic State University, and Valdosta State University were in attendance. The “Outstanding Campus Liaison Award” was presented to the co-liaisons from State University of West Georgia, Ms. Diane Smith and Dr. Denise Overfield.

“Using Campus Conflict Resolution Committees to Manage Change” was the theme for the Ninth Annual 2005 Workshop held at Georgia College and State University. Diane Kirkwood, Georgia Southwestern State University, was the recipient of the “Outstanding Campus Liaison Award”. Liaisons from the following institutions were not represented: Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College, Albany State University, Augusta State University, Bainbridge College, Fort Valley State University, Gainesville College, Middle Georgia College, Southern Polytechnic State University, Valdosta State University, and Waycross College.

Several institutions have attended less than half of the annual Campus Liaison Workshops. Gordon College, Southern Polytechnic State University, Valdosta State University and Waycross College have not sent their liaison/an institutional representative to as many as four of these annual meetings.

Recommendations: Institutions should support liaisons and CCRC members to attend annual liaison workshops.

Summer Institute on Conflict Management in Higher Education

The 2006 Summer Institute conducted at Jekyll Island offered classes in Campus Mediation, Innovations in Mediation, and Cross Cultural Negotiation. Armstrong Atlantic State University, Atlanta Metropolitan College, Augusta State University, Clayton State University, Georgia College and State University, Georgia Perimeter College, Georgia State University, Kennesaw State University, Macon State College,
Medical College of Georgia, North Georgia College and State University, University of Georgia, and University of West Georgia sponsored participants. See Appendix E.

In 2005, Summer Institute classes included Campus Mediation, Innovations in Mediation, and Interdisciplinary Insights for Conflict Resolvers. Half (N=17) of the institutions sent participants. See Appendix E.

During this evaluation period, CNCR has designed and developed a variety of resources/materials that ensure capacity building beyond the Summer Institute. Those resources include a video/DVD on Facilitated Discussion Model of Academic Dishonesty Cases at the University of Georgia, an on-line video of creative teaching methodologies in CM, the CNCR Swap Meet Sourcebook (a compilation of teaching activities created by participants in three CNCR Swap Meets), a higher education CNCR website to offer more resources to USG, and a nation-wide database on CM in Higher Education.

C. Disseminating Knowledge beyond USG
One of the goals of the Initiative is “to make the USG an exemplar and nationally recognized leader in the development of alternative dispute resolution in higher education.” Seventeen presentations promoting the University System of Georgia as a national exemplar and recognized leader in CM have been presented by CNCR staff. See Appendix F. CNCR is working closely with the University of Warsaw and the university system of England, both of which have adopted aspects of the model developed under the Initiative.

*Recommendation:* The Advisory Committee and the Chancellor should continue to support these activities and be on the alert for similar opportunities.

V. Summary:
In the face of frequent leadership changes at the institutional level, liaisons/CCRCs continue to accomplish the goals of the Initiative. Evidence such as types of conflict resolved by CM, training programs, and innovations at both large and small campuses, shows the institutionalization of CM at the campus level. Most institutions show a mature knowledge and acceptance of the Initiative and CM practices. There is also an increased national and international recognition of the USG as an exemplar in CM in Higher Education. However, in reviewing recommendations from the last evaluation, it is noted that some of these recommendations are the same as those mentioned in 2004 thereby indicating limited progress in some of these areas.
APPENDIX A

THE BOARD OF REGENTS’ INITIATIVE AND POLICY DIRECTION ON CONFLICT RESOLUTION UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA

Background

The University System’s Vision Statement and Guiding Principles recognize the value of constructive conflict resolution. Conflict is a pervasive and normal aspect of all public and private human interaction and organization. It promotes intellectual debate and heralds change, and as such, should be viewed as an opportunity. While there are many ways to resolve conflict, the method chosen should maximize the inherent opportunities while minimizing human, institutional, and social costs. The Board of Regents therefore established a Blue-Ribbon Committee in November 1994 to study the appropriate use of less adversarial, more collaborative methods of conflict resolution in matters involving internal complaints, discipline, and grievances, and external complaints and concerns.

The Regents’ initiative and the work of its Blue-Ribbon Committee comport with a broader, national trend institutionalizing methods of alternative dispute resolution (“ADR”):

- Recent federal legislation directs federal courts and agencies to incorporate ADR processes to reduce the costs and delays of litigation and to create more functional regulation.


- A majority of states have empowered trial courts to refer matters to ADR for resolution prior to trial and established state-wide offices of dispute resolution to resolve public and community conflicts and facilitate the courts’ use of ADR. There are now more than 1200 ADR programs connected to the courts, and the American Bar Association has recently established a specialized Section on Dispute Resolution.

- Many of the nation’s largest private corporations have pledged to use ADR instead of litigation and have revised their internal procedures to incorporate these more collaborative and less costly methods to resolve conflicts.
THE BOARD OF REGENTS' INITIATIVE AND POLICY DIRECTION ON
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Background, Cont.

The ADR trend in Georgia mirrors the national trend:

- The state Supreme Court has created a coherent plan for the use of ADR in the state’s trial courts, including rules empowering trial courts to use ADR, a broadly representative permanent Commission to establish policy, and a state-wide office to assist courts in the implementation. Trial courts in more than fifty counties have ADR programs available, the administration of which is funded by filing fee surcharge legislation passed by the General Assembly.
- The state Supreme Court requires all members of the Georgia Bar, which has formed a specialized Section on ADR, to be educated in this area.
- The Workers’ Compensation Board has adopted an ADR system.

More importantly, this trend is reflected in educational institutions, where conflict resolution has emerged as a respected interdisciplinary field for research and teaching. Several prestigious institutions of higher education, including Harvard University, have established ombuds offices and student mediation programs. Legal affairs personnel from the University System of Georgia have been instrumental in forming the new ADR task force of the National Association of College and University Attorneys (“NACUA”), now training mediators.

The University System’s potential for ADR leadership is evidenced also by several statewide developments: faculty teaching ADR have formed an inter-institutional consortium; several institutions are rethinking their formal grievance procedures and incorporating mediation processes; and many faculty and administrative leaders have taken mediator training. None too soon: already in primary and secondary schools, in Georgia as well as nationally, students are being taught conflict resolution skills, and some schools are using students to mediate student disputes.

In summary, all such efforts to teach and use alternative dispute resolution are congruent with the Board of Regents’ vision and principles for the System. Institutions of higher education are communities that should encourage collegiality, trustworthiness, and collaboration. The resolution of campus conflicts should improve the atmosphere for learning, teaching, research and service; it should maximize benefit and minimize costs; it should stress individual and institutional responsibility, respect collaboration, and accountability; it should embody principles of fairness, equity, and accessibility; and it should serve the community-at-large by providing students with collaborative skills and instilling a sense of personal responsibility that make good citizens and effective leaders.
THE BOARD OF REGENTS' INITIATIVE AND POLICY DIRECTION ON
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Goals

Accordingly, the Board of Regents' goals are:

- To establish a System-wide conflict resolution program that maximizes collaborative resources and guidance for institutional processes and practices, which are developed for and well integrated into the particular institutional culture of each campus;

- To decrease the reliance on adversarial processes, such as formal grievances and appeals and courtroom litigation, both within the System and in its dealings with other persons and agencies;

- To achieve timely, equitable, and satisfactory resolutions at the lowest possible level within the System and at its institutions in the most efficient and cost-effective manner commensurate with the interests and rights of all concerned and reduce conflict recurrence while anticipating and responding to future conflicts;

- To make the institutional environment for students, faculty and staff more protective of human dignity and trust, more respectful of the value of conflict, and more effective in fostering communication and community; and

- To make the University System of Georgia an exemplar and nationally recognized leader in the development of alternative dispute resolution for higher education.
Implementation

Since individual institutions within the University System are diverse and have different needs, conflict resolution procedures are likely to vary among them, and no one particular model or set of procedures should be mandated. The alternative processes of dispute resolution designed under this policy direction should complement, not undermine, existing decision-making processes and make existing structures of authority more, not less, effective. While they may require an initial commitment of resources, they should result in significant institutional savings System-wide. Periodic review and improvement should be expected.

The Board of Regents therefore directs that:

1. The Chancellor’s Office establish a University System Advisory Committee on Conflict Resolution with the following responsibilities:
   - Take lead in developing and extending an educational program on conflict resolution to all the institutions in the University System, including focus groups to maximize buy-in on the institutional level and encouraging the institutional development of pilot program proposals;
   - Recommend a comprehensive plan for a System-wide conflict resolution program, based in part on advice received from institutional focus groups;
   - Provide advice to the Chancellor’s Office on the implementation of that plan.

2. The Chancellor’s Office, in consultation with the University System Advisory Committee on Conflict Resolution, implement the following measures toward a comprehensive program of conflict resolution:
   - Develop and distribute a manual on conflict resolution systems design that includes illustrative models and possible pilot programs;
   - Create and distribute a directory of resources that includes relevant definitions, bibliography, contacts, associations, neutrals, and trainers;
   - Consult with institutions on the implementation of policies and procedures in conformance with this initiative;
   - Develop education and training materials and continuing programs, including use of distance learning technology, on conflict resolution appropriate to the needs of the institutions and the communities they serve, and establish assessment procedures for these education and training programs;
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- Establish appropriate means for identifying, orienting, and contracting with neutral mediators when needed to maintain the integrity of alternative dispute resolution at institutional or System levels;

- Compile and maintain data and other information on the use of various means of conflict resolution in the conduct of institutional activity, and help institutions establish assessment procedures for their programs;

- Develop policy and practices to address the use of alternate means of dispute resolution in the Chancellor’s Office itself, congruent with this policy direction, and including:

  - Designation of an individual as its dispute resolution specialist and liaison to the University System Advisory Committee; and

  - Provision of appropriate training for all involved.

- Review all Board of Regents policies and standard contract agreements and recommend to the Board any appropriate amendments congruent with this policy direction.

3. Each institution in the University System develop policy and practices that address the use of alternative means of dispute resolution congruent with this initiative, including the following:

  - Designation of an individual as its institutional dispute resolution specialist and its liaison to the University System Advisory Committee and the Chancellor’s Office;

  - Provision of appropriate training for all involved and;

  - A review of its standard agreements for contracts, grants, and other assistance, to determine whether to amend them to authorize and encourage the use of alternative means of dispute resolution.
APPENDIX B
Web-based Questionnaire, 2004-2007

Board of Regents’ Initiative and Policy Direction on Conflict Resolution

Institution: ________________________________
Name of Liaison(s): _______________________

The following questionnaire has been designed as a web-based report for your convenience. We hope you will find this process efficient and sensitive to your schedule. The questions are organized into the following topical areas: steps for developing and implementing conflict management programs, campus leadership, innovations, sustainability, and impact. Please work with your Campus Conflict Resolution Committee to complete each question with as much accuracy as possible. If you experience difficulty in responding to any of the questions, call Lin Inlow at 404.651.0344.

Please submit your report by 20 December 2006. In addition to this questionnaire, I will call in January to set up a visit with you and your committee.

Development and Implementation of Conflict Management

Campus Liaison and Committee: Form and Function

About the Campus Liaison:

1. List job title(s) for current Liaison(s).
   1.a Date of your appointment(s) has been from __________ to __________.

2. Who was the previous Liaison?

3. When you as the campus liaison want advice about implementing and developing conflict management programs, who/where do you go? (Check all that apply.)

   ___ Campus Conflict Resolution Committee (CCRC)
   ___ supervisor
   ___ senior leadership
   ___ colleagues within institute
   ___ colleagues outside institute
   ___ former liaison/committee members
   ___ books
   ___ other, please specify:
   ___ external provider of CR services
   ___ film
   ___ training programs
   ___ academic courses
   ___ liaisons from other institutions
   ___ CNCR
4. What resources have you used to address challenging conflicts on campus? (Check all that apply.)

- personally resolved without assistance
- one or more colleagues assisted
- supervisor assisted
- university attorney assisted
- personal attorney assisted
- university ombudsperson or mediator assisted
- personal/outside retained ADR services
- other, please specify:

About the Campus Conflict Resolution Committee (CCRC):

5. Is there a committee currently intact? ___Yes ___No If no, why?

6. Please identify current members, their occupational status, and email addresses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Member</th>
<th>Occupational Status</th>
<th>Email address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. How often does your committee meet?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Once a year</td>
<td>Once a semester</td>
<td>More than once a semester</td>
<td>Once a month</td>
<td>Once a week</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Education and Training

8. How many trainings on conflict management have been conducted on your campus since January 2006? Please list title of training, date, number of participants, and audience (faculty, staff and/or students).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
<th>Audience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Are there any academic courses, modules within course or professional development activities for faculty related to conflict resolution/conflict management being taught on your campus?  ___Yes  ___No  If yes, please complete the following list.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Course</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Modules within course (name of course)</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Professional Development Activities</th>
<th>Coordinator /facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Describe any new materials since January 2004 that you created to promote/educate about conflict management.

Assessment

11. How do you monitor conflict on your campus?  (Check all that apply.)

___ I (we) don’t monitor  ___ mediator/ombuds reports
___ surveys  ___ institutional assessment
___ committee meetings/reports  ___ formal evaluation
___ campus newspapers, newsletters
___ listserves
___ informal conversations/“word of mouth”
___ departmental reports (e.g. Affirmative Action Office, Human Resources, etc)
___ other, please specify:

12. If you have conflict handling procedures on your campus, how do you determine their effectiveness?  (Check all that apply.)

___ user satisfaction surveys  ___ routine follow-up with disputants
___ formal evaluation  ___ focus groups
___ unsolicited feedback
___ other, please specify:

13. Are there barriers that keep some issues/conflicts from being addressed?  ___ Yes  ___ No  (Check all that apply.)

___ policies  ___ budget resources
___ campus practices  ___ personality issues of the disputants
___ leadership  ___ not enough time
___ technical support
human resources (lack of ADR trained personnel, clerical support, etc.)
other, please specify:

14. Are you satisfied with the way conflict is managed by your university today?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Not at all  Somewhat satisfied  Very Satisfied

15. In your view, are there ways to improve current practices in conflict management or conflict resolution on your campus?  Yes  No If so, what might they be?

Dispute Systems Design Recommendation

16. Describe your conflict management program/services for faculty, staff and students.

17. Who on your campus do you report to about the progress of your conflict management program/service?  How often?

18. What is your annual budget?

18a. Are you satisfied with the funding, if any, allocated by your university to support conflict management?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Not at all  Somewhat satisfied  Very Satisfied

Program Evaluation

19. When did your CCRC last evaluate your conflict management program/services for faculty, staff, and students? Please describe.

20. If you provide mediation on your campus, how many cases have your campus mediators mediated during the period of January 2004 to January 2007? ____

20a. How many cases have been referred to mediation? ____
Of the referred cases, how many were resolved without a formal mediation? ____

20b. If you provide mediation or facilitated discussion on your campus, please complete the following table regarding categories, types, and number of mediation cases. (One
particular dispute may fit in multiple categories/types. For example, a case involving cheating, race and gender, would add to each of the three types.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>Sexual orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>Salary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sexual harassment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Termination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interpretation of policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td></td>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td>Whistle-blowing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Dispute</td>
<td>Intellectual property</td>
<td></td>
<td>Other (please specify):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty governance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degree requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grades</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cheating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic misconduct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Violation of student conduct code</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. If your campus has an ombuds office, how many visitors did the ombuds see during the period of January 2004 to January 2007? ___

21.a Please complete the following table regarding categories, types, and number of ombuds cases. (One particular case may fit in multiple categories/types. For example, a case involving cheating, race and gender, would add to each of the three types.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>Sexual orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>Salary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sexual harassment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Termination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interpretation of policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disability</td>
<td></td>
<td>Whistle-blowing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Dispute</td>
<td>Intellectual property</td>
<td></td>
<td>Other (please specify):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty governance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degree requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grades</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cheating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic misconduct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Violation of student conduct code</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
22. In your opinion, what are the strengths and weaknesses of your conflict management program/services?

Campus Leadership

23. Who are the “champions” that support the Initiative on your campus?

Hyperlink to Definition:
A champion in conflict management is someone who has repeatedly demonstrated leadership in the development and implementation of conflict management programs; supported and promoted the goals of the Initiative and Policy Direction on Conflict Resolution; and, personally encourages collegiality, trustworthiness, and collaboration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Current Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. Who do you think are “natural problem solvers” on your campus?

Hyperlink to Definition:
A natural problem solver is most likely someone who:
- Is a good listener and a trusted confidante;
- Is willing to say what needs to be said in a way that people can hear it;
- Encourages people to work out problems, rather than ignoring them;
- Conveys hope that problems can be solved;
- Offers other “points of view” to help create understanding and empathy;
- Works to get people together to “talk things through”;
- Asks good questions that get people thinking constructively about an issue;
- Cares enough to bring problems to the attention of the right people;
- Offers constructive suggestions and solutions to problems;
- Can be counted to make matters better, not worse; and,
- Is sought out by others.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Current Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Innovations

25. Describe any unique programs or policies that have been created through your conflict management program.
26. What are the incentives (tangible or intangible) for developing innovations in managing conflict?

27. Do you have a plan to add new activities to manage conflict on your campus?  
   ____ Yes  ____ No  
   If yes, please describe.

28. Are you satisfied with the resources (communication technology, materials, personnel, etc.) that are available for managing conflict?

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   Not at all  Some  Satisfied
  ewhat satisfied  Satisfied

29. What kind of resources would you like to have? Please specify.

   Sustainability

30. What steps have been taken to sustain the existence and growth of your conflict resolution program?

31. What are the most significant obstacles to sustaining and growing the conflict management program?

31.a. What strategies have you developed to overcome those obstacles?

32. What factors have facilitated the implementation and continuous improvement of your conflict management program/service?

   Impact

33. Please rate the degree of impact that the Initiative has had on the way in which conflicts at your university are resolved.

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
   Not at all  Some  Significant
   Impact

33.a What evidence exists for this rating?

34. Are there issues keeping some conflicts from being resolved?  ____ Yes  ____ No  
   If yes, what are they?

35. Please describe the Initiative and/or conflict management practice on your campus by using a metaphor. Eg. “Finding a mediator on our campus is like looking for a needle in
a haystack.” or “The ombuds office is like an oasis in the desert. It’s a safe resource that helps deal with problems.”

36. Comments:

This report is submitted by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Job Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**APPENDIX C**

**Strengths and Weaknesses of CM by Classification of Institution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification/Institution</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weakness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Type I: Universities** | - CCRC has strong focus on policy development and review  
- Well established foundation for conflict management program/services  
- Quality of mediators  
- Institutions flexibility and openness about the types of disputes that get mediated  
- Facilitated discussions for academic honest matters  
- Training  
- Web-page promoting mediation  
- People who are champions  
Use skills in every day work life. | - Number of qualified individuals to handle conflict  
- Poor publicity  
- Lack of single point of contact for user  
- Lack of diversity amongst ombuds  
- No CCRC  
- Several changes in Liaison  
- Refusal by some to refer cases  
- Negative mindset regarding how conflict should be solved that is manifested by many on campus  
- Support from university  
- Awareness of program  
- Inability to convince more people to use service  
- No CCRC  
- CCRC has not met in past 2yrs  
- Vagueness about program  
- Lack of administrative support in distributing on-campus survey |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification/Institution</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weakness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Type II: State Universities** | - Available  
- Confidential  
- Support from administration  
- Many key personnel have mediator training  
- Majority of campus leaders embrace the spirit of ADR and have adapted practices that help to resolve conflicts informally  
- Workshops arranged annually by Human Resources  
- Proactive efforts in Residence Life to train residence life personnel in conflict management  
- Leadership supports and advocates for the conflict management program/services  
- CCRC’s commitment for Initiative to succeed  
- Good mechanisms for raising the issues  
- Members of committee seek continued training yearly and meet regularly  
- Committee consistently meets with progress made on their goals  
- Committee members are dedicated and have “buy-in”  
- Committee members who attend the Summer Institute are immersed and come back to campus with new energy  
- Reliance on development of strategic plan and utilization of campus resources to reach goals  
- Have the foundation in place | - Program not used for fear of retaliation  
- Program not used because not known  
- Lack of funds for training  
- Frequent senior leadership changes  
- Title of administrator of mediation misrepresents process  
- Lack of awareness of ADR  
- Need policy to reflect ADR  
- Leadership changes (i.e., three presidents since 2005) caused the conflict management program to fall "through the cracks."  
- Not enough promotion  
- No structured student component  
- No annual budget specifically for mediator training  
- Campus ADR advocates tend to be some of the busiest people on campus.  
- Lack of time to prepare, train, and evaluate conflict  
- Not used  
- Once issues are raised, more proactive follow-up needs to happen more quickly to solve the problem  
- Need better ways to get resolution  
- Campus at large doesn't utilize services to extent that they could  
- Lack of awareness of the mediation process and its benefits  
- Lack of trust regarding confidentiality of mediation (Trust issues are also linked to administration)  
- Lack of resources |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification/Institution</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weakness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Type II: State Universities (contd)** | - Have a CR policy and procedures manual. | - Lack of dedicated office  
- Lack of ombuds  
- Campus has a strong conflictual culture making CCRC's goals difficult to achieve  
- Campus culture fearful of coming forward due to fear of retaliation |
| **Type III: State Colleges** | - Great foundation  
- New employees complete on-line training about mediation  
- Good record-keeping of conflict  
- Current grievance committee is interested in revising the grievance policy  
- CCRC addresses problems before come public  
- CCRC has been re-established with potential for student involvement | - Little campus wide training  
- Inactive CCRC  
- Grievance policy does not include ADR  
- Lots of conflict that stays off radar  
- Lack of administrative buy-in  
- Lack of knowledge of mediation process  
- Campus culture including leadership  
- Competing demands on CCRC |
| **Type IV: Two-Year Colleges** | - Some policy incorporating ADR  
- Coordinated training in other HR areas  
- Training support for employees  
- Liaison's familiarity to campus community  
- Effective training from CNCR  
- Campus-wide awareness of the program needs on campus  
- People (especially faculty) know it's there and do make contact | - Lack of a currently staffed CCRC  
- Policy needs updating  
- Needs revitalization  
- Lack of training  
- Multiple roles and responsibilities of the liaison  
- Time demands of the liaison  
- Limited budget  
- Lack of training for committee members  
- Degree of awareness of ADR  
- Lack of time to develop informational materials for faculty, staff, and students |
# APPENDIX D
## Campus Liaison's Tenure and Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Liaison</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College</td>
<td>Hubert Wood, Bertha Daniel</td>
<td>1996 - 1997, 1997 - present</td>
<td>HR Director, HR Director, Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany State University</td>
<td>Everett Cordy, Adria Nobles Kimbrough, Tony C. Jones, Veronica Adams-Cooper</td>
<td>1996 - 1998, MD, MD - 2006, 2006 - present</td>
<td>Faculty, Legal Counsel, Legal Counsel, Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armstrong Atlantic State University</td>
<td>Joe Buck, Dennis Murphy, John Kraft</td>
<td>1995 - 2001, 2001 - 2004, 2004 - present</td>
<td>VP Student Affairs, Legal Counsel, Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta State University</td>
<td>Don O'Neil, Peter Basciano</td>
<td>1995 - 2006, March 2006 - present</td>
<td>HR Director, Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton State University</td>
<td>Donna McCarty, Donna McCarty &amp; Terri Taylor-Hambrick</td>
<td>1995 - present, 2000 - present</td>
<td>Faculty, Admin, Faculty, Admin &amp; Ombuds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Georgia Community College</td>
<td>Debbie Yancey, Tom Hoffacker, Kathleen Morris</td>
<td>9/1995 - 10/2003, 10/2003- 11/2006, 11/06 - present</td>
<td>HR Director, HR Director, HR Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus State University</td>
<td>Larry Meisel, Terry Norris, Tim Howard</td>
<td>1995 - Spring 1998, Spring 1998 - MD, Spring 2003 - present</td>
<td>Faculty, Faculty, Admin, Faculty, Admin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darton College</td>
<td>Ron Henry</td>
<td>1995 - present</td>
<td>VP Business &amp; Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Valley State University</td>
<td>John Dubriel, Dwayne Crew</td>
<td>1995 – 2003, 2003 – present</td>
<td>Faculty, Admin, HR Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Liaison</td>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gainesville State College</td>
<td>Steve Tilley, Wendy Thellman</td>
<td>1996-2003, 2003-p</td>
<td>Director of Continuing Ed/Public Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Institute of Technology</td>
<td>Jean Fuller, John Schultz</td>
<td>11/1997 - 11/2006 11/2006 - present</td>
<td>Director, Faculty/Staff Support Services (HR) Assoc Director, HR Staff Ombuds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Perimeter College</td>
<td>Linda Nelson, Pam Colbinson, Karen Truesdale</td>
<td>1995 - 1996 1996 - 1997 1997 - present</td>
<td>HR, HR, HR Director, Employee Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Southern University</td>
<td>Ruth Ann Rogers, Kenneth Manwaring, Melanie Morales</td>
<td>1996 – 1998 MD 2006 2006 – present</td>
<td>Training Director, Associate Dir, HR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon College</td>
<td>Randy Braswell, Steven Nape, Greg McNamara, Peter Bolt, Lisa Shiveler</td>
<td>1995 – 12/1997 12/1997 - 2004 2004 - MD MD - present 2007 - present</td>
<td>Director, IR, Director, Admissions, Faculty, Faculty, Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennesaw State University</td>
<td>Helen Ridley, Dot Graham</td>
<td>6/95 - 1996 1996 - present</td>
<td>Faculty &amp; Admin, Faculty &amp; Ombuds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macon State College</td>
<td>Clyde Conine, Thom Harrison, Greg McNamara, Thomas Harrison</td>
<td>1996 – 1998 9/1999 - MD MD Summer 2005 - present</td>
<td>Faculty, Faculty, Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Liaison</td>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical College of Georgia</td>
<td>Andrew Newton</td>
<td>1996 - 2001</td>
<td>Legal Counsel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LD Newman</td>
<td>3/2001 - MD</td>
<td>Legal Counsel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Andrew Newton</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>Training, Education Dir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ale Kennedy</td>
<td>7/2005-1/2007</td>
<td>Training, Education Dir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Debra Arnold</td>
<td>1/2007 - present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Georgia College</td>
<td>Patrick Wamsley</td>
<td>1995 - 1998</td>
<td>VP Fiscal Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patrick Wamsley &amp; Russ Hinson</td>
<td>1998 - 2003</td>
<td>VP Fiscal Affairs &amp; HR Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lisa Chastain</td>
<td>2003 – present</td>
<td>HR Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Georgia College &amp; State University</td>
<td>Steve Ross</td>
<td>1996 – Fall 1998</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bob Saba</td>
<td>Fall 1998 - 2001</td>
<td>Faculty, Admin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mary Lou Frank</td>
<td>3/01 - 2002</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mac Martin</td>
<td>2002 - present</td>
<td>Dir, Student Counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savannah State University</td>
<td>Allen Zow</td>
<td>1996 - 2003</td>
<td>Legal Counsel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Behrooz Kalantari</td>
<td>2003 - present</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Georgia College</td>
<td>Carl McDonald</td>
<td>1996 – present</td>
<td>Faculty, Admin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Polytechnic State University</td>
<td>Mary Ellen McGee</td>
<td>1997 - 1999</td>
<td>AA officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maggie McHugh-Parrish</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>Secretary to VPAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Debbie Patrick</td>
<td>12/99 – present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
<td>Art Leed</td>
<td>9/1995 – present</td>
<td>Legal Affairs, Assoc Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of West Georgia</td>
<td>Dawn Davis</td>
<td>Fall 1996 – 10/98</td>
<td>HR Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diane Smith &amp; Jane</td>
<td>10/98 - 2005</td>
<td>Admin Coor &amp; Faculty, Admin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>McCandless</td>
<td>2005 – present</td>
<td>Admin Coor &amp; Faculty, Admin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diane Smith &amp; Denise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valdosta State University</td>
<td>Louis Levy</td>
<td>1996 – 1997</td>
<td>Faculty, Admin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stephen Childs</td>
<td>1997 – Spring 2007</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Becky Murphy &amp; Martha</td>
<td>Spring 2007 - present</td>
<td>Assist Director of HR &amp; Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laughlin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waycross College</td>
<td>Anthony Hendrix</td>
<td>1996 - 1998</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ellen Burleson</td>
<td>1/1999 - present</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**APPENDIX E**

Number of Attendees per Institution by Class at the CNCR Summer Institute, 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institute</th>
<th>Mediation</th>
<th>Innovations</th>
<th>Interdisciplinary</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albany State University</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armstrong Atlantic State University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta State University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Georgia State University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus State University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalton College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gainesville State College-Oconee</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia College and State University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Southern University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Southwestern State University</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennesaw State University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical College of Georgia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Georgia College and State University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savannah State University</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valdosta State University</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Attendees per Institution by Class at the CNCR Summer Institute, 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Mediation</th>
<th>Innovations</th>
<th>Cross-Cultural</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Armstrong Atlantic State University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta Metropolitan College</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta State University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton State University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia College and State University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Perimeter College</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennesaw State University</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macon State College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical College of Georgia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Georgia College and State University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of West Georgia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F
National and International Presentations
Promoting USG as a National Exemplar in CM

- “Conflict Resolution in Education Around the World”, National Communication Association, panelist, Boston, September, 2005
- “Conflict Resolution in Education and Peace Education Working Group” Global Conference From Reaction to Prevention: Civil Society Forging Partnerships to Prevent Violent Conflict and Build Peace, United Nations, NY, convener and facilitator, July 2005
- “Conflict Resolution in Education Around the World: Research and Practice”, International Association for Conflict Management, panelist, June 2005
- “Managing Campus Conflict”, University of West Florida, Pensacola, May 2005
- “Translating Research and Communicating Effectively with Stakeholders: Reporting Multi-site Qualitative Results”, American Evaluation Association, Atlanta, November, 2004
- “Collaborating with Program Stakeholders to Build Capacity for Sustainable Internal Evaluation Efforts”, American Evaluation Association, Atlanta, November, 2004
- “Managing Campus Conflict”, University of West Florida, Pensacola, June 2004
- “Systems Design”, Ohio Commission on Dispute Resolution and Conflict Resolution, Columbus, Ohio, June, 2004
- “Designing Conflict Management Systems in Higher Education Evaluation: Often Overlooked, Frequently Misunderstanding”, Columbus, Ohio, June, 2004
- “Managing Mediation Process and Building Agreement” American Mock Trial Association, Intercollegiate Mediation Tournament, Brenau College, October 2004
- Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict, Invited participant, Ottawa, December 2004