Regions Working Group Report
# Working Group Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raja G. Bhattachar</td>
<td>University of Redlands</td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauren Adamski</td>
<td>Syracuse University</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackie Simpson</td>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kara Kurczeski*</td>
<td>University of Houston-Clear Lake</td>
<td>Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleurette King</td>
<td>University of Connecticut</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Shutt</td>
<td>Emory University</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy McCleave</td>
<td>Mary Baldwin College</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Pettitt*</td>
<td>Humboldt State University</td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demere Woolway</td>
<td>Washington State University</td>
<td>Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ischel Rosal</td>
<td>University of Texas at Austin</td>
<td>Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcia Purdy</td>
<td>Grinnell College</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Have stepped down from the group
Regions Working Group

The Regions Working Group chair is responsible for coordinating the diverse regional networks of Consortium member institutions. The working group is made up of regional representatives and works to ensure member and non-member institutions have access to continuing professional development, education, advocacy, and support resources.
The intent of the survey was to gauge the Consortium members’ interest in regional support.

Fall 2008

63 Responses
Survey Results

How would a Regions Group of Consortium Members benefit you if divided in any of the following ways?

Overwhelming response to this question (69.4%) was geographic location with several individuals supporting demographic connections (institutional type specifically).
Survey Results

Are there other “interest groups” that would be of assistance to you?

- Size
- Goals (DP Benefits, non-discrimination policies, etc.)
- Staffing patterns
- Where offices are situated in the institution (institutional wide focus verse student affairs)
- Identities of directors
- HBCU
- Funding levels

- Experience of staff in centers
- Rural/urban
- 2-4 year institutions
- Research intensive/phd
- Place in development of programs and services (comprehensive programs and services verses limited support)
- Age of office (coming out group…newbies)
Are you interested in being in more than one group? For example, being a member of both the Religiously Affiliated Institution Group and Northeast Group?

The overwhelming answer was “Possibly.” Individuals want to see how the breakdowns were relevant to their institutions and examine the time commitment. There is interest in “interest groups” that represent some of the categories in the previous question.
Survey Results

How do you prefer these group meetings to occur?

71.4% suggested annual regional meetings, followed by conference calls (66.1%) and listserv/discussion boards (60.7%).
Survey Results

Should there be a leader or point person(s) for each group? If yes, how will that person(s) be chosen?

There was full agreement that there should be a point person. Members felt that this process should begin organically with self nomination of the point person. From that point, the regions can determine the best process.
Who would you recommend to head up your preferred regions group(s)? Please list your suggestions and the type of regional group they would/could represent.

- Matt Carcella, New Jersey
- Great Lakes - Gabe Javier
- Mickey Hart, Ohio
- Nancy Jean Tubbs, California
- Billy Curtis, California
- Bob Schoenberg, Pennsylvania
- Heidi Adielia Stanton, Washington
- Jackie Simpson, Michigan
- Brent Bilodeau, Michigan
- Josh Dean or Rebecca Rod, Idaho
- Lauren Adamski, New York
- Ryan Black, Missouri
- Adrea Jaehnig, New York
- Amit Taneja, New York
Survey Results

Would you be interested in having regional in-person meetings once a year (or however often) to discuss issues, ideas and meet each other? Why or why not?

YES!

Members were very concerned about cost of travel. Some suggested taking full advantage of Creating Change and meet during the conference.
Anything else you would like to share?

Keep in mind the cost of travel.

Keep in mind how to define “region.”

Thank you for doing this.
Next Steps and Recommendations

- Determine Regions
- Create Regional Representative job description
- Determine process for selecting Regional Representatives
- Select Regional Representatives
- Finalize mission and other working group structures
- Timeline
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>States/Provinces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Washington 4, Oregon 3, British Columbia 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Idaho, Alaska, Montana, Wyoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Lakes</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Minnesota 7, Wisconsin 5, Illinois 9, Michigan 7, Indiana 2, Ohio 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Ontario 1, Maine 4, New Hampshire 2, Vermont 1, Massachusetts 8, Rhode Island 1, Connecticut 2, New York 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>California 22, Hawaii 1, Arizona 2, Colorado 5, Utah 2, Nevada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Midwest-TOTAL 8, Iowa 2, Missouri 4, Kansas 1, Nebraska 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>North Dakota, South Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Atlantic</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Pennsylvania 8, Delaware 1, Maryland 2, New Jersey 2, District of Columbia 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Central</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Texas 3, Louisiana 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New Mexico, Oklahoma, Arkansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South/Southeast</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Georgia 2, South Carolina 1, North Carolina 3, Tennessee 1, Florida 4, Virginia 3, West Virginia 1, Kentucky 1, Mississippi, Alabama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next Steps and Recommendations

- Determine Regions
- Create Regional Representative job description
- Determine process for selecting Regional Representatives
  - First year - Call for representatives
  - Second year - Regional elections
- Select Regional Representatives
- Finalize mission and other working group structures
- Timeline
Timeline

January
Creating Change

February 14
Job description complete for Regional Reps

February 18
Call for Regional Reps

March 4
Deadline to apply for Regional Rep

March 18
Regional Reps selected

March 31
First conference call with new Reps

June/July
Regional meetings
QUESTIONS-FEEDBACK?