




WHO IS
COLLEGE
FOR?



*Moderator
Guide*

Table of Contents

<i>Welcome and Project Overview</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Introduction</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>What is Deliberation?</i>	
<i>What is the Goal of Deliberative Dialogue?</i>	
<i>Preparing for the Dialogue</i>	
<i>Moving from Positions to Interests</i>	
<i>Objectives for the Moderator</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>The Moderator's Role</i>	
<i>Developing Questions</i>	
<i>Discussion Format</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>Setting the Scene</i>	
<i>Beginning the Dialogue</i>	
<i>Wrapping Up</i>	
<i>Administering Forms</i>	<i>16</i>
<i>Skills for Moderating</i>	<i>17</i>
<i>At a Glance: "Who Should Go to College"</i>	<i>22</i>

*Published by the
National Forum on Higher Education for the Public Good
610 E. University Ave., Suite 2339
Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1259
Telephone: 734-615-8882 / Fax: 734-615-9777
www.thenationalforum.org*

With generous support from the Kellogg Fellows Leadership Alliance, Michigan Community Foundations, the National Issues Forum and the W.K. Kellogg Foundation

Copyright 2004 by the National Forum on Higher Education for the Public Good

Design by Marty Betts Design

The opinions expressed in this report, unless expressly stated to the contrary, have been created to stimulate discussion and may not reflect the views of the National Forum or the project partners.

Welcome and Project Overview

Welcome!

Thank you for moderating a dialogue! Although a moderator does not need to be an expert on the issue being discussed, your role does require that you understand the purpose of deliberation. We hope that this guide provides you with a sense of what deliberation means, the moderator's role, the dialogue format, and principles and skills to keep in mind as you interact with the participants.

Deliberative dialogues can be held with as many as 400 participants. The ideal size, however, is closer to 10-15, so there is increased opportunity for participants to be actively involved. The length of a dialogue can vary. We have found, however, that approximately **2 hours** allows for an introduction, thorough consideration of each approach, and a conclusion.

The purpose of a deliberative dialogue is to bring community members together to discuss a relevant and important issue. The question we will address in this dialogue is *"Who should have access to education after high school?"* or *"Who is College For?"* Our hope is that participants will have a more informed understanding of the complexity of this issue and discover the value of deliberation as a tool for making decisions.

When you host a dialogue, we will provide you with a Moderator Material Packet including: guidelines on moderating a deliberative dialogue, a sample script, pre/post discussion forms, consent forms and a moderator report form. Additional moderator and discussion guides can be downloaded from our website (www.thenationalforum.org).

A Project Overview: Access to Democracy

Access to higher education is a critical issue in the state of Michigan, brought to light by the Supreme Court cases regarding admission to the University of Michigan. It is an issue that people care deeply about, but a topic on which many people may lack adequate information. The National Forum believes that by framing this issue in public terms, and engaging in deliberative dialogues, we may better inform public opinion and positively influence civic engagement.

The Access to Democracy project is a statewide initiative intended to engage community members, students, and civic leaders in dialogues on higher education. The overarching purpose of this initiative is to increase awareness around access to higher education recognizing that for change to take root we must have movement at the individual, community, and policy levels.

Access to Democracy represents an effort to link these three levels; providing information from "grass roots" dialogues to "grass tops" policy makers. The project strives to: 1) increase public awareness, knowledge, and understanding of the issue of access to higher education, 2) introduce deliberation as a public policy education tool and 3) include the public's voice in public policy formation.

The information obtained through these dialogues—along with detailed, localized information about educational attainment and economic prosperity—will be used to directly inform policy decisions throughout the state.

The approach the National Forum has undertaken for this project is patterned on the National Issues Forum (NIF) model of framing an issue from three different perspectives. Each perspective, or approach to treating the issue, is based on a different set of priorities and values. In deliberative dialogue, all perspectives are given equal consideration, the costs and benefits of each perspective are weighed, and the implications of policy implementation are discussed. Dialogues will be supported by the dissemination of research and reports that underscore the importance of higher education to the state's future.

Current partners in the Access to Democracy project are the Kellogg Fellows Leadership Alliance, the Michigan Community Foundations, the National Issues Forum, and the W. K. Kellogg Foundation.

For additional information, please contact us at:

National Forum on Higher Education for the Public Good
610 E. University Avenue, Suite 2339
Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1259
Telephone: 734-615-8882 Fax: 734-615-9777
www.thenationalforum.org

Introduction

What is Deliberation?

"To deliberate" means to think about or discuss issues and decisions carefully – weighing the pros and cons of the available options and evaluating different perspectives. The purpose of deliberation is to engage the public in conversations about important issues relevant to their lives – issues where multiple public perspectives exist. Making decisions on such complex issues requires consideration of the costs, benefits, and tradeoffs associated with the options available to us.

Deliberation is in stark contrast to our more conventional system of debate, where issues are polarized and people take a "pro" or "con" position. In debates, there are winners and losers. The only information brought to light is what either side regards as relevant. For deliberation, we must keep in mind that all situations, ideas, and solutions should be a part of the conversation and they all have upsides and downsides.

What is the Goal of Deliberative Dialogue

The goal of deliberation is to deepen an individual's understanding of an issue through examining multiple perspectives. The process highlights an issue's complexities and can clarify an individual's stance on the subject. In dialogue, we will face tough questions, and possibly deep differences of beliefs.

The deliberative dialogue process is not meant to end with resolution. There is no right or wrong solution to this issue. There will be elements of each approach that resonate with participants and parts that do not. We have attempted to capture different ways of thinking about the issue in each of the approaches, but the three approaches are not mutually exclusive. This issue poses a dilemma. Expect tension and conflict to arise in the conversation. Consensus is not the goal – examination and a deeper understanding of multiple perspectives are the goals. The following table briefly outlines the differences between debate and deliberation.

Characteristics of Debate and Deliberation

<i>Debate</i>	<i>Deliberation</i>
<i>Contest</i>	<i>Weigh</i>
<i>Compete</i>	<i>Decide</i>
<i>Argue</i>	<i>Make decisions</i>
<i>Promote opinion</i>	<i>Seek overlap</i>
<i>Seek majority</i>	<i>Look for common ground</i>
<i>Persuade</i>	<i>Framed to make choices</i>
<i>Dig in</i>	<i>Structured</i>
<i>Tightly structured</i>	<i>Listen</i>
<i>Express</i>	<i>Usually slow</i>
<i>Usually fast</i>	<i>Clarify</i>
<i>Clarify</i>	<i>Complementary</i>
<i>Majoritarian</i>	<i>Choose</i>

Debate and deliberation are usually easily differentiated. Both have their uses. The critical point is to understand which problem situations are best addressed by debate and which are best addressed by deliberation.

Differences between deliberation and conversations are more difficult to see. The crucial difference is that dialogue is conversation to increase understanding. Deliberation may include dialogue, but it goes further. **Deliberation is conversation to make a choice about how to act together.**

Moving from Positions to Interests

Although the process does not necessarily lead to consensus, the dialogue should uncover areas of agreement and common ground.

Bringing to light common ground and shared interest can be facilitated by moving from "positions" to "interests." A "position" can be defined as a specific outcome or action perceived as meeting immediate needs. A position represents a specific action. It is concrete and minimally negotiable. An "interest," on the other hand, refers to the desires, fears, beliefs, values and concerns that individuals hope to advance. An interest is a broad concept and has many possible outcomes. Therefore, the final portion of the dialogue can be focused around which-the aspects (or pieces) of each approach resonate with the participants-creating a mixing and matching of different approaches.

Preparing for the Dialogue

A moderator does not have to be an expert on the issue. The role of the moderator is to manage the discussion and the environment in which the discussion takes place. Reading the dialogue guide and summary sheet, considering questions that get to the heart of the issue, and thinking through the essence of each approach are the critical parts of preparation.

In addition to the moderator, there are several other integral roles in a deliberative dialogue. These are: **time-keeper** (a volunteer, arranged at the dialogue); **recorder** (pre-arranged); and **observer** (pre-arranged). It is important that the individuals serving as recorder and observer understand their roles and responsibilities before they arrive at the dialogue, since these roles change how they are able to participate in the dialogue.

→ The Time-keeper:

The moderator should request that a participant volunteer to serve as time-keeper. This role is important since deliberation requires that each approach is weighed equally and that there is ample time for processing. The time-keeper monitors how much time is spent on each approach, communicating to the moderator when it is time to move to the next stage of the dialogue.

→ The Recorder:

The recorder is responsible for capturing the gist of individuals' overall comments. These should be recorded on newsprint and posted as the dialogue proceeds, so they are visible to all participants. As best as s/he is able, the recorder should not ask participants to restate what was said; this may interrupt the dialogue's flow. As the moderator describes this role to the dialogue participants, s/he should acknowledge that the recorder may not be able to record everything.

The Purpose of Recording:

- To remind forum participants of their deliberations, agreements, and action items.
- To create a reference document.
- To inform stakeholders who were not at the forum, or at times even a wider audience, of discussion, decisions, and actions.

The Recorder's Dialogue Responsibilities:

- Capture the key points, both appealing and not appealing, about each choice.
- Ask for clarification when necessary.

Considerations for the Recorder:

- Be brief.
- Be careful to use words that clearly communicate the intended meaning. (Will the notes be understood days after the forum?)
- Do not try to write everything; some comments may be discussions of previous points.
- Write clearly in large letters with a dark marker; label pages clearly in consecutive order.

Qualities of Effective Recording:

- Brief.
- Well-organized.
- Clear.
- Legible.
- Accurate.
- Neutral.
- Appropriate amount of information.
- Uses active verbs.
- Captures the tensions, costs and consequences, and common ground for action as expressed by participants.

Post-dialogue Responsibilities

- Remove "group memory" from walls. Put sheets in order (numbering the pages).
- Review each page to check titles and section headings. Make sure the writing is legible and makes sense.
- Roll up "group memory." Label outside with group name and date.
- Deliver to person responsible for producing post-forum reports (the moderator).

→ The Observer:

The observer's role is to offer a synopsis of the conversation.

The Purpose of having an "Observer":

- Reflect the efforts of the moderator, recorder, and participants (both individually and collectively) to focus on deliberation – the weighing of options.

The Observer's Dialogue Responsibilities:

- Arrive well-rested and alert.
- Observe participants as they gather.
- Note participants' body language.
- Listen carefully and take legible notes.
- Record actual statements (not paraphrasing) of dialogue participants.
- Keep track of the context in which such statements are given.

- Pay attention and make notations about the group's dynamics. (As the dialogue progresses)
- Notice and record shifts in direction during a dialogue. (For instance, what comments signal a shift away from agreement and toward conflict? What comments signal a shift away from conflict and tension toward common ground?)
- Identify and list what expressions or statements cause breakdowns (movement toward greater confusion) and breakthroughs (movement to deeper understanding and common ground).

Considerations for Observer:

- Consider using an observation team. One individual may focus on what people say about the issue (content) and another on the dialogue process.
- Be sure that your observations are guided by and reflect equality, fairness, citizenship, and inclusiveness.
- Focus your observations on the following questions:

- *Does the public connect to the issue of higher education as "conventional wisdom suggests?"*
- *How does the public approach the issue?*
- *Are there other dimensions, not included in the approaches, that people in the dialogue see?*
- *What is important to people as they deliberate?*
- *Is a "public voice" recognizable?*
- *Was any firm common ground for action revealed?*
- *What effect did the deliberation have?*
- *What needs to happen in the next national dialogue about "Who Should Go to College?"*

Roles

As the moderator, it is important that you be familiar with this guide. The moderator should prepare a list of questions to pose to the group. We suggest preparing approximately five questions. You will probably find that you will introduce two or three questions and the participants will raise others as they go through each perspective. To be sure that your questions advance the dialogue, prepare questions that get at how different constituencies may view or experience the issue at hand. Questions should also help participants consider their personal stake in the issue in terms of each approach.

Be sure that you have read the discussion guide so that you understand each of the three approaches.

Dialogue Structure

In its introduction, the discussion guide defines the issue of access to higher education and includes a brief history of how we have gotten to where we are today. This information is intended to frame the discussion and provide a context for the three perspectives, referred to as approaches, that follow.

A deliberative dialogue should thoroughly address each of the three approaches considering:

- *What supporters of the approach might believe about the issue;*
- *How supporters would address the issue;*
- *How opponents of the approach might respond; and*
- *What are the tradeoffs – the costs and consequences – of the policies supported by each perspective?*

It is very important that each approach be given equal time for discussion (15-20 minutes in a typical session). After thorough exploration of each perspective, discussion should turn to comparing the points of view.

Objectives for the Moderator

The Moderator's Role

The issue of who should go to college will be considered from many points of view. It is imperative that the moderator remain impartial. The moderator must resist the temptation to step out of his/her role to offer opinions. Every participant should be encouraged and affirmed. This requires awareness of your own "unconscious" behaviors and things that "push your buttons." Every perspective and every participant should be given a fair hearing.

The role of the moderator is to:

- 1) Set **ground rules**.
- 2) **Administer pre-dialogue forms and audio-tape the process (in some cases)**.
- 3) Move the conversation beyond simply sharing stories toward **weighing costs and consequences of the approaches**.
- 4) **Remain neutral** throughout the discussion, while encouraging participants to explore all facets of their own and others' opinions. Neutrality can be difficult to maintain. Be mindful of instinctive reactions, such as nodding in agreement or sounds of disagreement.
- 5) Acknowledge and recognize all sides of each option, keeping in mind that deliberation requires **weighing options**.
- 6) Stay with deliberation until participants understand that the issue is a) framed according to what is important to people and b) until people have identified the conflicts among approaches. **Keep the discussion moving and focused** on the issue.
- 7) Ask for **clarification** if an individual's point is not clear.
- 8) Help to **synthesize** key thoughts or concepts that emerge throughout the discussion.
- 9) **Keep track of the time** so participants can move through a discussion of each of the approaches and into an ending period of reflections. No matter the level of experience, most moderators find timekeeping to be a challenge. Sometimes it's hard to move on to another approach with so much more that could be said. But in order to deliberate – to really make progress on the issue – participants need the opportunity to **weigh all the major approaches** and reflect on the process.
- 10) Reserve **ample time for reflections** on the forum. Between allowing time for participants to lay out their personal concerns about the issue at the beginning of the forum and the demanding work of deliberation, it's easy to find yourself with little time left at the end of the forum to reflect on what's been said. But, in many ways, this is

the most important work the group will do – and they must have time to do it. Explain clearly at the outset that it is important to reserve this time, and then enlist the participants' support in working with you to preserve it.

11) Administer Post-Survey Forms.

12) Please **return all forms** to the National Forum on Higher Education for the Public Good.

Things to keep in mind:

- Recognize that deliberative dialogues **seldom end in total agreement or total disagreement**. The hope is that forums will end in a discovery of a shared sense of purpose or recognition of how interests are interconnected.
- Your natural curiosity and your interest in **understanding diverse views** will be your greatest assets. So use them to ask questions that probe the underlying motivations, tradeoffs, and the willingness of the participants to recognize each approach.
- A **welcome sign** can help set an inviting tone.
- **Inclusion** – everyone has something important to say and as moderator, you set the tone for listening and being inclusive.
- **Be aware of the diverse experiences and perspectives** that serve as departure points for the conversation. Keep in mind that diversity comes in many forms: cultural, racial, ethnic, gender, sexual orientation, ability, socio-economic status, interests, etc.
- **Consider whose voices are not represented at the table**. To truly understand an issue, it needs to be considered from multiple perspectives. If the participants seem to share a point of view, they can still discuss alternate interpretations. You may want to use an empty chair as a prop. You can designate the chair as the seat of someone or a constituency not present for the discussion. This can be a helpful tool in helping participants understand what is meant by considering the voices of those not present.
- **Focus on the consequences of positions**.
- In making **transitions between approaches**, moderators can use a main point that links to the next approach (either in support of the next approach or one that proponents of the next approach would find problematic) or segue by noting that the group has completed its thorough examination of the approach.
- **Action is needed to connect discussion with change**. This is something to discuss at the end of the dialogue. Dissemination does not equal utilization.
- **Feelings and facts are both important**.

Developing Questions

People do not attend dialogues to hear about the moderator's position on the issue at hand. They come to discuss. Therefore, we suggest preparing approximately 5-10 questions for each of the three perspectives.

(Suggestions are included in your Facilitator script and in this document).

You can expect to address two or three of these questions per approach. Let questions bubble up from the participants as well.

3 Types of Questions

There are different types of questions associated with the three sections of a dialogue. These include: **Opening Questions**, **Approach Questions**, and **Closing Questions**.

- **Opening Questions**

These questions are intended to help participants connect the issue to their own lives, experiences, and contexts. A fruitful discussion requires that participants begin by understanding their own, personal stake in the issue. (As the dialogue proceeds, hopefully participants will begin to understand how the issue impacts others in the group.)

As engaged community members, you have a lot of issues on your plate: healthcare, the threat of terrorism, social security.... For you personally, where does access to postsecondary education (or community college, college, university) fall on a scale of 1-10 in relation to these kinds of issues? Where does access fall in relation to the other issues you're concerned about? It's important, but how important is it?

- **Approach Questions**

These questions are intended to help participants understand the complexity of the issue. Asking participants about consequences serves to focus attention on how different constituencies would be impacted by the policies that are associated with each approach.

Does anyone have anything to lose through adopting this approach? What actions would we take? Think of your Thanksgiving dinner table; what would your family think? What would a community college administrator (or a student in remedial education, a major employer in your area...) think about this perspective?

- **Closing Questions**

These questions are intended to serve as a time for the participants to synthesize and reflect on what has been said. It concludes the session, but it should not necessarily produce a feeling of resolution or consensus. It is okay if participants leave the dialogue stewing over what was said so that they resume the discussion with their families, friends, colleagues, and others.

How would you summarize our discussion to your neighbor? Do we have common ground? Is it okay if we leave here feeling unsettled? Would anyone make a strong case for or against a certain approach?

Discussion Format

Setting the Scene

The goal of the opening portion is to create a welcoming environment so that real exchange can occur. Introduce participants to the format so they know what to expect and the rationale behind using deliberation.

I. Opening (15%)

1) Welcome

- General welcome and introduction of moderators.
- Mention sponsors of the dialogue and relevant programming in the area.
- Explain the rationale for the kind of work the participants are getting ready to do – deliberation.
- Describe deliberation vs. debate.
- Introduce the observer and recorder.

2) Pre-Discussion Questionnaire and Consent Form

- The purpose of the survey is to focus participants on the issue and take stock of their initial feelings. Assure participants that their names will never be associated with the consent form or questionnaires.
- Inform participants there will be a post-forum questionnaire and request that they fill it out before leaving.

3) Audio Tape

- The purpose of the audiotape is for research and so we may share information with community members and policy makers. All names will remain confidential.

4) Ground Rules

Ask the group what ground rules they would like to have for this discussion. Provide examples. If the examples below do not emerge from the group, offer them yourself. We suggest that you list these on newsprint and post them for the discussion. Having these visible helps to remind participants of what was agreed upon. The following are examples of what the group might address:

- *Everyone is encouraged to participate.*
- *The purpose is to have an open dialogue – not a debate. This means we can offer alternative ideas. Evaluate ideas – do not criticize people.*
- *It is fine for participants to choose to be silent, but not okay for anyone to feel they are silenced.*
- *Every individual will need to make an effort not to dominate the conversation.*
- *Please try to self-monitor the duration of your comments.*
- *An atmosphere of respectful listening is desired.*
- *No one is ever expected to disclose information that is private or personal.*
- *All comments are respected and welcomed.*
- *The responsibility for doing the work of deliberation belongs to the group.*
- *We will consider each approach thoroughly, examining the pros, cons, and tradeoffs.*
- *Responses and questions will be directed toward one another.*
- *Everyone should feel free to ask for definitions of terms used with which individuals are not familiar.*
- *Do not use acronyms, because they may exclude some participants from the discussion.*

5) Starter Video

If available, show the video. Before doing so, explain that the video reviews the problems underlying the issues. The discussion guide lays out the issue in the same way.

6) Personal Stake

Connect the issue to people's lives in the first few minutes of the dialogue. Have participants consider how the issue relates to their personal experiences. Suggested Questions:

"Has anyone had a personal experience that illustrates the problem associated with this issue?" "Within your family, or circle of friends, is this an important issue?" "What aspects of the issue are most important to you?" "How does the issue affect people?"

Beginning the Dialogue

Some moderators like to begin a Forum by asking several participants to volunteer to describe, in their own words, what they think is being conveyed in each approach. This helps to move the forum away from the moderator and toward the participants owning the conversation.

II. Deliberation (65%)

Consistent with deliberation as a concept, moderators ask basic types of questions about each of the approaches:

1) What is valuable to us?

This question gets at why making public choices are so difficult: the approaches address issues that people care about very deeply, such as being treated fairly and our national interest. This question can take many forms:

- *How has this issue affected you personally?*
- *What things are most valuable to people who support this option?*
- *What is appealing about this approach?*
- *What makes this approach a good idea – or a bad one?*

2) What are the costs and consequences associated with option?

This question can take many forms as long as it prompts people to think about the likely effects of various approaches valuable to them. Examples include:

- *What would result from doing what this approach proposes?*
- *What could be the positive and negative ramifications of doing what you are suggesting?*
- *Can you give an example of what you think would happen?*
- *Does anyone have a different estimate of costs or consequences?*

3) What are the tensions or conflicts in this issue that we have to work through?

As the dialogue progresses, moderators will ask questions that draw out conflicts or tensions that people have to "work through." They might ask:

- *What do you see as the tensions between the approaches?*
- *What are the conflicts that grow out of what we've said about this issue?*
- *Why is this issue so difficult to decide?*
- *What are the "gray areas"?*
- *What remains unresolved for this group?*

4) Can we detect any shared sense of purpose? How is our interdependence grounds for action?

Wrapping Up

III. Ending the Forum (20%)

1) Reflect on what has been accomplished

a. Individual Reflections

- "How has your thinking about the issue changed?"
- "How has your thinking about other people's views changed?"
- "How has your perspective changed as a result of what you heard in this forum?"

b. Group Reflections

- "What didn't we work through?"
- "Can we identify any shared sense of purpose or direction?"
- "What tradeoffs are we, or are we not, willing to make to move in a shared direction?"

2) Next-Step Reflections

- "What do we still need to talk about?"
- "How can we use what we learned about ourselves in this forum?"
- "Do we want to meet again?"

3) Post-Discussion Questionnaire

The moderator should collect the questionnaires.

4) Moderator Report Back Form

Answer the questions on the Moderator Report Form included in the "Moderator Material Packet." Please use the research questions in the "Administering Forms" section of this guide to get a sense of what we hope you focus on as you go through the dialogue and create the report.

Please return these forms to:

Attention: Access to Democracy

National Forum on Higher Education for the Public Good

610 E. University Avenue, Suite 2339

Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109-1259

Phone: 734-615-8882 Fax: 734-615-9777

email: nabowman@umich.edu

Administering Forms

The National Forum on Higher Education for the Public Good is organizing dialogues across the state of Michigan. *The National Forum* staff will be investigating three research questions related to these dialogues. These are:

- 1) How do people perceive the issue of access to college?
- 2) How can we facilitate access to college?
- 3) What is the impact of these community dialogues?

As you moderate the dialogue and complete the "Access to Democracy Community Dialogue Report," it may be helpful to let these research questions guide and focus you.

Your "Moderator Material Packet" consists of the consent form, pre/post-discussion form (1 page, double sided), and the Moderator Report form. In many cases, you will also have a tape recorder and audio tapes.

• **Consent Form** (administered by moderator):

Before you begin, all participants must be made aware of the consent form. There are two versions of the consent form – one for dialogues that will be audio-taped and one for dialogues that will not be recorded. Please be sure you administer the appropriate form and refer to the script for doing so included in the "Moderator Material Packet."

• **Pre/Post-Discussion Form** (administered by moderator):

This is a two-sided form. One side is the pre-discussion survey; the other is the post-discussion survey. During the audio taped sessions, participants should write their names or pseudonyms on the form. We ask this of participants because we are interested in seeing to what degree the survey responses reflect what individuals say during the discussion. Please refer to the script for administering this form included in the "Moderator Material Packet."

• **Moderator Report Form**

(completed by moderator):

Since we are investigating how people perceive access to college and the impact of the community dialogues, we are especially interested in what you see in the dialogue. Please provide us with a report summarizing the dialogue. The questions on the form address logistical questions related to the dialogue process as well as the content discussed.

Please return all of these forms and the Moderator's Report to:

The National Forum on Higher Education for the Public Good

Attention: Access to Democracy

610 E. University Avenue

Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109

Phone: 734-615-8882 Fax: 734-615-9777

email: nabowman@umich.edu

Skills for Moderating

There is no single, correct way to moderate; however, to be an effective moderator certain skills and principles should be kept in mind. Although this list is not exhaustive, please be aware that there may be overlap between categories.

Attitude

The moderator's attitude is crucial to the success of a dialogue.

A moderator should be:

- Understanding
- Genuine
- Respectful
- Non-judgmental
- Empathetic
- Neutral

Rationality

Be aware of degrees of rationality – although conflict and tension can arise due to different values, beliefs, and experiences, attempt to keep individuals feeling comfortable and safe by remaining neutral. There is no room for personal attacks or judgment of positions held by participants in this discussion. The conversation should be an exploration of the issue.

Listening

Listening is powerful and empowering. By really listening to another person, we gain understanding and make him/her feel valued, cared for, respected, and important. To demonstrate that you are actively listening to participants, the moderator should:

- Focus his/her attention on the speaker.
- Wait for the speaker to finish speaking - don't interrupt.
- Let yourself finish listening before you speak.
- Ask questions to clarify content – get actively involved.
- Listen for central ideas.
- Consider content, not delivery.
- Empathize – put yourself in the other person's shoes.
- Be responsive.

Never tell people what they think, but ask or say "What I interpret you saying is ___ is that right?"

Try using the following prompts to exhibit you are actively listening and to summarize participants' thoughts:

Let me see if I understand.... What I think I'm hearing is.... In your experience.... So, do you think.... I wonder if.... It appears that.... So, do you mean.... It sounds like....

Clarifying

Help to focus and clarify the discussion. By asking whether you understood the speaker's point, paraphrasing your understanding of a comment, restating an idea or thought to make it clear, or posing another question to the speaker the moderator helps the listener be able to confirm that his/her comment was understood. Clarifying can correct misunderstanding and false assumptions on the spot. It also shows the speaker that the moderator is really listening. Asking for clarification can also help the speaker become clearer about what s/he is trying to say.

- Summarize key points (or ask others to do so).
- Restate to confirm your understanding of what participants say.

Engaging Others

Although participants are not required to speak, no one should be silenced. Be sure to convey that all participants are invited into the dialogue.

- Ask probing questions.
- Bring in points of view that have not been talked about and/or are not represented in the discussion.
- Create opportunities for everyone to participate.
- Balance contributions of participants.

Flow

A deliberative dialogue is a discussion based on three different perspectives of one issue. The discussion should flow in the same manner that a conversation between thoughtful individuals would unfold. To facilitate this, the moderator can utilize the following techniques:

- Reflect: Restate the content and feeling of the message. ***"Let me see if I am hearing you correctly...."***
- Reframe: Focus on the needs and values being expressed and validate them. ***"So I hear that as a quality, fairness is very important to you."***
- Summarize: State concisely the main thoughts. ***"It sounds to me as if we have been talking about a few major themes...."***

- Shift focus fluidly: Move from one speaker or topic to another.
"Thank you, John. Do you have anything to add Jane?" "We've been focusing on X. Does anyone have feelings or opinions about other elements of the issue?"
- Use Silence: Allow time and space for reflection by pausing between comments.

Non-Verbal Behavior

Verbal and non-verbal signs, such as body language, are both forms of communication. To maintain neutrality, it is important to be conscious of the way you use non-verbal behaviors and what they communicate. Non-verbal behaviors include: tone of voice, facial expressions, gestures, eye contact, and posture. Be understanding that different cultures may interpret non-verbal cues in distinct ways.

- Watch for differences in communication styles (frequency, speed, tone, non-verbal behaviors). Do not assume a certain style holds a certain meaning.
- Be willing to adapt your own communication style.
- Observe others' behavior carefully before drawing conclusions.
- Be aware of 'target' and 'dominant' dynamics. Be willing to "team-mediate", with another person in order to represent more than one set of identities.
- Invite the parties to bring a support person to help balance power dynamics.
- Identify the conflicts over values and the conflicts over behaviors. Values are difficult to mediate; behaviors often reflect values.
- Listen carefully to understand where both parties are coming from and to identify their most important issues, apart from their stated positions.
- Remain neutral, especially as it becomes more difficult – the conflict between the parties is not your problem.
- Be patient. Communicating and learning about cultures both take time.
- Challenge your assumptions. If you believe something to be true, constantly ask yourself why you believe it.

Conflict

Keep in mind that the tension surrounding this issue is not meant to be resolved! However, it is important to remember that conflict can exist on multiple levels:

- internal – an individual can experience conflicting thoughts and beliefs.
- inter-personal – conflict can exist between individuals.
- group – conflict can exist between people comprising a group.
- inter-group – conflict can arise between groups.

Conflict is not always a bad thing. Sometimes what feels like conflict may be a new opinion, challenging the status quo. You may however, have to deal with difficult people. Because this issue is very personal to some people, you can expect to encounter several challenges as a moderator. Conflicts may include, though are not limited to, quiet participants, silence, talkative or domineering participants, lack of focus, misinformation, lack of interest, and/or tension.

Examples of transitional statements when dealing with domineering participants:

- *How would others respond to that?*
- *[Pull an empty chair up to the table and designate it the spot for a member of a constituency not represented at the table.] How might this individual respond to what was just said?*
- *Excuse me, but it looks like Mary wants to get in on this conversation. Let's move it around.*

Examples for side conversations:

- *I'm regretting that the rest of us aren't benefiting from what you're discussing. Could you summarize what you've been discussing?*

Example for personal conflict:

- *It seems we're moving off of the issue. I see hands, let's get other voices on the issue.*

Approach One: Those Willing to Work For It

Supporters of Approach 1 believe that any student can attend college, regardless of their lot in life. They may need to take a longer, more difficult path, but their hard work will pay off in the end.

What Should be Done?

- Adopt alternatives to race-based affirmative action. Need-based alternatives are fairer than race-based plans.
- Expand guaranteed student loan programs. Federal support to pay for college while a student is in school is a wise investment in the nation's future human potential.
- Increase support for community colleges and extension programs through four-year colleges. For many students, if college is not close to home or work, it is not a viable option.
- Place greater emphasis on career exploration and development in high school.
- Recognize and give credit for the experience adult learners bring to the classroom. Adult learners do not need to replicate what they have already learned on the job.
- Offer course and college services beyond the traditional 8-5 workday. Do not penalize adult students who must maintain a job while attending college.

Opposing Voices:

A student who graduates from an elite private university is likely to make more money and find a better job than someone who attends a local community college. Minority students, who are more likely to be enrolled in community colleges, will likely not fare as well economically or professionally as their white counterparts. Opponents would also argue that the definition of "qualified" is subjective. Advanced Placement (AP), honors courses, and International Baccalaureate (IB) programs are not available in all schools. These are not obstacles that can be overcome by simply working harder.

Costs and Consequences:

Cost can be prohibitive for poor students, however if everything is paid for them then they may lack the personal investment to finish. However, taking out loans to cover the cost of an education that exceeds a family's income can be a burden even for the most dedicated young people.

Approach Two: The Most Academically Qualified

Supporters of Approach 2 believe that given our limited resources, the best investment for the country is in those students most likely to advance society and maintain America's competitive edge in the global marketplace.

What Should be Done?

- Admission to college should be based primarily on merit. Admissions policies should be race- and gender-neutral, and preferences for children of alumni should be eliminated.
- Increase merit-based scholarships. These scholarships emphasize academic achievement regardless of personal background.
- Implement a more demanding K-12 curriculum. Only the most successful youths will continue on to college.
- Improve standard measures of achievement. It is necessary to have a standard by which all students can be compared.
- Emphasize scientific literacy. Many of today's jobs require a high degree of technical competence.
- Provide additional support for private education. Highly capable students cannot always afford high tuition.

Opposing Voices:

In this system, the rich get richer and the poor remain poor. While women and minorities have made significant progress in education since the 1960's, they are still largely underrepresented in the nation's political leadership and in the influential and high paying professions like medicine and law. Affirmative action must be maintained and protected.

Further, standardized tests discriminate against women and minority students. These measures also fail to account for potential, determination, civic engagement, and abilities in the arts, athletics and entertainment.

Costs and Consequences:

Merit-based admissions policies are vital in matching students to institutions for which they are properly prepared. However, this practice allows inequalities in K-12 to be compensated for rather than being addressed.

Approach Three: Everyone

Supporters of Approach 3 believe that college education doesn't merely serve individuals; it benefits everyone by strengthening society. Educated people are more engaged citizens and contribute more to society.

What Should be Done?

- Support race- and need-based affirmative action programs. We are highly segregated as a nation and need to actively work to eliminate inequality.
- Diversify the college facilities to reflect the racial, ethnic, gender, and physical ability differences of the incoming students.
- Create a sliding scale for cost of tuition. Students should be expected to pay a portion of the cost of their education, but it should be in proportion to their means.
- Increase system wide capacity. There needs to be enough seats in the classrooms to accommodate all interested students.
- Clearly align state high school graduation requirements with college admissions standards.
- Make high quality education available to all students and all communities. High school graduates should not be forced to choose between leaving their community and attending college.

Opposing Voices:

We have limited resources that must be divided among important social priorities such as health care, social security, K-12 education, and new concerns for our personal security. It is too expensive to allow everyone to go to college. Further, a college education isn't even necessary for most jobs in this country when you take into account on-the-job training.

Also, accepting less qualified students in to college will water down the system and lower the overall quality of education. Lastly, it is not the role of college to teach citizenship. That is the role of the family, faith, and the community.

Costs and Consequences:

There are significant benefits to a highly educated population where individuals are better educated and more engaged with the democratic process, but at what cost? Are the benefits of educating more of our citizens worth cutting funding for other priorities or increasing taxes to afford it?

The following chart is intended to help you deal with difficult personalities. It is meant as a supplement to the material provided.

Type of Difficult Person	Characteristics	Tactics
Hostile/Aggressive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bullies, overwhelms, and intimidates others. • Criticizes and argues relentlessly. • Believes there's only one way to handle a situation — can't accept feedback. • Reacts even more strongly to resistance from others. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Don't panic. Stand up to the hostile person. • Don't take it personally. • Give him or her time to run down. • Get his or her attention carefully (use name of person clearly and loudly).
Wet Blanket	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses negativism ("It won't work," or "We tried that last year"). • Feels that those in power don't care or are self-serving. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Don't argue. • State your own realistic optimism. • Don't rush into proposing solutions. • Be ready to take action on your own.
Know It All	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feels and exerts the impression of absolute certainty, power, and authority. • Is usually right. • Cannot be dissuaded once on a course. • Treats others as irrelevant. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do your homework. • Question firmly but don't confront. • Present alternatives as detours. • Avoid being a counter expert.
Balloon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Speaks with great authority about subjects that s/he has little knowledge of or pretends to be an expert. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State facts as an alternative version. • Give balloon a wry out.
Staller	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is pleasant and supportive, but avoids decision-making until the decision is made for him/her. • Hint and beats around the bush. • Is quality oriented, can't let go of something until it is perfect, which means never. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Get him or her to describe the plan in detail. • Rank alternatives. • Link plan to values of quality and service. • Give support after decision is made. • Follow up.
Complainer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acts self-righteously, blames and accuses others. • Makes no effort to solve problems (feels powerless). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Listen attentively. • Switch to problem-solving, "What would happen if...?" • Paraphrase — define the problem.
Clam	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses monosyllables or silence to avoid conflict. • May feel backed into a corner. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ask open-ended questions. • Comment on what's happening.
Super-Agreeable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is often personable, funny, outgoing. • Talks you what you want to hear, but lets you down in a crisis. • Commits to actions they won't or can't follow through on. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Say you value him or her as a person. • Compromise/negotiate if conflict arises. • Get his/her commitments in writing. • Be prepared to take action on your own.
Deadwood	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Doesn't contribute anything to the actual team effort. • Is often in a power position. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand why the person is there — s/he may occupy a role position in the formal power system that is important to the smooth functioning of the informal power system. • Try assertiveness.
One Who Takes All the Credit (Plagiarist)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steals credit for others' achievements, ideas, roles, organizational abilities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confront the plagiarist in front of a mutually respected third party. • Emphasize the team effort. • Send additional copies of written material with your name on it to people higher than the plagiarist.

Discussion Notes:



NATIONAL FORUM ON HIGHER
EDUCATION FOR THE PUBLIC GOOD

*Center for the Study of Higher
and Postsecondary Education
University of Michigan
610 E. University Ave., Suite 2339
Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1259
Telephone: 734-615-8882
Fax: 734-615-9777
www.thenationalforum.org*
