

President's Commission on Human Relations & Equity

Meeting Notes

Friday, October 19, 2012

Present:

Juanita Aguilar
 Marc Barrie
 Janice Brown
 Lance Burger
 Michael Caldwell
 Xuanning Fu
 Juan Carlos Gonzalez

Teresa Huerta
 Suzanne Kotkin-Jaszi
 Dawn Lewis
 Arthur Montejano
 Liliana Ocegueda
 Paul Oliaro
 Francine Oputa

Jan Parten
 Jenelle Pitt
 Christina Roybal
 Cynthia Teniente-Matson
 Brian Tsukimura
 Paul Yunouye

Absent:

Joe De los Santos
 Alex Espinoza

Israel Lara
 Ramakrishna Nunna

Elizabeth Potter
 Klaus Tenbergen

3:30 p.m. – 5:00 pm**Haak Center Boardroom, HML 4115**

Meeting commenced at approximately 3:35. A quorum was present.

I. Welcome

Chair Matson welcomed the commission and provided a brief overview of the agenda.

II. PCHRE**A. Approval of Meeting Notes**

Chair Matson requested that the commission review the meeting notes for significant changes and/or corrections. Members of the commission did not provide any significant edits.

It was MSC to approve the notes of the September 28, 2012 meeting.

B. Priority Strategies/Activities for 2012-13 and Beyond**1) Working Definition of Cultural Competence**

Chair Matson requested that Dr. Alma Clayton-Pedersen provide an update on the work of the PCHRE Subcommittee on Cultural Competence. Dr. Clayton-Pedersen referenced the previously disseminated handout which included the proposed definition on cultural competence. Another iteration of the definition was sent to the subcommittee, which took into account the commission's feedback from the September 28, 2012 PCHRE meeting. The subcommittee met once more to discuss the revised definition of cultural competence. Dr. Clayton-Pedersen stated that the proposed definition is succinct, but yet comprehensive. Dr. Lance Burger informed the committee that the definition included everything the subcommittee requested. Dr. Jenelle Pitt agreed. She further added that it was an efficient and collaborative process. Dr. Francine Oputa echoed the comments from Dr. Burger and Dr. Pitt. She added that the subcommittee reviewed each word of the definition to ensure it communicated the commission's intent.

Chair Matson announced she was pleased with the proposed definition. She felt it was comprehensive and encapsulated all of the commission's previous discussions. Ms. Janice Brown agreed, stating that the definition was straightforward, clear, uncluttered and focused.

Chair Matson asked Dr. Suzanne Kotkin-Jaszi if she had any concerns about the proposed definition. She agreed that the subcommittee did a fine job drafting the definition. She thought it was easy to understand, and the commission's intent was very clear.

Chair Matson suggested that the commission approve the proposed definition of cultural competence as one of the working definitions. She reminded the commission that the definition could be revised at any time. The definition would be included in future collateral material and the diversity plan as the commission moves forward.

Chair Matson asked if a member of the commission would like to make a motion to approve adoption of the working definition of cultural competence. It was moved by Dr. Oputa. Dr. Dawn Lewis seconded. All were in favor. There weren't any oppositions or abstentions. The adoption of the working definition of cultural competence was unanimously supported.

Chair Matson thanked the subcommittee for their work in drafting the definition

2.) Newsletter

Next Chair Matson provided a brief background/overview regarding the Rise to Excellence newsletter. She reminded the commission that a hard copy of the Rise to Excellence newsletter, which was previously distributed to the campus community in early February, provided an update on the status of the commission's work. At the PCHRE retreat, the commission recommended that another update be provided to the campus community. Chair Matson recommended that the commission consider utilizing the Rise to Excellence online newsletter as an avenue to update the campus community on the commission's work. She highlighted the fact that the Rise to Excellence newsletter is connected to the core values of the Strategic Plan for Excellence IV. The PCHRE newsletter could be reflective of the *Respect for Difference* core value.

Chair Matson explained that the newsletter would provide an update as to where we are at, what we are doing, how we came about, our history, our working definitions and timeline. She asked the commission to review the draft document and provide feedback.

Dr. Juan Carlos Gonzalez requested an update on the university's designations. Dr. Xuanning Fu provided a brief update stating that the university was designated as a Minority Serving Institution (MSI), Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI), and Asian American Native American Pacific Islander Serving Institution (AAANAPSI). Chair Matson requested that Dr. Fu bring the background and percentages required for each designation.

Ms. Brown inquired about the frequency of distribution of the newsletter. She suggested a fall and spring update.

Ms. Jan Parten recommended changing the order of the articles within the newsletter. Dr. Paul Oliaro also recommended including a section that provides the names of the commission members. He also suggested that the newsletter be sent from President Welty.

Chair Matson concluded by stating that headlines would be reviewed and updated. The definition of cultural competence and the date of the campus community forum would be added to the newsletter. Additional suggestions and feedback should be sent to Chair Matson or Ms. Nina Palomino.

C. Diversity Plan

Chair Matson announced that the commission's next agenda item consisted of an update on the subgroup's work on the four themes. Chair Matson recommended that the commission review the themes and agree on a final draft to communicate to the university community. She reminded the committee that the Committee for Faculty Equity and Diversity (CFED) had recently reviewed the four themes.

Each theme leader provided a brief summary on the revisions made to each theme. Dr. Fu reported on behalf of Theme One's group (Supporting Student Access and Educational Success). The group rewrote the theme to streamline the content and make it easier to read and understand. The strategies and indicators have been reduced so that each corresponds to the actions located in one of the three areas: awareness, knowledge or capacity. Dr. Oliaro was concerned about the action items that reflect "review" because the other themes used other words such as ensure, explore or enhance. Theme One was also the only theme that includes an annual report as an indicator. He also cautioned the commission about the use of the word inequities within all four themes. Overall, he is concerned with the lack of consistency within all of the themes. Dr. Clayton-Pedersen recommends that each theme define inequity. Dr. Oliaro agreed.

A brief discussion ensued regarding the use of the word "review" and "inequities" throughout the document. For example, theme one uses "inequities" and "inequalities" in capacity actions three and five. Dr. Fu stated that it is difficult to pinpoint which definition to use. Chair Matson asked if the commission was comfortable leaving the document as is. The commission agreed to leave as is.

Dr. Michael Caldwell reported on behalf of Theme Two's group (Recruiting, Developing and Supporting Employees). The group determined that the language and terminology needed to be synchronized within the theme. Dr. Caldwell stated that the group modified the language to define end users more clearly. For example, rather than using the words "workforce" and "hiring officials," the group tried to pinpoint specific individuals such as faculty, staff and administrators.

Dr. Clayton-Pedersen asked if the indicators were modified. Chair Matson replied that the group will need to review the indicators one more time to determine if the indicators within each theme are measurable. Dr. Fu agreed that this is a working document that will need to be revisited to ensure the use of accurate research methodology, such as consistent indicators over time.

Chair Matson reassured the commission that there will be a review of the indicators at a future meeting. She also informed the commission that the themes will be proofed and read for consistency.

A detailed discussion occurred about measurable indicators. After the detailed discussion, Chair Matson asked if the commission had any additional comments about Theme Two. Dr. Oliaro encouraged the commission to consider adding a final indicator to all the themes requiring an annual report. The commission agreed.

Dr. Lewis reported on behalf of Theme Three's group (Promoting and Supporting Excellence in Teaching, Learning and Scholarship). The group simplified the language to a readable level that was acceptable by all audiences. In addition to simplifying the language, the group reviewed the action items to ensure that each corresponded to an indicator. A few strategies were removed because the items were too prescriptive/procedural for the plan.

Chair Matson called for comments on the revisions of Theme Three. Dr. Oliaro stated that the plan was specific and well-written. Dr. Suzanne Kotkin-Jaszi reported that CFED reviewed the plan and had two main concerns: 1.) the resources available to implement the plan and 2.) an evaluation to close the loop, such as feedback and/or report back to the faculty. She also suggested adding a mechanism to recognize faculty.

Dr. Fu was concerned about strategy two and indicator five. He suggested rewording strategy two and eliminating indicator five. He stated that indicator five would be too hard to measure.

Dr. Caldwell mentioned that a certificate could be developed related to diversity within particular majors. Dr. Lewis explained that the original intent was to identify courses within majors that provide diversity curriculum specific to the discipline.

Dr. Clayton-Pedersen explained the importance of the faculty role in understanding diversity and inclusive practices, regardless of the discipline. It should be a paradigm shift for faculty. Faculty should communicate to students the importance of taking certain curriculum.

Dr. Fu and Dr. Burger agreed that the strategy should focus on program design. Dr. Clayton-Pedersen emphasized that the language needs to be strengthened. Chair Matson recommended that Dr. Lewis take the suggestions back to Professor Alex Espinoza. She agreed.

Chair Matson thanked the group for the feedback and discussion. Dr. Lewis stated that the subgroup for Theme 3 will revise the document to address the concerns that were discussed at the CFED meeting: 1.) resources to implement the diversity plan and support for technology in teaching and scholarship, 2.) desire for a report back to the faculty, and 3.) to highlight faculty who are exemplary at Theme Three.

Chair Matson reported on behalf of Theme Four's group (Affirming a Campus Culture of Inclusion, Respect and Equity). The group provided simplification to the theme's language and clarity to the strategies and action items. An audit was conducted to ensure that the group's original intent was connected to the actual language of theme. In the strategies section, awareness, knowledge and capacity actions were not labeled. Chair Matson will label each action. The group did not revise the indicators as those will be reviewed at a future meeting.

D. 2012-13 Schedule/Timeline

Chair Matson provided a brief summary of the commission's next steps which include: 1.) minor revisions to the themes based on today's comments, 2.) review the indicators and begin revisions, and 3.) take draft plan to the Academic Senate (tentatively scheduled for November 5). A campus forum will be scheduled for mid-November. Chair Matson will continue to work on the preamble. At the next meeting, there will be an update on all of the aforementioned items as well as a discussion on indicators and action items.

As the meeting adjourned, Chair Matson recognized Dr. Kotkin-Jaszi for convening CFED and for the assistance in marshaling feedback and comments. She also thanked the commission for their participation in the meeting.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 5:00 p.m.

III. Diversity Definitions

- *Diversity*: Individual differences (e.g., personality, language, learning styles, and life experiences) and group/social differences (e.g., race/ethnicity, class, gender, gender identity, sexual orientation, sexual identity, country of origin, and ability status as well as cultural, political, religious, or other affiliations) that can be engaged in the service of learning.
- *Inclusion*: The active, intentional, and ongoing engagement with diversity—in people, in the curriculum, in the co-curriculum, and in communities (intellectual, social, cultural, geographical) with which individuals might connect—in ways that increase one's awareness, content knowledge, cognitive sophistication, and empathic understanding of the complex ways individuals interact within [and change] systems and institutions.
- *Equity (student focus)*: The creation of opportunities for historically underrepresented populations to have equal access to and participate in educational programs that are capable of closing the achievement gaps in student success and completion.

Source: Association of American Colleges & Universities
Website, 2011

- *Equity (employee focus)*: The creation of opportunities for historically underrepresented populations of employees (faculty and staff) to have equal access to professional growth opportunities and resource

networks that are capable of closing the demographic disparities in leadership roles in all spheres of institutional functioning.

Source: Clayton-Pedersen, 2011 Adapted from the University of Southern California's Center for Urban Education's Equity Scorecard™

IV. Parking Lot Items:

1. 9/23/11 - College – specific reports on the website? (Juan Carlos)
2. 9/23/11 - NCAT (Course Redesign)
3. 9/23/11 - Do we have peer institutions by which we compare ourselves in terms of our work on institutional diversification? (Juan Carlos)
4. 9/23/11 - Publicize cultural benefits of globalizing Fresno State, not just focus on \$ benefits (Juan Carlos)
5. 9/23/11 - President Welty & BOT endorsement of Fresno State Diversity Plan?
6. 10/07/11 - Potential Research Projects for Graduate Students (Juan Carlos)
7. 11/4/11 – Include the word – “Inclusion” in the name of this document (Francine)

V. Next Meeting: Friday, November 2nd, from 3:30 – 5:00 p.m. in the Haak Center Boardroom, HML 4115