

President's Commission on Human Relations & Equity

Meeting Notes

Wednesday, November 28, 2012

Present:

Janice Brown
 Michael Caldwell
 Alex Espinoza
 Xuanning Fu

Ramakrishna Nunna
 Liliana Ocegueda
 Francine Oputa
 Jenelle Pitt

Christina Roybal
 Cynthia Teniente-Matson

Absent:

Juanita Aguilar
 Marc Barrie
 Lance Burger
 Joe De los Santos
 Juan Carlos Gonzalez
 Teresa Huerta

Suzanne Kotkin-Jaszi
 Israel Lara
 Dawn Lewis
 Arthur Montejano
 Paul Oliaro
 Jan Parten

Elizabeth Potter
 Klaus Tenbergen
 Brian Tsukimura
 Paul Yunouye

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

Meeting called to order at 3:40 p.m.

I. Welcome

Chair Cindy Teniente-Matson welcomed the commission and provided a brief overview of the agenda items. The agenda was slightly modified to include grant award announcement from Dr. Ramakrishna Nunna.

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

Commission will return to approval of minutes due to lack of quorum.

B. APLU Grant/Award

Dr. Nunna announced that the university was amongst the award recipients of APLU's 2012-13 Diverse Learning Environments grant. The grant is about providing services to students in STEM fields, focusing specifically on engineering and construction management. Part of the grant requires us to administer a survey. The survey instrument is called the "The Doers Learning Environment." (copy of instrument distributed to the committee). In addition to the core questions, the survey will allow for additional modules that we can tailor to the questions we want to ask (e.g. student's experience coming into Fresno State; other types of learning environment questions that will help identify how students feel about Fresno State services; and other information that we previously have not captured).

Dr. Nunna and Dr. Clayton-Pedersen discussed the survey and Dr. Clayton-Pedersen shared that she worked with Silvia McDonald, Director of Lumina/AASCU, on designing a similar type of instrument. Fresno State will be administering the survey to sophomores and juniors and the SCCC, also participating in this project, will be surveying their first two-year students. This is a two-year grant with one survey administered this year and another next year. APLU will be paying for the entire survey and UCLA is going to manage the survey. Fresno State will identify and provide ID and email information for the students selected for the survey.

Dr. Nunna finds the survey timely and that it ties in to the work PCHRE is presently doing. He will be working with Dr. Fu's office to see if this instrument can be tailored or modified to make it relevant for the entire student population.

The survey will be administered in the early part of January and will provide student a two or three week window to respond.

Dr. Clayton-Pedersen asked how this work maps on to the work that Dr. Fu is doing on assessment. Dr. Fu clarified that the campus' cultural climate survey does not include students. It is strictly for employees. He further added that a survey of this nature, exclusive to students, would be a good supplement to what we have. The next time we perform the cultural climate survey, we will be a lot more focus on making the tie to the university's strategic plan and the diversity plan.

Dr. Clayton-Pedersen asked if the university is part of the freshman survey. If so, it may be worthwhile to leverage this survey with some additional questions from the freshman survey so as to start to build a longitudinal database that will allow the university to collect additional data across the years and serve as a measure of progress.

Dr. Fu stated that the next freshman survey will be administered in 2014 to allow more space between surveys. He also clarified that it is a national survey and the university has little control over the questions asked or the questions it can add.

Dr. Nunna agreed to email Dr. Clayton-Pedersen a copy of APLU's 2012-13 Diverse Learning Environments survey.

Dr. Caldwell asked if it is a canned instrument or can the questions be altered. Dr. Nunna stated that we will be using a canned instrument for the first year because four other universities are doing this nationally. Dr. Caldwell added if there are there any concerns with the questions not matching our campus. Dr. Nunna clarified that these questions will not be "checked" or students will be able to skip over them. He has not seen the instrument in action so does not know how it will be laid out. In the second year, the university will have the opportunity to add its own module.

C. Priority Strategies/Activities for 2012-13 and Beyond

Chair Matson briefed the group on the presentation to the Academic Senate. She and Dr. Kotkin-Jaszi met with the Academic Senate and provided a 10-minute PowerPoint presentation that included the full plan with all four themes. They provided an overview that included updates made from the comments and feedback that came in from the previous round of dialogue. The presentation went well. It did not include a lot of conversation, but there was a sense of engagement and attention to the themes with specific interest on wanting to learn more on how this plan might impact faculty.

Special attention was given to theme three. The faculty members were invited to the open forum on November 15 and/or to go online and submit their comments which are being taken until the end of this month, November 30. All the materials were provided to the Academic Senate office to post on their website.

We have received a set of written comments from Dr. Honora Chapman (copy of the comments was distributed to the committee). Dr. Lewis and Professor Espinoza addressed the issues raised by these comments. Professor Espinoza prepared a written response back to Dr. Chapman.

Ms. Brown highlighted some of the comments and events that took place during the open forum.

Some individuals were very emotional about the topic. One in particular said his piece and then stormed out. Another individual stated that the ability to comment is a critical part of this program/process, but there has to be a willingness to have open dialogue and listen.

There was a lot of discussion on the gender discrepancy of our student population, specifically retention and what efforts are being made in recruitment and retention of male students because those numbers are declining and understanding the challenges they are facing.

Other concerns voiced during the forum include:

- The MI trend,
- GE issues and deductions to the 120 units: Oftentimes we will see is reduction in non-essential courses which tend to be diversity related.
- The evaluation process of instruction and how this diversity program would impact faculty in that process.

It was also suggested the university review its top campus websites and main pages. These all contain pictures of female students, predominantly. This is not a concern, but maybe needs to be visited so as to look at the message we are sending and in regards to which population(s) we serve.

These are amongst the comments and questions Ms. Brown submitted in her report to the committee for consideration.

There was also discussion about diversity efforts in education as compared to corporate America with examples of how corporate America has brought significant light to the issue.

Ms. Brown added that they closed the forum and pointed individuals to the website and encouraged them to submit any additional comments or concerns.

Chair Matson also shared comments provided by Dr. Loretta Kensinger. One comment was specifically related to ensuring that we integrate the value of the MI requirement. She is referring to the importance of the general education multicultural requirement on this campus, as a way that the faculty and the department show their support for the importance of diversity in the educational life of our students.

She added that the feedback comments go directly to Ms. Nina Palomino, who has been out of the office. There could be additional comments submitted via the website and she will check with Ms. Palomino on her return on December 3.

Dr. Clayton-Pedersen asked how many questions/comments have been received thus far. Chair Matson stated that we have heard from about a dozen, 8-10 at the open forum and two additional individuals as shared with this group.

Dr. Fu asked Ms. Brown if the person who made the comment regarding the discrepancy in services to male students versus female students mentioned any services specifically. Ms. Brown stated that specific services were not mentioned. He asked if this group recognized the discrepancy between these two groups and whether or not we are focusing efforts on this discrepancy.

Dr. Clayton-Pedersen shared that in the last 18 months ACE released a compendium of articles around men of color that might be a useful resource as we look at some of these issues.

Significant discussion followed in the area of services for male students, statistics were shared regarding the retention and graduation rates between male and female students and amongst the specific racial groups; Dr. Caldwell highlighted some of the efforts and services offered to males in minority groups here at Fresno State; and a distinction was made as to why outreach efforts are focused on underrepresented groups.

It is clear that men, specifically white males, have now become the minority, but white males do not have retention issues. Statistics show that it is women and other "minority" groups that are at a disadvantage.

Dr. Nunna offered that his college is 80% male, which is typical in those fields. Dr. Fu shared that males typically attain the higher degrees and go after the higher paying jobs, where women come into fields/jobs where the earning power is lower than other fields. This is true nationally and underrepresented groups have even higher disparities.

Chair Matson added that this illustrates some of the education around knowledge, awareness and capacity that needs to take place on our campus in understanding diversity issues.

Dr. Clayton-Pedersen commented that we need to be careful not to paint the whole university with a single brush and be careful to not stigmatize the groups who are showing these gaps. We need to keep in mind that all students experience difficulty at some point in their careers. We need to remain focused on all students and particularly on those that are underserved.

Dr. Caldwell reminded the committee that Dr. Oliaro and Dr. Covino were very sensitive and stressed the importance of remaining focused on academic performance.

Professor Espinoza shared some of the discussion he and Dr. Lewis shared and the frustration that comes with developing a plan that speaks to everything and the realization that there isn't such a plan. There can't be. It is unfair to ask this body to devise such a plan. It is good to be aware of the issues and take them into consideration as the plan develops and evolves.

Ms. Brown stated that the comments do give us another perspective and should cause us to look at our communication, websites and other aspects that influence how individuals see the university.

Chair Matson turned the attention to the preamble and the collateral materials, beginning with the collateral materials.

Dr. Caldwell asked if the evaluation portion has been cleaned out. Chair Matson stated Dr. Lewis and Professor Espinoza are handling that update. She would contact Dr. Matt Jendian regarding the removal of that piece.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

D. Next Steps

1. Wrap up the feedback and comments that have come in and make sure the committee has addressed them as necessary.
2. Update and finalize the plan, there may be some minor tweaks.
3. Forward plan to the President for approval
4. Complete Indicators
5. Launch in January 2013

Chair Matson also shared that over the last months she and Ms. Palomino have been working with University Communications to select a public relations firm to help write the collateral materials. The firm selected was Jeffery Scott Advertising (JSA), the principal director, Jim Lowe is the contact person for this project.

At this point, JSA has been provided with all the materials that we have thus far, including the draft preamble. It was clarified that they do not have the freedom to change any of the words in the document. The charge is to provide a design that incorporates the full document in some way and brings attention to the details that have been put together in the plan. Separate from that, we also need collateral pieces to talk to various audiences. Some flexibility was provided for them to pull out as they designed pieces targeted at specific audiences (students, faculty, staff, managers and volunteers). They have been asked to provide a total of five different pieces. The definitions will be included in every collateral piece and no flexibility was allowed with those.

JSA will be at the next steering committee meeting and potentially at a December meeting with the PCHRE. JSA will be working closely and directly with Dr. Clayton-Pedersen and Ms. Palomino, who are representing this committee.

Also, this group needs to nominate the top two or three things we want to accomplish over the next semester. The resource piece will be discussed at Level A. Chair Matson will be making a presentation to the Level A committee in January and submit a formal request for financial resources. We need to start attaching the words with dollars as we link to the plan. This body still has a lot of work to do in the coming months.

Dr. Nunna asked if it is possible that they (JSA) could come up with a mobile app related to the plan. Dr. Clayton-Pedersen really liked the idea and would keep it in mind as they moved forward.

Chair Matson stated that the committee would return to the launch and implementation of the plan in January. However, there was still work to be done on the language and asked the committee to submit their feedback and preamble comments if they haven't done so already.

Dr. Clayton-Pedersen reviewed the plan and felt that it was quite technical. What is the purpose and goal? Chair Matson clarified that we do need a formal document and that document should reflect some of the formality and importance of this work both for internal and external audiences. Therefore, some of the technical components need to be included. The preamble should briefly explain why and how we got to where we are.

The collateral pieces will contain a different type of preamble, one where it is contained in a few sentences. They also might contain a "welcome" message in multiple languages. Ms. Brown added that the collateral pieces should include a general statement that provides audiences an opportunity to receive the information in an alternate format. She will forward a sample statement. The intent is to have the collateral materials ready in January.

There will be a meeting in December to briefly discuss where we are. In January we will come back together and possibly begin working on the lay out for the next six to twelve months.

Meeting adjourned at 5 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™
- *Cultural Competence*: The state of having and applying knowledge and skill in four areas: awareness of one’s own cultural worldview; recognition of one’s attitudes toward cultural differences; realization of different cultural practices and worldviews; and thoughtfulness in cross-cultural interaction. Over an extended period of time individuals and organizations develop the wisdom and capability to: 1) examine critically how cultural worldviews influence perceptions of power, dominance and inequality; and 2) behave honorably within the complex dynamics of differences and commonalities among humans, groups and systems.

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: Tuesday, December 11th, from 11:30 a.m. – 5:00 p.m. in the Vintage Room