

President's Commission on Human Relations & Equity

Meeting Notes

Tuesday, March 13, 2012

---

**Present:**

Juanita Aguilar  
Ambar Alvarez-Soto  
Janice Brown  
Alex Espinoza  
Israel Lara  
Dawn Lewis

Natalie Nakic  
Ram Nunna  
Paul Oliaro  
Francine Oputa  
Jan Parten  
Carlos Perez

Jenelle Pitt  
Elizabeth Potter  
Cindy Teniente-Matson  
Ted Wendt  
Nina Palomino

**Absent:**

Joe De Los Santos  
Selena Farnesi  
Juanita Flores-Muniz

Juan Carlos Gonzalez  
Tina Leimer  
Teresa Huerta

Vongsavanh Mouanoutoua

**1:00 p.m. – 3:00 pm**

**Haak Center Boardroom, HML 4115**

Meeting called to order at 1:10 p.m.

**I. Welcome**

Chair Cindy Teniente-Matson welcomed the committee and provided a brief overview of the agenda items.

**II. PCHRE**

**A. Approval of Minutes from 3/2/12**

It was MSC to approve the minutes of the March 2, 2012 meeting.

**B. Alma's Exemplar**

The committee consulted with Alma Clayton-Pedersen regarding the newly drafted comprehensive plan, which contained content representing all five themes of the committee's original document.

Alma explained that her ultimate goal was to provide a narrative document in which the committee could view the framing of the following objectives: awareness, knowledge and capacity. The revised format permitted the committee to review the content to ensure that it included all distinct areas of work that needed to be captured, and to also assist in eliminating any unnecessary repetition.

Chair Teniente-Matson summarized Alma's overview stating that she took the committee's material and re-casted it in a way that she thought was logical and clear.

Alma mentioned that there was one theme eliminated. She explained that the eliminated theme did not have enough content to retain the narrative framing. She informed the committee that when international issues are separated out, they are really easy for people to focus on those issues versus domestic diversities. Although there was not enough content to leave as a stand-alone theme, combining it with the other themes strengthened the content. The themes were indicated in red font and they have been integrated within the four themes that remain within the document.

Chair Teniente-Matson then requested that Alma provide an overview of the draft version of theme one. Alma emphasized that her first goal was to identify the target audience for the actions and try to reframe it in a way to make it consistent throughout the document. She attempted to capture all of the committee's work; however, she is not certain if she has done "justice" to all of the committee's ideas. Throughout each theme, she tried to maintain a broad view of the target population and what the committee was trying to address with that target population.

Chair Teniente-Matson requested that the committee review the objectives of themes one and four to ensure that the draft document accurately reflected what the committee intends to accomplish in the respective areas.

While the committee was reviewing the themes, Alma quickly mentioned that she drafted an overview; however, she is still in the process of finalizing an initial draft. She would like to obtain the committee's feedback of the draft document prior to creating a comprehensive and thorough vision.

Paul Oliaro was concerned about the focus of theme one. The revised version of theme one seemed to focus on information gathering, assessment, and surveys, as well as communicating information to the various populations. There was less content for activities for specific interventions that were included previously that have proven to be successful in increasing both student retention and success.

Alma addressed Paul's concern. She requested that the committee review theme three. There were a lot of actions embedded in theme three that focused on the High Impact Educational Practices and Principles of Excellence so that if the university implements these practices and principles, the programs and practices that Paul mentioned would be included in that section. She was trying to show that the university already has these programs so they should be examined to determine which ones work best and "beef up" those that work and eliminate the ones that are not working.

Paul explained that the Student Success Task Force has already done some of the work that Alma suggested. There have been a number of interventions that have been implemented over the last eight years. Tina Leimer has shepherded the programs so that those kinds of assessments are evaluated on a regular basis. As a result, some programs have been dropped, others have been enhanced, and some have been initiated.

Chair Teniente-Matson emphasized that the committee does not want to go backwards. The committee wants to be careful about the wording that is laid out in the plan. There are some practices that the university has already implemented, and the committee does not want to lay it out in such a context that it appears that the university is not doing them. Therefore, in this particular area, the committee offered feedback that the narrative should be more focused on either the continuation and/or the heightened awareness of the new interventions because the university is further along in this area.

Paul mentioned that the plan will be on-going. Assessment is a central theme within the Student Success Task Force. The task force's work will never be done because there is constant evaluation of the impact of various interventions, as well as the monitoring of the progress of overall graduation rates, and in particular, the retention and graduation rates of individual underrepresented minority groups.

Chair Teniente-Matson then requested that Paul review the knowledge objective. She stated that the wording within the document appeared to be accurate and aligned with what the university will continue to do. In the strategy section, the university would want to increase the number of those individuals engaging in outreach. Paul agreed.

Alma provided feedback regarding the discussion. She stated that it appeared that the language was "deficit minded" and focused on programs that targeted underrepresented minority students. She explained that this language could create a stereotypical notion of who those students are. In an effort to prevent this notion, she tried to broaden the thinking about what the committee is trying to do generally with the campus, while providing an emphasis on underserved or underrepresented students. She was not trying to stigmatize the work that is currently occurring with specific students, but rather recognize that many students need help.

Furthermore, she mentioned that there needs to be particular attention in monitoring students that have historically been underserved or underrepresented.

Paul agreed with Alma and said she was right on target. The task force has not targeted specific groups, but has focused on all kinds of different interventions that affect all students. There has been an emphasis on underrepresented groups in ensuring that they are aware of intervention programs so that they take advantage of them.

Alma also added that the university should be proactive and intentional in drawing students in to the intervention programs. Paul agreed.

Chair Teniente-Matson suggested that the strategy under the awareness objective needs to be enhanced and/or changed. She noted that the knowledge objective and strategy were fine as written. The capacity objective was okay as written; however, she recommended amending the strategy. Paul agreed with Chair Teniente-Matson. He mentioned that the wording just needs to be tweaked.

Chair Teniente-Matson asked for additional feedback. No additional feedback was provided. She asked Alma to discuss her draft work for theme two.

Alma stated that theme two was one of the most difficult themes to pull together because there was a lot of content/ideas. The draft focused on employees and not necessarily faculty, but faculty are included in some ways. She used the term workforce within the document; however, she thought it was important to include the language around faculty. It was important to mention faculty because it is focused on supporting the work.

Alma also noted that there is an absence of any mention of additional funding through resources or any other kind of resources in any other themes. She did this purposefully because it is an area that is so important that it needs to be listed out. This could be accomplished by either including it in a vision statement (with a bigger goal of whatever the preamble is going to be) and/or in a conclusion statement. The community needs to recognize that this is an important endeavor and it touches everybody enough to figure out a way to reallocate or identify external resources to get this work underway with adequate resources to achieve success.

Chair Teniente-Matson reminded the committee that another thing to consider around resources is that there is Annual Strategic Plan Fund and this type of work would be eligible to compete for funding. She then asked for the committee's feedback regarding theme two.

Ted Wendt expressed concern regarding action item one located within the capacity objective. The narrative focused on region recruitment; however, the university recruits nationally. He explained that the wording is written in a way that it appears that the university is trying to meet a quota. He then stated that searches are not regionalized.

Alma responded by clarifying that it could be reworded to read "region and national" or "region and nation". Her goal was trying to communicate a vision of a diverse campus. There has to be an explicitness that is taken to the broader community, regional or national, that the plan focuses on creating a diverse community for reasons of innovation, creativity, and productivity. Not just to create a diverse community.

Ted Wendt recommended that the language be more expansive. Alma suggested adding the word "nation". There was some discussion regarding the regional and national recruitment of faculty and staff.

Jan Parten explained that the university recruits administrators both regionally and nationally. She believed that Ted accurately stated that the university recruits widely for the most qualified, and that the most qualified represent the applicant pool that the university has in the region. There is no specific targeting for that, because of Prop 209, as that is not an acceptable hiring process for the institution. She also expressed concern about the wording in the capacity objective. All faculty, staff, and administrative searches include an EEO

designee that are charged with ensuring that the university is promoting and are following policies and procedures in a broad sense. She explained that the university is already doing this; however, the university could do them better. For example, there could be additional training and/or activities that the university will benefit from. She is concerned because the wording implies that perhaps the university is void of these types of activities.

Chair Teniente-Matson asked Jan if she was requesting a specific word change. Alma stated that she could work on rewording this section.

Israel Lara informed the committee that he liked the wording of the capacity objective. The narrative was worded in such a way that it communicates a clear message to administrators, faculty, and staff. On the other hand, he understood the concerns related to Prop 209. He also agreed with the concerns from Ted and Jan, and perhaps their suggestions for rewording could be incorporated into the document. He recommended that the narrative to stay as is.

Francine Oputa agreed with Israel, however, she also understood Ted and Jan's concern. She emphasized that the narrative needs to be as strong as possible to communicate a clear message that diversity is important. She added that in order to have a diverse workforce, there must be a diverse applicant pool for faculty, staff and administrators.

Chair Teniente-Matson suggested that Israel and Francine's concerns could possibly be addressed in the action statements.

Israel added that the university should understand and/or do their due diligence to reflect the diversity within the region. He understood Jan and Ted's concerns; however, he feels the diversity should reflect the region.

Chair Teniente-Matson requested further comments. There weren't any additional comments. She once again stated that the actions might need to be stronger in what the university aspires to do. The other narrative could be "softened" so that it is worded appropriately.

Alma warned the committee that the wording needs to be clear when talking about "qualified applicants". She expressed that the committee needs to expand and see differently about how excellence is brought to the academy. The language embedded within the document is walking a line between getting a broadly diverse campus community while seeing excellence differently. She requested that the committee to reflect on this statement. She further added that a campus community cannot achieve excellence without having a diverse community. It is important to create an environment in which a broad range of diversity see themselves at the university.

Jan supported Alma's statements. On the other hand, she is concerned that some words do not necessarily reflect a broad range of diversity. Alma provided examples of reasons as to why it is important that the language remain as written, but within the parameters of the law.

Israel further added that the plan is about developing a blue print for the future. He emphasized that the content of the document should be clear that diversity is important. The language should reflect the fact that diversity is embraced on campus and not shunned away. Diversity should be part of a university's mission and vision to have students of color come to a campus, and there should also be a nurturing environment.

Jenelle Pitt shared a personal experience with the committee. She stated that she appreciated Alma's passion for the voice she is lending regarding the diversity plan. She agrees with Jan regarding the language, but she would also like to see clear communication in the wording used in the diversity plan.

Chair Teniente-Matson thanked Jenelle for sharing her personal experience with the committee.

Francine Oputa commented on the importance of the words within the document. She stated that language has to be clear because people are looking at the language to see if they are welcome at the university.

Chair Teniente-Matson requested additional comments. The committee did not provide any additional comments regarding theme two. She then asked the committee to focus on theme five. Alma stated that she has not made any additional updates to theme five.

Chair Teniente-Matson explained that theme five was discussed thoroughly at the last meeting. She explained that it was now time for the committee to review theme five in its totality and see if it makes sense. The committee should expect to review the document in its totality as part of a homework assignment.

Chair Teniente-Matson then requested that the committee review theme three.

Alma provided a brief overview of her work. She informed the committee that she divided the awareness objective in two different sets of strategies and actions. She thought it was important to be explicit on what the university was trying to do, but it was too hard to put the language into one statement.

Alma stated that it was difficult to ensure that she held on to the fidelity of the content of the narrative provided from the subcommittee. She asked that the subcommittee to provide feedback to see if she has done “justice” in capturing the concepts and ideas that were provided. She informed the committee that the set of ideas within the capacity objective were not presented in the subcommittee’s original narrative. She added them because she felt there needed to be ideas to move forward and there also needed to be some guidance in to how to get them accomplished. She provided strategies to start small and work outward.

Chair Teniente-Matson explained that she liked the way that the strategies included students and it laid out the expectations for students with the faculty. It aligned with several concepts that the university is currently promoting.

Dawn Lewis questioned the content regarding students being able to value diversity and inclusion. She asked Alma if it was still included in the document. Alma responded stating that it was included in several places in the document. One location was in the indicators of progress under the awareness objective.

Janice Brown expressed concern regarding the lack of presence of universal design within theme three in the document. Alma explained that universal design was discussed in theme five. There was some discussion of which theme should include universal design. Alma said she would ensure that it get included in theme three; however, she asked the committee where it should be placed within the theme.

Jan recommended placing the item in the awareness objective in section one item number two. Janice said that universal design is not a tool, but rather a concept. There was some debate amongst the committee of where to place universal design.

Chair Teniente-Matson recommended that Janice email Alma some specificity about universal design so that she can decide where to place it within the document. Ram Nunna suggested placing the item in the awareness objective narrative. Alma disagreed with placing it in the awareness objective, but she will work on placing it within theme three.

Ram Nunna requested that the group review the indicators. He recommended that the second indicator be removed from the document.

There was a detailed discussion regarding the second indicator. Alma explained that the indicator is in the document to reward faculty for doing work of including diversity. One way to reward is to tie to tenure and promotion. She explained that there has to be some incentives aligned with motivating faculty.

Carlos Perez agreed with Alma. He stated that there has to be an incentive for professors to put diversity into the classes.

There was some discussion regarding the utilization of surveys that include additional questions related to diversity, either composed by the department at large or the individual faculty member.

Alma explained that there needs to be a way to capture students' reactions because it provides two things: 1) that the students got value of it or not and 2) if they did get value of it, then it should be counted for whatever matters to them. In this case, it would be student evaluations.

Dawn agreed that there should be an evaluation to accurately capture the effort that faculty are making. She does not know if it should necessarily be in the evaluation process. She recommends another format to use as an assessment.

Alma stated once again stated that there needs to be some kind of format. She was concerned that it needs to be tied to things that matter to faculty or there will not be any incentive for faculty to do it. Dawn recommended getting the faculty committee members together to discuss a possible incentive. Alex Espinoza agreed that there needs to an incentive.

Alma reminded the committee that theme three was built on the notion of starting small and doing infusion work. As success is achieved then that is broadened out to the broader campus. It is not going to be infused campus wide immediately. Even if it is only a small group of pioneers who add it to the evaluation, it provides data to suggest the scale of whatever it is that they are doing. The university has to start by having a small group of pioneers lead the effort and be compensated, not necessarily monetarily. There has to be something of value for the pioneers to undertake the theme.

Cynthia Teniente-Matson requested further comments. Ram commented that if the RTP process will be the process used as a reward system then it would not capture all faculty. If the committee wants the process to affect everyone, then he does not think the RTP process will work.

Alma reminded the committee that there is not going to be a program that will affect everybody. The committee needs to keep in mind that the process has to start in a way that increases the potential of having a broad impact. She explained that there probably won't ever be one-hundred percent participation.

Jan asked the committee to review action four within awareness objective of theme two. She stated that one idea is to consider the Provost's Awards as an incentive to faculty. Although it does not link entirely to RTP, it does link to recognition, promoting, and rewarding actions with a monetary reward of some sort. If it is not in the evaluation process, the Provost's Awards are a way that it could be recognized/rewarded monetarily

Ted provided a brief overview of the Provost's Awards process. He thought it could be a possible to ask the Provost to consider adding a category related to diversity.

Chair Teniente-Matson further added that it appeared that we have some room to build on processes that we are already doing on campus. She asked the committee if they had any other comments/feedback for Alma. There weren't any additional comments provided.

Chair Teniente-Matson requested that the committee review the draft document and send the comments, reactions and thoughts to Nina Palomino by March 20. The feedback will be compiled into a coordinated voice to share with Alma about where the committee see's the plan coming together. She reminded the committee that there will still be another chance to review the document again with everyone's comments on March 27, when Alma returns for her campus visit. She expressed that it is important that all committee members are comfortable and familiar with the content of the document.

Chair Teniente-Matson asked if it was feasible to submit responses by March 20. The committee agreed.

**Other:**

**a) Consultation Groups – Nomination/Potential Volunteer List**

Chair Teniente-Matson requested that the committee review the revised consultation groups list to ensure that all groups have been captured. The list was revised based on feedback from the March 2 committee meeting. She also requested that the committee review the names of the volunteers/potential volunteers to ensure that the names were accurate.

There were a few minor additions. The revisions will be incorporated into the document and an updated list will be provided at the next committee meeting. The committee will discuss the revised list at the next meeting.

**b) Alma’s Visit – March 27**

Chair Teniente-Matson reminded the committee that Alma’s next visit is scheduled for March 27. She emphasized that this was an important meeting and encouraged the committee members to avail themselves to participate. In addition to the full committee meeting, the steering committee will also meet with Alma. If needed, private and/or group meetings can also be arranged. The goal is to wrap up the draft, if it is ready, as well as discuss training efforts to prepare for an April launch. At the meeting, the committee will also discuss the possibility of having the final plan available in multiple languages.

**III. Diversity Definitions**

- *Diversity*: Individual differences (e.g., personality, learning styles, and life experiences) and group/social differences (e.g., race/ethnicity, class, gender, sexual orientation, country of origin, and ability 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:** Tuesday, March 27<sup>th</sup>, from 2:00 – 4:00 p.m. in the Henry Madden Library, Room 3212