President's Commission on Human Relations & Equity

Meeting Notes

Friday, March 2, 2012

Present:

Juanita Aguilar	Tina Leimer	Jenelle Pitt *(via phone)*
Ambar Alvarez-Soto	Dawn Lewis	Elizabeth Potter
Janice Brown	Ram Nunna	Cindy Teniente-Matson
Alex Espinoza	Francine Oputa	Ted Wendt
Selena Farnesi	Jan Parten	Nina Palomino
Juan Carlos Gonzalez	Carlos Perez	

Absent:

Joe De Los Santos	Israel Lara	Paul Oliaro
Juanita Flores-Muniz	Vongsavanh Mouanoutoua	
Teresa Huerta	Natalie Nakic	

1:00 p.m. – 3:00 pm   **Haak Center Boardroom, HML 4115**

Meeting called to order at 1:15 p.m.

I. Welcome

Chair Cindy Teniente-Matson welcomed the committee and immediately began reviewing the agenda items.

II. PCHRE

A. Approval of Minutes from 2/2/12 and 2/17/12

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

It was MSC to approve the minutes of the February 17, 2012 meeting with minor edits to the second paragraph in agenda item II.

B. Alma's Exemplar

Chair Cynthia Teniente Matson explained that the committee would begin the first agenda item by consulting with Alma Clayton-Pedersen. Chair Teniente-Matson provided a brief summary of previous committee meetings. As a committee, there have been a couple of ideas being explored to move from a theme-based document into an actual plan. The committee had previously reviewed four models of diversity plans; however, the committee is most interested in the UCLA and Chico State model. Although there has not been an agreement on the use of either model, these two seem to be possible options to assist the committee in moving from a theme-based document to a plan.

She also mentioned that in reviewing the five themes that the committee created, there appeared to be some overlap and integration woven in between the various themes. The committee realizes that it is important to integrate the themes in order to get to a working document. As a result, the committee will continue the consultation process with Alma to assist the committee in getting to an outcome. Based on conversations and feedback from the steering committee, Alma has begun an exploration process for a model that may work for the university's diversity plan. On today's call, Alma will begin to walk the committee through her frame of thinking using the committee's framework and the initiation of a discussion of what works and what does not work. Alma will attempt to explain what she is trying to do so that the committee can understand the process.

Chair Teniente-Matson explained that all committee members have a copy of the draft document that Alma created. She then asked Alma to comment on how she sees the document coming together from her perspective. Alma explained that she was only focusing on theme five and noticed that it contained a lot of text. Alma explained that she had to look at all of the text overall to make sure that when the document is rolled out it is in a coherent context. In order to work from a frame of reference, she provided a vision statement, objectives, strategies, actions, and indicators of progress. This structure provides the framing for the text and discussion to be consistent and coherent. She mentioned that there is a lot of overlap. She tried to take the bullets that were given to her and put it in a framework that made sense for her to write about. The framing was a way to think about what it is the university has to do to implement the plan.

Alma emphasized that the document she provided was a "first" draft. It is a complicated process to bring all five themes together so that there is coherence across the whole.

Chair Teniente-Matson shared her reactions and comments. She explained that she is thankful that the committee now has a working document. The document helped her remember and reflect on the fact that there still is a lot of overlap and lot of text that we are still working with. Chair Teniente-Matson was alarmed about the length; however, she realized that Alma had integrated all of the text that the committee provided. She mentioned that the document would need to undergo a thinning process as the committee gets closer to a final comprehensive document. She explained that this document gives the committee an idea of a model for the plan. She reminded the committee that in the last meeting there was some discussion about the models used at Chico State, which is short and skim, and UCLA, which is somewhere in between and has a lot more text and explanations. If the committee likes the format provided by Alma, there will be some culling.

Chair Teniente-Matson was concerned that the committee's initial framework was lost in the working document. The document contains a long vision statement, but the document doesn't have a goal. An option is to have the vision statement become the goal statement to maintain the committee's original objectives, indicators, strategies, and actions. As the committee reviews the draft document, she would like to hear feedback from the committee on how to move forward. She recommends that the committee maintain the model of goals, objectives, indicators, strategies, and actions to be consistent with the strategic plan.

She paused and asked the committee to review the draft and provide feedback to Alma, while expressing the fact that the committee needs to keep moving forward.

Ted Wendt reminded the committee that the steering committee "steered" Alma in the direction of selecting the longest goal/section as a starting point. He stated that he is not concerned that all goals/themes remain the same length. It does not necessarily mean anything that the goals/themes may end up in different lengths. He also mentioned that he does not mind the fact that the narrative is lengthy. The length emphasizes the importance of the theme, and perhaps bullets are not the appropriate method to convey the complex narrative of a diversity plan. He mentioned that he favored the model Penn State used for their diversity plan.

Juan Carlos Gonzalez also commented on the draft narrative provided. He liked the content provided in the document, however, he was concerned about the length. He stated that it may not appeal to all university constituents. He recommends providing both a lengthy document and an executive summary so that the length is appealing to all audiences.

Dawn Lewis agreed with both Ted and Juan Carlos. She stated that the committee should not limit the length of the narrative provided. The document will be written to try to change a culture on a campus and the narrative should be as lengthy as necessary to convey the importance of the plan and how the university will access it. She agreed that both versions are needed to appeal to the

university community. She also pointed out that she liked the content of the vision statements, and they could possibly be pulled out as a preamble to the plan.

Tina Leimer agreed with Dawn regarding the complexity in changing a campus culture. In her experience with conveying complex information to people is that they want shorter documents to review. She agreed with the other committee members recommending an executive summary to complement the narrative of the plan.

Selena Farnesi stated that a comprehensive document is fine but in order to change the campus culture, the document needs to be accessible and in a user-friendly version. She emphasized that the document should have some flexibility. Chair Teniente-Matson agreed that the document would be morphing throughout time.

Janice Brown mentioned that there should be some flexibility in the document to turn it into something that everyone can use. She agreed with the other committee members, but she also stressed that we need to utilize various tools to reach the various audiences. She described the executive summary as priceless.

Alma agreed with all of the committee's responses/feedback. The more detailed document needs to be accessible to all audiences. She explained that the document should not be an either/or, but rather it is an executive summary, lengthy narrative and possibly more. The document can also be tailored with different components to accommodate the role of the different groups of the campus community.

Chair Teniente-Matson felt the conversation provided clarity on the variety of documents that may need to be produced to be useful for various audiences. Alma once again expressed that the detail document should remain rather than producing a document with bullets.

Chair Teniente-Matson then requested that the committee focus on the content of the document. She explained that there was overlap and repetitive statements. She asked Alma if there was still some concern regarding the repetitiveness in the document.

Alma highlighted the fact that the dimensions are no longer in the document. She mentioned that there is enough overlap in the document and the committee needs to re-frame content to capture the committee's language. The committee does not need to go back to the over-arching dimensions. For example, there is a lot of content in the document that addresses the campus climate issues. She explained that it is time for the committee to look at the document in a holistic view rather than in the various themes. Themes that are closely tied should not necessarily be eliminated, but could possibly be combined to similar themes to reduce overlap.

Chair Teniente-Matson asked for the committee's feedback for moving forward regarding the overlap within the document. The committee needs to provide direction for Alma on how to proceed with the overlap that the committee provided within the themes. The committee did not remove the overlap and duplication so that the subcommittee's work did not disappear. Therefore, the committee needs to reach agreement on how Alma should proceed, by reducing overlap but not losing the context.

Ted expressed concern regarding removing the overlap. He provided an example to illustrate the problem with dropping context from one theme just for the sake of reducing overlap. Alma responded by reminding the committee to look at the document holistically. She explained that there needs to be an overarching vision. She will do everything she can to retain the committee's original essence of what is being communicated in the document; however, she needs the committee to agree on the direction how she should proceed.

Juan Carlos stated that he agreed with the elimination of overlap, especially if there need to be a balance to achieve content across all themes. He understands that all of the content can't be kept for the final document, but he would like the majority of the content to remain.

Alma agreed and stated that duplications are necessary, but the content needs to be tweaked so that it is seen differently. The document should not raise questions.

Janice reminded the committee of Tina's previous idea of placing duplications in a principles section. For example, there could be a section that could include basic principle to address a bigger picture versus individual actions or strategies.

Chair Teniente-Matson believed there was a basic consensus that the committee does not want to lose significant points within the document. There are some guiding principles that will overlay/weave through all of the themes and need to be addressed. The committee understands that everything will not remain in the document, but as long as the context of the committee's work is not lost then the committee is okay with Alma moving forward with the document. Chair Teniente-Matson encouraged Alma to keep thinking of the document in a holistic way in order to pull the document together. She explained that sticking to the committee's original themed work is helpful, but it does not have to be exact.

Alma informed the committee that she was concerned about having a document that comes together as a way as seen as coherent and comprehensive. She explained that committee has to be careful to not create different silos within the document, as those hinder synergy. She will try to capture all content either (or both) within a vision statement or a series of bold statements.

Chair Teniente- Matson reminded the committee that the document could always be changed at a later time. Juan Carlos and Alex Espinoza agreed that Alma should be given a "full license" to pull the document together. The committee did not provide any counter opinions or approaches. The committee agreed to provide Alma with a "full license" to proceed and pull the document together.

Chair Teniente-Matson then asked Alma to comment on the objectives: awareness, knowledge, and capacity/experience.

Alma provided working definitions for each of the objectives. She asked the committee to begin to think about environmental forces that may get in the way of the implementation of the plan. She requested that the committee keep these potential resisters in mind while reading the document, specifically the actions and strategies. Alma explained that the three objectives awareness, knowledge, and capacity/experience are explaining how she built/thinks about the work and how she writes about it.

Chair Teniente-Matson called for additional feedback from the entire committee. There weren't any additional comments.

Other:

a) **Update from the Education and Scholarship Group**

    Chair Teniente-Matson asked Dawn to provide a highlight of what the subcommittee accomplished. Dawn reported that the committee first reviewed Alma's framework. When the subcommittee initially met, they realized there was a lot of content on faculty capacity but there wasn't much on learning, ability and experience from the three portions of Alma's framework. The subcommittee came up with additional material, organized it in clear objectives, and went

through and revised the original content. Given the current budget, the committee was careful when referring to items that had incentives and funding. Those items were changed to support due to the fact that support can also mean encouragement, rather than monetary incentives. Dawn's main concern is taking the document and placing each item under the appropriate objective so that it looks coherent. The document is now ready for the committee's input.

Chair Teniente-Matson asked the committee to react to Dawn's request for input for the committee.

Janice expressed concern regarding objective five and the deletion of universal design. She believed the item should remain in the document. Dawn suggested that Janice attempt to revise the document to include it in the objective. Janice agreed to revise the wording.

Jan Parten reminded the committee that universal design was also included in the subcommittee's work from recruiting, developing, and supporting faculty and staff. Chair Teniente-Matson stated that she will ensure Alma is aware that it is an important issue for the committee.

Ted Wendt requested that the committee review and consider rewording objectives four and eight. He is concerned that the wording of objective four implies a universal mandate and requested that it be reworded.

The committee recommended using wording such as encourage, reassure, support, promote, or encourage. There was a detailed discussion amongst the committee members regarding the wording of objective four and eight. After much discussion, Dawn suggested that Alma place objective eight into the preamble. The committee agreed.

Chair Teniente-Matson requested that Dawn work with Alma to reword objective four to address the concerns addressed by the committee. She requested that further revisions be sent to Dawn to incorporate into the document to send to Alma.

Juan Carlos expressed concern about of making objective five at the university level. Ram Nunna explained the importance of retaining the item at the school/college level based on research done by NSF. Dawn further explained the importance of leaving the item at the school/college level so that it is specific to the discipline where the faculty would be redesigning the courses and doing research that meets diversity and is meaningful to them. Ram stated that he would find the NSF report and share it with the committee.

Janice Brown retracted her recommended changes regarding universal design. She realized that items c and d were combined. Janice is okay with the wording as is.

Chair Teniente-Matson once again asked if there was additional feedback. Juan Carlos questioned objective five, item g. Dawn, Ram, and Chair Teniente-Matson stated that the item was transferred from the original document. Cynthia Teniente-Matson explained that the item was moved directly from goal three of the strategic plan to be incorporated into the diversity plan.

Dawn was concerned about retaining the wording of "central valley" because of the inclusion of the international and region; she changed the wording without specifically adding "the

central valley". Chair Teniente-Matson requested that Dawn explain her concerns to Alma and let her work it into the document.

Chair Teniente-Matson requested additional feedback but the committee did not have any further comments.

b) **Diversity Plan DRAFT Timeline**

Chair Teniente-Matson briefly reviewed the revised timeline that was updated based on feedback/suggestions from the February 17 meeting. She reviewed the March timeline stating the goal for the month is to prepare for Alma's visit. Alma will continue to work on the document and brief the steering committee at each of the future meetings. The goal is to finish the working draft so that there is a draft completed for review with the consultation groups. On March 27, the committee will finalize talking points, brief summaries, surveys, and/or PowerPoint presentations to use as resources for consultation. The April meetings are not as impacted because the group will be disbursed soliciting feedback from the consultation groups. The April meetings will consist of discussion of the feedback from the solicitation groups. Alma will return on April 26 to assist the committee in determining how to proceed and update the draft, if necessary, with all of the feedback from the campus community. In the month of May, the committee should be in the stages of starting to finalize a plan.

Chair Teniente-Matson asked the committee if there were any concerns with the timeline, but the committee did not have any concerns. She reminded the committee that the changes were minor.

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

Chair Teniente-Matson briefly reviewed the draft consultation groups list. She explained that the consultation groups list was compiled by the nominations from the PCHRE committee. This list does not necessarily mean that all groups are on the list; however, these were the groups that came up. At the steering committee meeting, the members began to nominate prospective/potential individuals that could possibly address the groups. The potential nominations/volunteer names on the list are a starting point for how the committee might populate the list.

Chair Teniente-Matson requested that the committee review the list and provide additional comments/concerns. Ram Nunna requested adding the Henry Madden Library to the list. Selena Farnesi requested adding a number of student groups. She recommends visiting groups independently versus in large forums. Selena will provide a comprehensive list of student groups that should be added to the list. Francine Oputa also requested adding the Social Work Student Association and the African American Social Workers.

Chair Teniente-Matson informed the committee that the groups would be added to the list. Francine Oputa recommended categorizing the groups the groups to combine some of the student group meetings. Dawn Lewis requested adding Paul Oliaro as a potential volunteer to the ASI/student groups. Janice Brown requested a general session for the disability related student groups such as Services for Students with Disabilities, rehabilitation, counseling, and special education.

Chair Teniente- Matson asked the committee if there were any other groups that need to be added to the list. Elizabeth Potter was concerned about adding community constituents. Chair

Teniente-Matson explained that the list included the University Advisory Board as well as the title community members. These two groups should encompass community constituents.

Francine requested adding the local chambers.

Chair Teniente-Matson then asked the committee to review the names that were nominated from the steering committee. There were a few minor changes. The edits/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.

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 13th, from 1:00 – 3:00 p.m. in the Haak Center Boardroom, HML 4115