UNIVERSITY-WIDE COUNCIL ON INCLUSIVENESS & COMMUNITY
Meeting of Friday, September 23, 2016
10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
Hornby 2

AGENDA

1. Membership, Nominations, & Co-facilitation

2. Council's Work on the Matrix (see attachment for latest version of the matrix)
a. Unfinished tasks
b. Completing the matrix
c. Report to community
d. Preparing the matrix for public dissemination

3. Reports from Working Groups
a. Academic Relations—Faculty Searches
b. Communications—Mission and Vision Statements
c. Student Resources—Setting an Agenda, Town Hall Meetings, & Fall Forum
d. Staff Resources—Work with Human Resources

4. Report from Ad Hoc Group
a. Campus Climate Survey—Rankin Survey
b. Options
(i) Alternate, similar survey to Rankin: The UCLA HERI's Diverse Learning Environments (DLE) survey captures student perceptions regarding the institutional climate, campus practices as experienced with faculty, staff, and peers, and student learning outcomes. Diverse student populations are at the center of the survey, and the instrument is based on studies of diverse student bodies and the complexity of issues that range from student mobility to intergroup relations. It is a good survey from a reputable source. However, it is written only for students, which is a major drawback. In addition, there is an $850 participation fee as well as a $3.25 charge per survey processed. A limited number of questions of our own can be added for an additional $350. Assuming this survey is administered to all students at the University, the cost begins to creep toward $15,000 without even addressing issues of faculty and staff.

(ii) Free surveys: A number of other surveys, such as the HEDS and ARC3 instruments, are free, but they address only sexual assault and do not address all the other items of interest to the UCIC. The Title IX Working Group will turn to these if UCIC chooses an instrument that does not address sexual assault or if the UCIC cannot come to a consensus on a survey.

(iii) <u>Creating and administering a survey in-house</u>. There are some universities, including University of Puget Sound, that wrote their own surveys. This was a long process, aided by a very willing and capable Institutional Researcher. If the UCIC wants to conduct an in-house survey, it would need to start with focus groups, create and do a pre-test of the instrument. Then it would need to establish the reliability and validity of the survey instrument. Without establishing the reliability and validity of the in-house survey it would be ill-advised to make any important policy decisions based on it. To do all this well will take much more time and willingness of people with expertise in survey design and statistical analysis skills to join the effort.

5.   North Star 20/20, Equity, Inclusion, and Diversity (see attachment)
a. How might UCIC's mission and vision dovetail with the North Star Plan?

6.   Equity, Inclusion, and Diversity Strategic Plan Research and Drafting
a.   Selecting members
b.   Members develop a process—possibly based on below

Model Outline of a Campus Diversity and Inclusion Plan

I.   **A Campus Diversity & Inclusion Vision/Mission Statement**
II.   **Current Campus Diversity & Inclusiveness Assessment – Frame a diversity agenda informed by an assessment of the current status of diversity and inclusiveness within the institution.**
III.   **Annual and Multi-Year Goals – Setting long- and short-term goals.**
IV.   **Strategic Diversity Action Plan and Implementation Strategies – Background, purpose and timeliness of each strategy and how the campus plans to develop a program or initiative supporting each goal using an implementation strategy. Strategies will impact faculty, staff, students and leadership in an effort to build an inclusive campus program and support for underrepresented segments of the campus population and campus diversity.**
V.   **Assessment and Evaluation – Initially provide current benchmarks and projected outcomes in as much detail as needed reflecting the work of departments, divisions or programs. Going forward, analyze the success or limitations the campus experienced in implementing its diversity plan and identify adjustments to improve future performance and goal attainment.**
VI.   **Summative Statement**

Williams, D.A., Clowney, C. A Stylus Briefing. "Effective Practices for Academic Leaders, Strategic Planning for Diversity and Organizational Change" Volume 2/issn 1554-0464 Issue 3/isbn 978-1-57922-165-2 March 2007.

7. Your Items for future meetings?

Minutes of the September 23, 2016 Meeting

Present: Robin Cooper, Sean Dunnington, Brent Geraty, Larry Gross, Priya Jha, Sheila Lloyd, Leela MadhavaRau, Jeff Martinez, Damara Miller, Ralph Olivas, Keith Osajima, Nora Pulskamp, Julie Rathbun, Zack Ritter, Marco Schindelmann, Tim Seiber, Ron Troup, Emma Wade, John Walsh

Unable to Attend: Wendell Barner, Janee Both-Gragg, Kamala Gollakota, Isabella Griffin, Dominique Lombardi, Ruijin Ma, Dennis Mclin, Charnese Patterson, Elana Rapp, Conroy Reynolds, Joseph Richardson, Avijit Sakar, Belinda Sandoval-Zazueta, James Warren

At 10: 18, Sheila Lloyd, at the suggestion of Brent Geraty, began the meeting with announcements of campus events related to equity, inclusion, and diversity and with a discussion of how to create spaces for students grappling with the national incidents concerning race and policing over the summer.

1. **Membership, Nominations, & Co-facilitation**

Sheila Lloyd estimated that the current membership on the Council to be 30 individuals, given attrition. Leela MadhavaRau wanted to know whether we could determine how many people are still interested in working on the Council. Sheila Lloyd reminded those present of the minimal requirements for membership as decided at the September 1st retreat—i.e., participation in a working group and EUREKA training. After considering their nomination, the Council members present approved Denise Spencer and Dominic Ravina as new members. Sheila Lloyd asked students to determine how to nominate students who would be willing to co-facilitate the Council with her and asked for a volunteer to conduct an electronic poll after nominations were submitted.

2. **Council's Work on the Matrix**
a. **Completing the matrix**

Robin Cooper pointed out that item 9 should be rewritten by the Counseling Center. Tim Seiber raised question concerning item 4 and whether all searches, including administrative searches, should have its members undergo implicit bias training. He noted that the answers to item 4 would require determining current search practices what could be done to improve the search processes. Jeff Martinez made those present aware of the range of practices including those in his area where only 1 or 2 people make decisions about hires. Brent Geraty reminded everyone that the University currently has a search for director of Human Resources and he said that the questions for candidates should include those related to inclusion and diversity. He raised the following points: whoever is making judgments on hiring should have experience and knowledge of implicit bias, that the Council needs to talk more to people who make hiring decisions not just to search committees, and that individuals, e.g., heads of departments, who make many hiring decisions should have the implicit bias training. He will make sure he understands search practices and will report back to the Council with recommendations. Robin asks Brent to report back on the level of influence and power that HR has in hiring across the campus.

b. **Report to community**

Sheila Lloyd made everyone aware that the Report to the Community is being revised by the Communications Working Group. She asked everyone to look for the revised draft in an email next month.

c. **Preparing the matrix for public dissemination**

Sheila Lloyd asked those present to email her about any outstanding issues on the matrix. Emma Wade wanted to know why the matrix is an internal document for the Council, and she clarified that Project Real rather than BLACC wrote the demands. Brent Geraty added that the Council's role is to tell the writers of the responses to the demands when their responses are inadequate and get them to update the responses so that the matrix can be shared. Tim Seiber recommended that rather than release responses to the matrix that we should list what has been accomplished and what is still being worked on. Sheila Lloyd requested that Brent discuss the matrix with the Cabinet and that Emma Wade talk to the authors of the demands to see whether additional revisions are necessary.

3. **Reports from Working Groups**
   a. **Academic Relations—Faculty Searches**

Keith Osajima reported on the progress that is being made on implicit bias training. He recommended that the Working Group share an email from Dean Kendrick Brown regarding STRIDE training at the University of Tennessee. Sheila Lloyd asked that the working group meet with the Curriculum Committees to discuss the Faculty Position Request area on diversity. Keith Osajima volunteered to contact the Curriculum Committee chairs.

   b. **Communications—Mission and Vision Statements**

Sheila Lloyd asked to table this until next meeting. Leela MadhavaRau passed out copies of the survey on the Mission and Vision Statements.

   c. **Student Resources—Setting an Agenda**

Sheila Lloyd noted that Student Resources Group is very large. She asked Tim Seiber to speak about possible goals for the Group to pursue this semester. Those goals would be to take North Star 2020 and consider the possibility of the Planning document for the UCIC Equity, Inclusion, and Diversity Strategic Plan and to look at diversity initiatives with different groups of students. Tim Seiber also asked that a student lead the Working Group. Emma Wade reported that she had met with Char about hosting regular town halls, which would allow community to air grievances or ask for information from the Cabinet about issues. Damara Miller wanted to know whether there would be a facilitator of these meetings or would there just be a passing of the mike, to which Emma Wade responded that she wanted to pass the mike and keep the meetings informal. Sheila Lloyd noted that more structure be considered. Sean Dunnington commented that sometimes answers to students demands for change isn't change, but just a list of what is currently happening. He wanted to know how we ensure change that matters instead of just airing complaints. Sheila Lloyd asked the Group to brainstorm topics for conversation at town halls. Emma Wade volunteered to work on this with Sean Dunnington.

   d. **Staff Resources—Work with Human Resources**

Larry Gross informed those present of the research that the Staff Resources Working Group has undertaken. Among the things that were discovered is that there are 4 levels of staff: non-exempt (time-cards), administrative (exempt) with little to no supervisory responsibilities, administrative with supervisory responsibilities, and upper administrators (Cabinet). He also mentioned contractors. The Working Group will mainly focus on the 1st 2 levels: non-exempt and exempt with no supervisory. The Group's action items will include meeting with HR on September 28th to look at classification system. The Group wants to give voice to staff concerns, so the members of the Group will identify staff organizations (e.g., URSA) and meet with them and assess the new URSA structure, which combines exempt and non-exempt employees. Sheila Lloyd encouraged the Group not to overstep bounds with respect to "giving voice" to staff.

4. Report from Ad Hoc Group

Campus Climate Survey—Rankin Survey favored by the Group over other options examined. The discussion of whether there are real alternatives to Rankin resulted in Sheila Lloyd asking for volunteers to meet with Dean Andrew Wall to discuss how to work with the Cabinet on recommendations for campus climate surveys. Priya Jha, Leela MadhavaRau, and Marco Schindelmann volunteered.

The meeting ended at 12:13.