

**Senate Equity, Inclusion, and Anti-Discriminatory Advocacy Committee
Meeting Minutes**

January 17, 2014

Present: Ellen Ansell, Chair, Claude Mauk, Co-Chair; Marilyn Hravnak, Secretary;
Carey D. Balaban, Erkan Bayir, David Beck, Meg Mayer-Costa, Paula K. Davis, Linda Frank, Randy Juhl, Carol W. Mohamed, Cindy Popovich

Not Present: Brandon Benjamin, Charles Bonge, Deborah Brake, Irene Frieze, Kathy W. Humphrey, Jahmaiah Lewis, Gordan Louderback, Brady McCormick, Sharon Nelson-Le Gall, Burcu Savun, Katherine Seelman, Michael Spring, Luis Vallejo, Bruce Venarde, Kelly Williams.

The meeting was convened on January 17, 2014 in Room 826 Cathedral of Learning by Co-Chair Mauk.

I. MEETING MINUTES APPROVAL

The meeting minutes of December 13, 2013 were unanimously approved with the following correction.

A. Gender Equity, Inclusion & Discrimination (formerly the Gender Discrimination Initiatives Subcommittee) (Ansell Chair)

As written: The question arose as to what is disseminated regarding the lactation rooms to new faculty, staff and students.....The WG will contact **xxx** to inquire if this information is included in orientation for these groups.

Change: The name is: **Laurie Kirsch (VP for Faculty Development)**.

The minutes were then unanimously approved by attending members with the above amendment.

II. REPORT FROM WORKING GROUPS

A. Gender Minority Concerns—Venarde WG Chair was not present; he reported via email to Ansell that the WG did not meet this month.

B. Gender Equity, Inclusion & Discrimination--Ansell WG Chair reported no meeting this month

C. Academic Experience Beyond Mid-Life—Vallejo WG Chair not present; WG did not meet this month (per Hravnak WG member)

III. CONTINUATION OF DISCUSSION OF EIADAC GOALS

A. Enlisting Speakers

1. Topical Areas for which to Invite Speakers.

At the last meeting, there were 3-4 areas where the EIADAC felt we would invite speakers to speak to the Committee on the following topics. The report below summarizes the discussion regarding which topics to choose for speaker invitations for the remainder of the academic year, how the topic might be focused, and who would be invited to speak.

Topical Area 1. Diverse Faculty recruitment and retention

Alan M. Pittler from the Office of General Counsel and Carol Mohamed from the office of Affirmative Action, Diversity and Inclusion will be invited to speak on this topic, with the focus on an overview of law and practice in diverse faculty recruitment and retention. This would include processes for recruitment and interviewing, and retention activities such as promotion and tenure.

Topical Area 2. Dignity and Respect Standards in the Workplace.

Carol Mohamed and Paula Davis have a workshop that they offer on bullying in the workplace, and they are willing to expand that topic to provide Dignity and Respect in the Workplace as the framework, since bullying can be interpreted as a lack thereof.

Topical Area 3. Anti-Harassment. Although also under the umbrella of “Dignity and Respect in the Workplace”, there was discussion regarding the newly developed but not yet deployed online training for “Anti-Harassment” which replaces the current “Sexual Harassment” training. As reported by Balaban, the new training is broader (goes beyond sexual harassment), is more interactive, and leads the learner through different paths and decision trees in a variety of scenarios. According to Balaban, the strength of the new training is that a) it is more individualized for the learner, and b) provides for situations that can be less clear-cut and more subtle in “crossing the line” than the prior training. All faculty and staff will be provided this training at some point in the future, but the committee thought it would be helpful for EIADAC to receive advance training. Members will, in future be provided with a link to complete this online. The EIADAC would like to have the opportunity to view this training and perhaps provide comment before the full rollout occurs.

Topical Area 4. Current Demographics and Future Trends in Student Enrollment. It was suggested that Mark Harding, Director of the Office of Undergraduate Admissions and Financial Aide, be invited to provide the EIADAC with an overview of current demographics and future trends in undergraduate student enrollment, and how they address these trends as well as concerns of equity and inclusion in recruitment and retention of students. To address the Graduate student population, Balaban notes that there is no one person who could report upon the Graduate Programs as this varies School by School dependent upon the focus area of the school and the nations/countries that have interest in the area. However, EIADAC could contact Alberta Sbragia, VP for Graduate Studies, regarding our interest in obtaining information in this regard, and for direction as to which resources would be most helpful to obtain this information (statistics from institutional research, University Fact Book).

2. Preferred Order of Topical Areas, Invitation of Speakers, and Presentation Allocation

Each of the topical areas above would be presented during EIADAC meetings for the remainder of the academic year, depending on speaker availability. In terms of order, Ansell suggested and the Committee agreed that Area 4, Student Demographics, should be first on the agenda due to its potential to inform the Committee’s strategic plan. Area 1, Diverse Faculty Recruitment and Retention, and Area 2, Dignity and Respect in the Workplace, would be arranged for once Area 4 is scheduled. Area 3, Anti-Harassment, is an online Module, and although provided as the education for a month to be assigned, could be completed outside of meeting time (the link would be provided to the EIADAC members ahead of time) and then discussed as a group during the meeting time.

Hravnak suggested that each educational session occupy up to but no greater than 45 minutes of the 1.5 hour EIADAC standing meeting time. The speakers would be directed to prepare no more than 25-30 minutes, with 15 minutes for discussion. This is important so that the other work of the EIADAC, including WG plans and reports, and other action items such as policy review, can still carry on.

The EIADAC Chair (Ansell) and Co-Chair (Mauk) will work to arrange for the 4 educational sessions above, and develop the schedule.

B. Strategies for EIADAC self-education regarding policies that have bearing on equity, inclusion and anti-discrimination.

1. Should a systematic process of policy reviews by EIADAC be operationalized?
2. How should such a process work?

C Proposed External Review of Policies

1. What is the purpose of external reviews?
2. Does this situation warrant external review?

Items B and C above had discussion initiated at the prior meeting. The group today addressed item C first, which was the most controversial at the prior meeting. This item, initiated at the last meeting by Ansell and Mauk, was their suggestion proposing external independent review of our policies. In this continued discussion, Balaban asked which policies would be asked to review? Frank asked how we would focus such a review, why, and who would pay for such services. Mohamed also gave several examples which, while in the development process, were brought to the Committee to seek input. In response, Ansell cited the precedent of inviting outside review of academic programs

Hravnak noted that perhaps an initial step would be for EIADAC to develop our own internal process for rotational review of policies. The EIADAC discussed how this could be approached. Included would be a process for determining 1) which body of policies would be under review, 2) from that body of policies, how we would determine which of those policies would potentially have an impact on equity, inclusion and anti-discrimination, 3) development of a list of those policies of potential impact, and then 4) what our procedure and metrics would be for internal review of these policies. Once we are better able to determine which policies are of import, the types of information we seek to capture, and whether or which policies or groups of have equity, inclusion and anti-discrimination impact, we would be better able to assess how external review would add value, and how such a review would be directed, requested and planned for if needed.

Ansell asked Balaban to explain how University approaches policy review in general—is it situational or is there a systematic process? Balaban responded that there is not a process for systematic review, but the review and update of policies is based upon upcoming or occurring situations and frequency of use.

The EIADAC then discussed how we might develop a systematic process for EIADAC policy review. Frank suggested that we first conduct a case study—take one policy (or group of policies around a topic), and determine how we would organize a review of the policy, how the review would be focused, and how we would assess equity, inclusion and anti-discrimination in the review.

The EIADAC was in favor of such an approach, and Ansell suggested we start with disability and housing as the first policy area for the case study. Advice could be sought from James Earle (Associate Vice Chancellor (housing)) and Lynnett Van Slyke, Director Disability Resources and Services, and a representative from Students for Disability Advocacy.

The next steps in planning this initiative will be to

1. Ask Kathy Humphrey which policies might be impacted by this broad topical area.
2. Ask for Kathy and the advisors noted above to meet with us to discuss these policies.
3. Use this case study to develop a system for our internal EIADAC policy review—which policies, when, how (process, metrics), by whom.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

Hravnak noted that there are a number of EIADAC members who have never attended a meeting, and the policy that repeated nonattendance warrants removal. After discussion, Hravnak will prepare a list of individuals who did not attend 3 consecutive meetings from September thru January for Ansell to review.

V. NEXT MEETING

A. February 21, 826 COL, 2-3:30pm

B. Work of the WGs—Each WG will be asked to report on the following:

1. Hold a working group meeting to determine priorities for your action plans
2. Determine the types of information and data the group will collect, store, archive and report upon.
3. Be prepared to report on efforts at the February meetings

The meeting was adjourned at 3:16 pm

**Respectfully submitted,
Marilyn Hravnak
EIADAC Secretary**