## Title IX, Diversity, and Inclusion General EEO Committee Meeting – Via Zoom Friday, May 20, 2022 11:00 am – 12:00 pm

## **EEC Committee Members:**

Ahmadpour, Ali Justice, Lillian Alamillo, Lucy Kunisaki, Sheryl X Kushigemachi, Scott Andrade, Argelia Anzaldo, Carlos Kyte, Debbie Aramburo, Julieta X Langeveldt, Claire X Bailey, Nina Lemons, Marlow Baquir, Mari Levine, Georgi Baumunk. Jeff Marsh. Brandi Blada, Michael X McClelland, Darcie Bond, Breeanna McCoy, Roxanne Cervantes, Cynthia Miyashiro, Jane Morris, Wanda Chaney, Van Christophersen, Rick Patel, Dipte X Clemons, Lyn X Pineda, Carolyn X Dela Cruz, Chris Plum, Lavonne Fujiwara, Melissa X Reves, Idania Gonzalez, Ricky Robertson, Gary Rouse, Beverly Greco, Gary Gutierrez, Edith Russell, Elizabeth Gutierrez, Jorge Russell, Solomon Hernandez, Arturo Sabio, Sabra Hernandez, Maribel Sims, Jackie X Herrera Thomas, Hong Solarzano, Erika Herrera, Xocoyotzin Smith, Maria Herrschaft, Amy Toya, Greg Huynh, Tiffany X Unda, Viviana lino, Kelsev X Webb, Amanda X Ishikawa, Jaynie X Wells, Rex Josephides, Analu Williams, Robert

\_\_\_Youn, Yumi \_\_\_Young, Lashanta

## AGENDA

11:00 – 11:15am	Welcome and Overview
11:15 – 11:45am	<ul> <li>2022 EEO Plan</li> <li>2022-2025 EEO Plan Postponed 9 Months; Review Released Memo &amp; Guidance</li> <li>Board of Trustees Approved EEO Multiple Method Allocation Certification Form Due June 1, 2022</li> </ul>

11:45 – 12:00pm	<ul> <li>Fall 2022 Updates</li> <li>Pay for EEO Representatives</li> <li>Assignments, plans for Fall 2022, etc.</li> </ul>
-----------------	--

## Meeting Notes:

JCI greeted everyone and thanked everyone for attending. She updated everyone regarding the 9month extension for the EEO Plan submission, noting that we were set to update the EEO plan around this time, but they are changing the requirements to make it more data-driven. JCI shared the memo detailing the postponement.

JCI shared the side-by-side comparison of old vs. new EEO Plan requirements. She reviewed the different components and requirements listed, even though more information is needed before we can move forward in revising the plan in most instances.

VU said that the committee for the comprehensive master plan has already met, and will be meeting again at the beginning of June, and they have brought a consultant in. VU said that one of the issues is how to connect the master plan with all the other campus-wide plans – enrollment management, education, technology, equity, the eeo plan, etc., and the need to make sure that everything is in line and connected.

CW asked about interpreting the data and how that would work, i.e., would we just give it to Chancellor's Office and they send it back. CP said that we usually are reporting on the workforce, demographics, employees etc., and it seems like they are going to tell us how to use the submitted data to do the analysis that they want. She said there is still really no guidance as to how it will work yet.

JCI mentioned that we compare to similar institutions and our student base, but that we're hoping that explicit instructions and training will be forthcoming from the Chancellor's office. CP said they will likely want each District to use the same methodology. There was discussion about if it was dependent on faculty and staff turnover; CP said it depends on what they're asking for, but a lot of that is up in the air.

DM said that diversity is improving, and that even though small percentages may not look like a big deal, it actually is, and suggested that digging a bit deeper into the data might make this clearer.

JCI said that a decision has been made to work towards paying EEO representatives for serving on hiring committees. EEO representatives must serve on all FT committees, and ensure that there are no conflicts of interest, check bias, etc., and EER training and having them serve is part of the regulations. JCI established that in the near future, we are going to start making the serving as an EER on these recruitments receive a stipend. Funds are coming from EEO funds (TDI receives this money from the Chancellor's Office for EEO-related expenses). There has been a decrease in monies paid out for events and trainings for various reasons, largely the pandemic, etc. There has been a lot of feedback about how important it is to have high-quality, engaged EERs, and the TDI Office lacks the supply to meet the demand. There will be higher standards required to be an EER – more training, fully completing the entire recruitment, more discretion, no longer first come first serve.

NB suggested that it may be time to revisit the EEO video shown at the first meeting, as often questions come up and everything doesn't always come across. JCI said that some concepts are not easy to pick up on quickly, that often she will review something and it will seem to be understood at the time, but issues arising later make it clear that it wasn't. NB said that with regards to the EER video many committee members will tune out saying things like 'I've already seen this,' 'I don't need to pay

attention,' but they don't fully grasp it. NB offered any help she could give. DM had questions relating to the accountability to this – she understands the need for confidentiality, but sometimes it gets in the way of information being reported to those who need to know it to change the toxic culture. DM said that she has had Senate Reps. come to her with concerning information or situations that the EERs have not stopped, but they don't want the information passed on due to fear of losing their job, retaliation, etc. She wonders with EERs, how do we ensure accountability when there are problems. JCI agreed and noted that there are several separate issues in play – confidentiality vs. discomfort in reporting – impact on them, power dynamics, etc. JCI said that there will be updates to the training, the video, etc., the changes will take some time and may start small.

SK asked where the exact responsibility of the EER is defined. He discussed that when he thinks of the title, it seems kind of neutral and procedural, and wonders whether it is part of their job to seek out candidates who value diversity and inclusion. JCI said it is more the former, and said the other portion falls more under the Plan and to the subcommittees, and the EERs focus in hiring committees is getting people to follow the process, monitor biases, and stick with what they're supposed to do – hire based on the job announcement, hold discussions within the context of the process.

LC mentioned that another issue is that the culture of our hiring panels seem to think that the EEO is just there for the meeting, but they don't necessarily understand the consequences of interactions that the EEO is observing and monitoring, that the old idea of 'we can hire anyone we want' is still very prevalent, we just have to go through the motions of this process. She said that many committees don't take it seriously that the EEO at any time can stop the process if there are issues. She noted that she has gone to TDI and HR and had interventions on what they were doing, and that now is a good time, the culture can change. She suggested that in the marketing for EEO participation, the representative needs to be seen as an equal in that process. The number one principle is not to stop a hiring, but to make sure that hiring occurs as a non-biased process. JCI agreed that it's important for the committee to understand the EER's role. Hiring chairs need to be aware of the EER's role, and any changes to the process need to be clearly communicated, for example at 2<sup>nd</sup> level interviews, HR/President are making changes, such as the President asking a discretionary question at the end.

There was discussion about additional training and testing. An evaluation component was suggested – did this person do a good job, not did this person agree with me, was the EER completely quiet, did they not say anything if an incident occurred. JCI said that hopefully we can work together to address accountability. DM suggested an EER report at the end as well, as there are some problematic divisions/areas, but nobody wants to be the one to put that information out there due to negative repercussions. Within the bounds of what we're allowed to look at – division that will forward because they finally got prioritized, and if they don't hire, then they may not get to, so they hire someone who isn't an ideal candidate.

CW said that he had gone through an EER training at OC, and that there was a lot of role playing that was very helpful, and they were critiqued and received feedback. JCI asked if he had a contact or any information on the program to share.

JCI said that the goal is summer and we are open to any feedback. Fairness and transparency are important, and keeping the process consistent.