Title IX, Diversity, and Inclusion General EEO Committee Meeting – Via Zoom Thursday, September 28, 2023 11:00 am – 12:00 pm

EEC Committee Members:

Ahmadpour, Ali Alamillo, Lucy Andrade, Argelia Anzaldo, Carlos Aramburo, Julieta Bailey, Nina Baumunk, Jeff Blada. Michael Bond, Breeanna Cervantes, Cynthia Chaney, Van Christophersen, Rick Clemons, Lyn Fujiwara, Melissa Gonzalez, Ricky X Greco, Gary Gutierrez, Edith Hernandez. Arturo Hernandez, Maribel Herrera Thomas, Hong Herrera, Xocoyotzin Herrschaft, Amy Huynh, Tiffany lino, Kelsey X Ishikawa, Jaynie Justice, Lillian

X Kunisaki, Sheryl X Kushigemachi, Scott Kyte, Debbie Lemons, Marlow Levine, Georgi Marsh. Brandi X McClelland, Darcie X McCoy, Roxanne X Miyashiro, Jane Patel, Dipte X Pineda, Carolyn Plum, Lavonne Robertson, Gary Rouse, Beverly Russell, Solomon Sabio, Sabra Sims, Jackie Smith. Maria Solarzano, Erika X Unda, Viviana X Webb, Amanda X Wells, Rex Williams, Robert Youn, Yumi Young, Lashanta

___Murakawa, Trisha (BoT)

Osario, Andres (Student Rep.) Stein, Dulce (Student Rep.)

AGENDA

| 11:00 – 11:15am | Welcome and Overview |
|-----------------|---|
| 11:15 – 12:00pm | 2023 EEO Plan 2023-2026 EEO Plan Status Data Analysis and Component XIII Review |

Meeting Notes:

JCI greeted everyone and noted that the TDI office had provided the draft EEO Plan for 2023-26 to the committee earlier this week for review and feedback, and the purpose of this meeting is to review the

Plan and approve the draft for submission to the Chancellor's Office. She reviewed the Table of Contents, briefly describing each component.

JCI walked the committee through Component 10 and the process for gathering demographic data, and noted that providing that information is voluntarily, and certain categories have a low response rate. She said the link will likely be on the IR website. CP said the Chancellor's Office wants the data separate from the Plan because there is an expectation that the data will be reviewed and updated on at least an annual basis. The data is broken down by monitored groups in each job category. JCI reminded the committee that the Chancellor's Office provided more guidance as to reference points for comparisons (state of CA, US, local census, etc.), and reviewed the four stages that the data is tracked at, the 80% rule, and the steps to address adverse impact. Component 12 covers how we address underrepresentation, looking at retention, etc.

CW asked if we differentiate between FT and PT faculty for purposes of the report, because PT faculty are much more diverse, and if it takes into account length of employment, because in order to increase diversity, we would have to do more new hires. CP said it's not asked for in the plan, but is definitely something to consider, and that we could look into if we can track length of employment.

JCI said that Component 13 is the most substantive; it's the grid for pre-hiring, hiring, and post-hiring and what we are going to do as a District in each of those areas to help implement these practices. She discussed the creation of an EEO Subcommittee on the Screening & Selection Process, and various other goals in Component 13 related to training, committee representatives, etc. She said it's important that there are standard steps we can take to make the process more transparent and less subjective.

JCI moved on to the data analysis section, which used to be in the Plan, but is now external. JCI reiterated that data is broken down by gender, ethnicity, job category, and she walked the committee through weighted data categories (highest weight is given to student population, least weight is given to CA and US population), and reviewed an analysis of the applicant pool. The latest data is from Fall 2022. She noted that there is a big difference between FT and PT faculty and that for the later tables, many job categories are consolidated into 'Classified Staff,' because that's how ECC does it.

AW mentioned that a Union member had asked if applicants for TNC, TC and SSP positions are required to answer the race/ethnicity questions, and if it would be possible to run this report including TNCs, TCs, and SSPs employees. CP and JM noted that the data is pulled from iGreentree, and so would not include those categories.

AW said that it had been requested that the VP of HR and Director of HR be included along with the EEO Officer for complaints being directed to the President's office. The committee agreed that this was an acceptable addition to the Plan text.

DM said that for FT faculty there are multi-level interviews, and she's curious about the differentiation from the final interviews for the screening committee and then final interviews with the President, maybe add a column for selected for 1st interview, and then selected for final interview. JCl asked if that's something that we track, and JM confirmed that it is. JCl said that we could consider it moving forward, and CP noted it could be addressed in the sub-committees.

JCI asked if the committee approved the draft plan and the accompanying data. A vote was taken and the committee approved the Plan for submission to the Chancellor's Office.

VU asked about the timeline, and said she wanted to do a thorough data review. JCI said that it is due on Monday, October 2nd, but that there will be time to make changes after that as we also incorporate Chancellor's Office feedback as well. JM said she has talked to some other Districts that have already

submitted their EEO Plans and they got a tremendous amount of specific feedback, and it would be helpful to have that before making additional substantial changes.

JCI said she appreciates everyone's patience and feedback and realizes there is a lot of information. She said that our subcommittees will need to be intentional about their meetings, since there are specific goals we are trying to meet and thanked everyone for their time and efforts. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:54am.