President’s Commission on Diversity  
Meeting Notes – December 7, 2015

Present: Reggie Blaylock, Astrid Davis, Andy Feinstein, Stacy Gleixner, Debra Griffith, Andrew Hsu, Navpreet Kaur, Michael Kimbarow, Sue Martin, Veronica Mendoza Hand, Mary Okin, Lydia Ortega, Julie Paisant, Hector Perea, Michael Randle, Jeanette Somo, Meg Virick,

Absent: Fernanda Karp, Hyon Chu Yi-Baker, Francis Howard, Itza Sanchez.

GUESTS: John Briggs, Research Coordinator, Institutional Effectiveness and Analytics (IEA)  
Scott Heil, Director, Institutional Effectiveness and Analytics; Barry Shiller, AVP, Strategic Communications and Public Affairs.

Co-Chair Blaylock brought the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m. A big thank you to John Briggs, Scott Heil and Meg Virick for their work interpreting the results of the 2015 campus climate survey in comparison with the 2010 survey. Around the table for introductions.

Updates on action items:

1. **Campus Climate Survey – Overview of Results (Scott, Meg and John):** Every student, faculty, staff and administrator was contacted by email this past March and April. The estimated survey participation rates by the different groups were reported. They are similar to what has been received recently on other large university wide surveys. They are comparable to what some of the other CSU’s get when they run a big survey like the NSSE. The response level is higher than the 2010 campus climate survey.

   The student’s survey gender balance was a little more female then the population average by a few percentage points. We are right around 50/50, and we also had a number of students responding in none traditional genders. Average age was probably a little older than our student population. The age of 24 was calculated based on the survey. The university students’ age average is probably a bit younger than that.

   The survey changed a fair amount between the 2010 version and the spring 2015 survey, but in most areas where we can measure a change, the change was flat or negative. There were only a very small number of areas where there was any kind of positive change.

   Scott presented details of the results including analysis of responses related to the general climate, discrimination, harassment, comfort engaging in difficult discussions, racial tensions, campus engagement, safety, job satisfaction, and campus administration/leadership.

Next Steps - As recommended to the President:
The PCD will work to ensure that survey results are published/communicated to the campus community in a transparent manner.

The survey results will be communicated to the campus community as soon as possible before the upcoming holiday break in the form of an Executive Summary, along with a link to the entire survey results.

The idea is to send it now with some information indicating that after the holidays we will be getting more information out, giving folks a chance to review it during the break at their own leisure when they have time.

It was suggested to include in the campus message the various operational fronts that the administration has been working on, reflecting the areas of concern expressed based on the data received.

It was suggested to send the campus message that links to the data and executive summary on IEA’s website.

The PCD discussed in detail how to both present the results to the campus and engage the campus community in dialog about the results and next steps. Ideas were suggested to present the results to specific venues, such as the college’s welcome back meetings and to the University Council of Chairs and Deans (UCCD).

The importance of the open mic opportunity at last year’s two open forums was emphasized. Members of the campus community need a means of speaking and being listened to. The issue of low attendance at the open forums was discussed and addressed as a big concern. A point was raised to market differently to attract a broader audience.

The idea of creating a campus wide “Day of Conversation” was raised. Some ideas that were brainstormed include that this could be done in place of classes for a day; inviting community members and alumni; having faculty give extra credit points; including with the Day of Conversation a commitment for personal action after participating in the Day of Conversation.

The president can kick off her dialogue at the beginning of the semester with this and could be a really good start to the conversation and will also give time to think about the idea of creating a day of conversation.

Last point raised as PCD ran out of time was to consider having the PCD meet on a more regular basis. Meeting once a month does not seem to give the energy and continuity needed to do the job we have been asked to do.

2. Discussion on Request from Jewish Federation to Meet with PCD: No time to discuss this agenda item.

3. Discussion of Recent Race and Climate Issues on Campuses nationwide (related articles were shared on Google drive folder): No time to discuss this item.

The meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m.