

Santa Monica College - Equity and Diversity Committee

Meeting Agenda

Location: Zoom (<https://cccconfer.zoom.us/j/95534437834>)

Date: May, 18, 2022

Time: 11am-12:30pm PST (Pacific Standard Time)

Attendees: Steph Anderson, Sara Brewer, Amber Qureshi Urrutia, Tiffany Inabu, Valerie Udeozor, Julissa Hernandez Romero (student rep), Chloe Heo (student rep)

Interested Parties: Peter Morse

I. Call to Order & Approval of Agenda 11:08AM

Motion: Sara Brewer

2nd: Tiffany Inabu

Passed Unanimously

II. Introduction of Committee

- Welcome Valerie Udeozor from the Nursing Department

III. Public Comments

No public comment

IV. Approval of Minutes from April 6, 2022, Meeting

Motion: Valerie Udeozor

2nd: Amber Qureshi

Approved

V. Reports

Chairs report

- All-Gender Bathrooms Initiative
 - Steph presented to the state and discussed the process at SMC.
 - **Obstacle 1: California Plumbing Code (CPC).** The California Plumbing Code is binary (specifying only male and female facilities). The code essential prescribes a ratio of male and female bathrooms that public buildings must adhere dependent upon building occupancy. Because there is no inclusion or mention of all-gender/unisex restrooms, converting extant male and/or female multi-stall bathrooms to be all-gender would violate the CPC.
 - **Extant workaround – Jurisdiction Authority.**
 - Within the state of CA, some large entities have what is known as “Jurisdiction Authority,” which essentially allows them to interpret and

apply the CPC. The UC system and Cal State systems are both their own Jurisdiction Authorities.

- The UCs specifically have determined that so long as the proportion of all-gender, male-designated, and female-designated bathrooms do not exceed 1/3 of the total count, they are in compliance with CPC (<https://www.ucop.edu/construction-services/facilities-manual/resource-directories-rds/rd4-project-programmatic-guidelines/rd-4-1.html>).
- ****Santa Monica College is not its own Jurisdiction Authority.** So we're beholden to the CPC as it is written.

- **Hopeful legislation** – Ben Allen has introduced legislation that essentially allow a city, county or city and county to require public restroom facilities to be all-gender ([SB-1194](#)). I'm not sure when this will be voted on (maybe by June?), but it's already gone through a second read.
- **Other (potentially) hopeful opportunity.** Our facilities department told us that the CPC is set to be updated during the coming fiscal year. It is worth exploring ways that our institution can advocate for an inclusive update.

- **Obstacle 2: Physical construction specifications.**

- If SB-1194 were to pass, it specifies that all-gender bathrooms must be constructed to be fully-enclosed stalls (floor-to-ceiling walls and doors). At SMC, this would require that the bathrooms we've identified be renovated to meet this requirements. Our facilities estimates that this would cost up to \$15,000 per stall.

- All-gender bathrooms received support from DPAC Facilities and DPAC. Moving forward, there will be incorporation of all-gender bathrooms in facilities master plan for future construction.

- Other reports - No reports

VI. Old Business

- Advocating for more SIs (Amber)
There has been some expanding SI support. Amber will reach out to Maria Munoz (Campus Redesign) and Jessica Krug (IEPI grant) to follow up. Jessica Krug will be working with Senate Chairs to collaboratively work on a vision for the Center.

VII. New Business

- Land Acknowledgment statement from Decolonizing the Academy committee – Shannon Herbert
 - Tabled until the next meeting
- Working with FA to implement evaluation updates (Peter Morse) & Tenure/Instructional Evaluation Review – possible models for evaluation (Sara Brewer)
 - The evaluation process sits within a space where faculty have a voice, but must ultimately be agreed upon by the District. Any changes to the evaluation process goes to a committee. Peter wanted to know the ideal outcome and hear more about areas

where there needs to improvements and changes. How can we ensure that no harm is done?

- Example: adjunct faculty evaluation. If faculty get “needs improvement”, how can we make it a learning experience for improvement that is supportive and not punitive.
- Potential Ideal Outcomes:
 - Looking at different way of doing things (considering the circumstances).
 - Incorporating how equity is integrated into the curricula
 - Monitoring who sits on tenure faculty committees.
 - Explicitly explain what “needs improvement” means.
 - Evaluators to get training on how to do effective evaluations
 - Updating forms to be more specific so they’re outdated and too general.
 - Create a rubric to incorporate both the evaluator and evaluatee reflected upon during the evaluation process that can be discussed collaboratively.
 - Incorporate professional development.
 - Ensuring that faculty of color feels supported by the institution (i.e. allowing for innovative practices without retaliation during the evaluation process).
 - Opportunities for real dialogue about the evaluation.
 - Clearer guidelines on what self-evaluations or plans for professional development should look like and how detailed those documents should be.
 - Set clearer expectations on service commitments and involvement.
- How to implement change for updating evaluation forms (self and student): needs to have a proposal to go to a committee.
 - Type of committee: has to be agreed upon (faculty and administration).
 - Actionable steps to create committee: Peter (FA) brings this (the need for the committee) up to the next meeting with management.
- Next steps for the June meetings:
 - Close read and look at documents that Sara provided (Georgia, Boise, and English Dept.)
 - Steph will connect with Peter to discuss observation form.

VIII. Adjournment: 12:38