

Office of Title IX, Diversity, and Inclusion

Spring 2025 General EEO Committee Meeting Via Zoom

Tuesday, June 3, 2025 11:00 am – 12:00 pm

EEO Committee Members

- Agu, Chidinma
 Ahmadpour, Ali
- 3. Alamillo, Lucy
- 4. Andrade, Argelia
- 5. <u>Aramburo</u>, Julieta
- 6. Bailey, Nina
- 7. <u>x</u> Baumunk, Jeff
- 8. Blada, Michael
- 9. ___Bond, Breeanna
- 10. <u>x</u>Camacho, Carla
- 11. <u>x</u>Capistran, Guadalupe
- 12. <u>Casillas, Miguel (Student Rep)</u>
- 13. Casillas, Veronica
- 14. Cervantes, Cynthia
- 15. Chaney, Van
- 16. Christophersen, Rick
- 17. Cooper, Yamonte
- 18. ____Fujiwara, Melissa
- 19. <u>Gonzalez, Ricky</u>
- 20. <u>x</u>Gray, Jill
- 21. X Greco, Gary
- 22. x Gutierrez, Edith
- 23. Hanoa, Amy
- 24. Hernandez, Arturo

25. Hernandez, Maribel Herrera Thomas, Hong 26. Herrera, Xocoyotzin 27. Herrschaft, Amy 28. 29. Huynh, Tiffany lino. Kelsev 30. 31. x Ishikawa, Jaynie (Chair) 32. ____ Josephides, Analu 33. x Justice, Lillian 34. Kunisaki, Sheryl 35. x Kushigemachi, Scott 36. Kyte, Debbie 37. x Lemons, Marlow Levine, Georgi 38. 39. ___ Lipscomb, La Shonda 40. x Martinez Garcia, Sandra 41. x McClelland, Darcie 42. x McCoy, Roxanne 43. x Meredith, Julie 44. Miyashiro, Jane 45. Moreno, Edgar (Student Rep) Murakawa, Trisha (BoT) 46. 47. x Nguyễn, Connie 48. Osorio, Andres (Student Rep)

49. Patel, Dipte 50. x Perez, Grace Pineda, Carolyn 51. 52. x Plum, Lavonné Roberts, Brett C.S. (BoT) 53. Rouse. Beverly 54. 55. Russell, Elizabeth 56. Russell, Solomon 57. Sabio, Sabra 58. Sachdev, Vineeta 59. Sims, Jacquelyn Smith, Maria 60. X Solorzano, Erika 61. 62. X Soltis, Kayla (Student Rep) 63. x Soohoo, Erica 64. Stein, Dulce (Student Rep) 65. X Streicker, Nicole Suarez, Jason 66. 67. <u>x</u> Unda, Viviana 68. x Webb, Amanda

- 69. Williams, Robert
- 70. Youn, Yumi
- 71. Young, Lashanta

AGENDA

11:00 – 11:15 am	Welcome, Overview & EEO General Committee Updates
	Last meeting of semester!
11:15 – 12:00 pm	EEO Plan – Annual Certification
	EEO Subcommittee Updates:
	Recruitment & Outreach (Chair, Maria Smith)
	Screening & Selection Process (Chair, Maria Smith)
	Measures of Underrepresentation (Chair, Jaynie Ishikawa)
	• EER/Committee Member Training (Chair, Jaynie Ishikawa)
	Campus Climate Survey (Chair, Carolyn Pineda)
	Professional Development - Guest
	Speakers/Workshops/Events/Training (Co-Chairs Ali Ahmadpour,
	Sheryl Kunisaki, and Darcie McClelland)



MEETING NOTES

EEO Plan – Annual Certification

- New due date: September 1
 - The new due date for inputting into BoardDocs will be August 4, 2025, for the August 25th board meeting.
- CCC Webinar Series on Completing the EEO Annual Certification Form held on 5/13 & 14. Waiting for recording and FAQ link from them.

EEO Plan/Component 13

- EEO Plan was board-approved in February 2024 and covers February 2024 through February 2027. <u>2024-2027 El Camino College Equal Employment</u> <u>Opportunity (EEO) Plan</u>
 - Year 1: February 2024 February 28, 2025
 - Year 2: March 1, 2025 February 28, 2026 <-We are in Year 2!
 - Year 3: March 1, 2026 February 28, 2027

EEO Committee/Subcommittee Updates

- Recruitment & Outreach
 - In the fall, the committee developed a rubric to quantify a candidate's sensitivity to diversity which is included in our job announcements.
 - This semester, they are waiting for an opportunity to test the rubric on a management recruitment (possibly 2 recruitments).
 - In the upcoming fall meeting, they plan to review the results of the rubric responses.
- Screening & Selection Process
 - Two surveys were distributed to gather suggestions.
 - Survey results will be reviewed on June 5.
 - A report will be shared at the next meeting.
- Measures of Underrepresentation
 - EEO Plan Component 13: Sample data set & calculating adverse impact, CO's 80% rule, need for an ECC tailored measurement & finding a potential alternative measurement, challenges related to using metrics, what to do with all of this.
 - The group is evaluating how underrepresentation is measured, including the functions and weightings used.
 - A concern was raised about how to proceed if all factors are flagged as having adverse impact (AI).
 - Once a measurement approach is finalized, it will be shared with HR for use during recruitment.
 - A "homogeneity index" from machine learning was discussed as a potential tool.
 - The committee is considering what cutoff value to use, possibly differing from the article's recommendations (article attached).
- EER/Committee Member Training

El Camino College

Office of Title IX, Diversity, and Inclusion

- Working on update of EEO Search Committee Video in Keenan. Amy Hanoa, subcommittee member, updated slides to be compliant with accessibility/district standards. Will work on voice over next.
- EEO Plan Component 13:
 - Clean up member listing/training requirements.
 - Goal to have at least one representative from each bargaining unit committee.
 - Current membership is sufficient, but efforts are ongoing to designate reps.
 - Need to establish rep from each EE bargaining unit on EEO Gen Committee (?).
 - Training Participation: 75% participation rate in EER/EEO training.
- Discussion Point (ML):
 - Consider conducting a census of all divisions to reassess the number of reps, especially in light of recent reorganization.
 - Potential need to do more campus outreach?
- Campus Climate Survey
 - Employee Campus Climate Survey:
 - Survey has closed and results were reported out.
 - Feedback and recommendations were incorporated into HR's engagement survey action plans.
 - Updates were shared with the full committee (see emails from VU).
 - Student Campus Climate Survey
 - Findings were presented to the Student Success Committee approximately one year after administration.
 - The committee recommended collecting updates in areas needing improvement.
 - Tri-chairs asked VU to gather additional findings; a report-out is expected in the fall.
- Professional Development Guest Speakers/Workshops/Events/Training
 - No new funding requests have been received, so there are no current updates.
 - Previously, the committee focused on developing a standardized submission request process to guide the use of EEO funds.
 - This process ensures that funding requests align with the intended obligations of EEO-related funding guidelines.

EEO Committee – Open for Questions, Comments, and Concerns:

- Concern Raised (GP):
 - Employees from HR and/or Confidential employees serving as Equal Employment Representatives (EERs) may present a conflict of interest.
 - Concern that such EERs may not fully represent or voice committee concerns.
 - Example: If job descriptions (JDs) have nuanced changes, HR-affiliated EERs may not recognize issues, potentially aligning more with HR/management perspectives, leading to bias.



Office of Title IX, Diversity, and Inclusion

- Response (MS):
 - HR does not change job descriptions; this concern relates to a specific case and will be discussed offline (MS, GP, AW, JCI).
- Response (JCI):
 - If there is ever an issue with an EER, it should be reported to JCI.
- Concern Raised (DM):
 - Job descriptions (JD) can be vague, making it difficult to formulate relevant questions.
 - Response (MS): Job Descriptions (JDs) list representative duties and are reviewed and approved by the ECCE and the Board. Once a position is posted and the search committee begins reviewing applications, it is too late to make edits to the JD.
 - Screening is based on minimum qualifications; interview questions assess desirables.
 - Faculty searches allow for JD edits each time.
- Other Updates (JCI):
 - A condensed version of screening/committee training was given to the Board of Trustees (BOT).
 - Shout out to Roxanne! She is retiring this month; thanked for her all her hard work especially her efforts in processing large volumes of HR data for the EEO/Annual Certification reports!!

Spring 2025 Updates/Reminders

- Subcommittees were established to carry out the goals outlined in the EEO Plan, specifically focusing on increasing workforce diversity.
- All members are strongly encouraged to continue these discussions within the respective EEO subcommittees.
- Anyone interested in joining a subcommittee should contact JCI, AW, or NS in the TDI Office!
- Next meeting: likely in the Fall; Faculty are not here over summer.

Fall 2025 Meeting Dates

• TBD! NS will look at calendars and (try to) find the best meeting time.

JCI thanked everyone for attending and the meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:35 am.

A MEASURE OF HOMOGENEITY FOR NOMINAL CATEGORICAL DATA '

TARALD O. KVÅLSETH

University of Minnesota

Summary.—When dealing with nominal categorical data, homogeneity (dominance) is a characteristic of frequent interest. The present paper proposes a new measure of this characteristic. It is claimed to be superior to other available measures, especially with respect to its empirical properties.

For measuring the homogeneity (dominance, concentration) among nominal categorical data, the sum S of the squared proportions of observations in the various categories is a frequently used measure. It appears to have originally been proposed by Simpson (1949). Monotonic decreasing functions of S, such as 1 - S and 1/S, are commonly used measures of heterogeneity or diversity, especially in biology and ecology (e.g., Magurran, 1988).

Although S and related measures have a number of desirable theoretical properties, certain important empirical properties are not satisfied. In particular, S takes on values that are intuitively unreasonable, tending to be much too small (see also Kvålseth, 1989). The purpose of this communication is to introduce briefly a new measure of homogeneity (dominance, concentration) with superior empirical properties and one that satisfies all reasonable theoretical requirements. This new measure K is simply equal to the largest proportion, plus the second largest proportion divided by 2, plus the third largest proportion divided by 3, and so forth. Formally, if the proportions for the *n* categories are rank-ordered such that $p_1 \ge p_2 \ge \ldots \ge p_n$, then

$$K = p_1 + p_2/2 + \ldots + p_n/n = \sum_{i=1}^n p_i/i$$

That is, K is simply the mean inverse rank.

The potential values of K range from $K_0 = (1/n) \sum_{i=1}^{n} 1/i > 0$ to 1; K = 1 when all observations fall in a single category (i.e., $p_1 = 1$), which is the most highly homogeneous condition; and $K = K_0 > 0$ when the proportions are all equal (i.e., $p_1 = \ldots = p_n, = 1/n$), which is the least homogeneous condition for any given number of categories n. The corresponding range of values for the measure S is from $S_0 = 1/n$ to 1. Both K_0 and S_0 are decreasing functions of n as one would expect of any reasonable homogeneity index, that is, the

¹Address enquiries to T. O. Kvälseth, Department of Mechanical Engineering, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN 55455.

larger the number of categories is, the greater is the potential for having low homogeneity or dominance in an absolute sense.

As a numerical example, consider the case of n = 4 categories with proportions .10, .60, .10, .20 for which

$$S = (.10)^2 + ... + (.20)^2 = .42$$
 and $K = .60 + .20/2 + .10/3 + .10/4 = .76$.

This K value of .76, which is the midpoint of the interval from $K_0 = .52$ to 1, appears to be an intuitively reasonable homogeneity value for these proportions. By comparison, the S value of .42 clearly seems to be too small, that is, it is too close to the lower end of the interval from $S_0 = .25$ to 1. Such empirical arguments are most easily appreciated for the case of n = 2 categories. Thus, for example, consider the proportions (probabilities) .75 and .25. This distribution is equally far from the distribution (.50, .50) (when homogeneity is a minimum for n = 2) as it is from the distribution (1, 0) (when homogeneity is a maximum). Thus, for the (.75, .25)-distribution, a reasonable measure of homogeneity should have a value that is about halfway between its two possible extremes. This requirement is satisfied by the K measure since K = .750 + .250/2 = .875, which is exactly half way between $K_0 = .750$ and 1. For the S measure, however, we have S = .625, which is much closer to $S_0 = \frac{1}{2}$ than to 1.

In conclusion, the index K is proposed as a measure of homogeneity that appears to be superior to the classical S measure, especially with respect to their empirical properties. The theoretical properties of K, which will be detailed elsewhere, are similar to those of S. Some monotonic decreasing function of K may also serve as an appropriate measure of heterogeneity (diversity).

REFERENCES

Kvålsetth, T. O. Odds measure of qualitative variation. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 1989, 68, 830.

MAGURRAN, A. E. Ecological diversity and its measurement. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univer. Press, 1988.

SIMPSON, E. H. Measurement of diversity. Nature, 1949, 163, 688.

Accepted April 13, 1993.