

Steering Committee Meeting October 7, 2016.

Attending the meeting: Pedro Cavazos, Keith Champagne, Valerie Chapman, Anne Cubilie, Bobby Cummings, Michelle Cyrus, Sigrid Davison, Jeffrey Dippman, Barb Flanagan, Judith Hennessy, Pamela McMullin-Messier, Geraldine O'Mahony, Chuck Reasons, Dawn Alford, Susanna Flores, Lola Gallagher.

1. Welcome

Anne Cubilie began the meeting by explaining what has been happening with regard to the SJHR Dialogue and year-long theme. The transition from the first year to the second year has had its challenges. She thanked everyone for being here and for all of their efforts last year. Last year was a tremendous start. Anne also thanked the executive committee for sharing the workload going forward. She also noted that Stacey Robertson really believed in the importance of this work.

Anne noted that they did not put in place a governance structure last year. She asked how can we create a sustainable structure for the SJHR dialogue going forward? And how can we be transparent about these activities going forward?

Anne then went on to explain the sponsorship for this year's theme including generous support from Continuing Education. And she added that the Associate Provost's office gave some money as well.

She also noted that next year's theme had been decided on and it was sustainability. Hopefully we can incorporate sustainability into this year's framework on migration.

She noted that it is important that we maintain on ongoing dialogue and not simply forget about a topic/theme after the year is over. She added that Provost Frank is very supportive.

2. Introduction of individuals in attendance

3. Introduction of Executive Committee and the roles and responsibilities of each person.

The executive committee will rotate who heads the meetings. Sigrid explained that she was responsible for assessment. Keith talked about connecting academic and student life and will work with Lola on marketing. Barb noted that she was looking after the budget and was the campus contact. Chuck said he would receive proposals.

The goals for the SJHR Dialogues was explained (as outlined on page 2 of the handout). Discussion additionally clarified and connected the goals to the framework for the year.

Discussion of the meaning of migration. One point of needed clarification was regarding the overall theme of migration. Members of the Executive Committee explained that this year's theme would take an expansive understanding of 'migration' to include: IDPs, refugees, immigration, forced migration. We are interested in the causes and consequences of migration broadly defined and we were interested not only in domestic aspects but international aspects as well.

Discussion of assessment: Assessment will be focused on events that have been identified by the executive committee. Postcards with assessment questions will be utilized at each identified event.¹ How to assess (include in assessment) classroom activities was discussed. Members of the executive committee explained some of our initial efforts in this realm. For example, we would be going to the

different colleges to ask what was occurring within their departments. We also explained that this is an area that we need to work on throughout the year.

A concern was raised about the awareness of department chairs and specifics of a course. The group discussed ways to get faculty to self-report, respond to an electronic survey and how to best use Canvas as was done last year to share syllabi. This will be an ongoing discussion.

Discussion of Promotional and Funding Criteria: SJHR Executive Committee has drafted request for promotion and funding, this is primarily to identify those activities we have targeted for including in assessment and reporting. Information from the request form is to guide decision making, including how an academic or co-curricular endeavor meets the SJHR goals. Currently, the focus is on public events. This prompted a conversation about what promotion entailed. Given the subsequent discussion, the executive committee will need to define what is meant by promotion.

Concerns were raised about restrictions on the use of the logo. And noted that Student Activities does not want two different types of assessment.² Clarification was needed on the perspective of the SJHR Committee and what being included as an SJHR Dialogue event means. In part it is about attending to identified events in a consistent and strategic way, others noted that it will also help with coordination, credibility, and consistent devising of the theme. An example was made of a recent event, Songs of Justice, which was a fantastic way to start off and set the tone of the year even though it was developed independently of the theme. There will be a speaker in Nov that will be coming in in the next few weeks (and film) about Chinese food in America.

The SJHR Dialogues would like to encourage the entire campus to engage with the theme and with the tenets of social justice and human rights. As a newly formed group, we would like to identify a body of evidence on which to focus. Doing so, will allow us to confine what is attended to and hopefully better understand what works and what does not.

One task we will need to work on is a calendar, both for events and in regard to process. This will help faculty include the events and the theme more intentionally in their syllabi. Next year, having the theme set earlier and promoted (like late Spring quarter) would provide faculty the opportunity to include the theme in their courses.

There are two events that are being supported by SJHR Dialogues that have not gone through this process. Given our late start, we wanted to support these two efforts. We are trying to establish a transparent and consistent process as best we can and the Steering Committee will help us identify issues and refine what we are doing. For next steering committee meeting, we need to develop some working groups to deal with a few things, such as social media, and faculty engagement.

3:10 meeting ended.

Footnote 1 – Not sure if this was mentioned during the meeting, but a second level of assessment, an end of quarter survey, is also planned.

Footnote 2 – Sigrid subsequently talked to the Student Activities fee committee (10/13/2016), and they see no problem with SJHR Dialogues including an assessment with an identified event.